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Executive Summary

The Naval Inspector General (NAVINSGEN) conducted an area visit of Naval Air Station (NAS) Pensacola from 8-12 February 2016. We visited NAS Pensacola and various tenant commands. Our last visit to NAS Pensacola was during the Area Visit to Navy Installations in the Southeast Region in 2010. The team was augmented with subject matter experts, including personnel from the Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR); Naval Safety Center (NAVSAFECEN); Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC); Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS); Office of the Chief of Naval Operations (OPNAV), Chief of Navy Chaplains (OPNAV N097); Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy for Policy (DUSN (P)), and Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR).

Our overall assessment is that NAS Pensacola is supporting tenant commands and ensuring that quality of life issues for Sailors, their families, and civilian employees are adequately addressed within existing financial constraints. NAS Pensacola was awarded the 2015 CNIC, Commander in Chief’s Annual Award for Excellence and the installation is effectively meeting its mission to deliver readiness from the shore efficiently. NAS Pensacola has been able to meet emerging requirements without degrading support to tenant commands.

During our visit, we assessed facilities, safety and environmental programs, security, good order and discipline, and quality of life for Sailors, their families, and civilian employees. Additionally, we conducted surveys and focus group discussions to assess the quality of home life (QOHL) and work life (QOWL).

Our survey and focus group discussions found that QOHL and QOWL at NAS Pensacola were significantly higher than our historical area visit average. Rated on a 10-point scale, the QOHL and QOWL was 7.72 and 6.95, respectively; the corresponding historical averages are 7.21 and 6.39. Major negative impacts to QOHL and QOWL included concerns over security, facilities, and gymnasiums. The concerns regarding security centered on the open installation policy and problems accessing the installation. Participants’ expressed concerns over the aging building infrastructure throughout NAS Pensacola and concerns regarding the gym on Corry Station; heating, ventilation, and air conditioning; and hours of operation. Participants expressed positive comments regarding the new gym on NAS Pensacola, the classes offered, and the existence of the gym on Saufley Field. Specific comments from focus groups and surveys were passed to Commander, Navy Region Southeast (CNRSE) and NAS Pensacola leadership, and are included in our report.

KEY FINDINGS

Mission Performance

Command Relationships
The NAS Pensacola Commanding Officer has developed strong relationships with tenant commands; the best we have seen in recent memory. These relationships were forged through
informative and effective monthly leadership meetings, quarterly Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) drumbeat forums, ad hoc conferences, and informal social gatherings. The well-informed major commanders serve as information conduits for the remaining 113 tenant commands that reside within their respective chains of command.

Personnel Support Detachment
We found that the Personnel Support Detachment (PSD) has markedly improved their processes since our last visit in 2010. With a 99 percent timeliness rate, 97 percent accuracy rate, being rated the number 1 of 3 large category PSDs, and ranked number 6 of 43 PSDs overall, it is clear that PSD Pensacola is performing well with respect to Navy Pay and Personnel Support Center metrics.

Total Force Manpower Support
NAS Pensacola is well-manned at 95 percent, or 491 of 516 billets authorized. The regionalization of the N1, N5, and N8 position has resulted in the NAS Pensacola Executive Officer serving as onsite action officer and principal conduit for coordination and communication with CNRSE for these matters, in addition to other assigned duties. If CNRSE is not able to execute the N1, N5, and N8 responsibilities for NAS Pensacola, due consideration should be given to billet restoration or periodic site visits.

Funeral Honors Support
NAS Pensacola has 11 Sailors on staff dedicated to support funeral honors for the Pensacola support area, which includes 4 Florida counties and 10 Alabama counties. In fiscal year 2015 (FY15), NAS Pensacola performed 542 funerals, and demand has steadily increased over the past four years.

Air Operations
Funded airfield improvements commencing in FY17 will impact flight training at NAS Pensacola, particularly when the airfield is restricted to single runway operations. NAS Pensacola Air Operations Department has proactively engaged tenant commands and will implement a phased approach to mitigate adverse operational impacts.

Port Operations
An A-76 study conducted in 1999 resulted in contractor manning for the majority of NAS Pensacola Port Operations positions. This has been a resounding success. The Coast Guard is considering home porting three to four Medium Endurance Cutters at NAS Pensacola in FY17 with follow-on potential for Offshore Patrol Craft home porting in FY22. Pier modifications for the larger Offshore Patrol Craft will require additional collaboration to address significant funding requirements.

Human Resources Program Support
NAS Pensacola tenant commands expressed significant concern with the centralized, regional civilian hiring model. Specifically, commanders conveyed that personnel losses resulted in 12-18 month billet gaps, and that OCHR Stennis Operations Center is overtaxed and has diverted workload to the San Diego and Philadelphia Operations Centers.
Equal Employment Opportunity
We observed confusion regarding civilian employee collective bargaining grievances and Equal Employment Opportunity complaint processes and procedures. As a result, we recommend that the CNRSE Equal Employment Opportunity Officer and Employee and Labor Relations Representatives provide onsite training and meet with local unions in Pensacola.

Information Technology Infrastructure
NAS Pensacola N6 staffing is not aligned with the CNIC N6 CONUS, Hawaii, Joint Region Marianas Installation, and Region Staffing Model guidelines. At the time of our inspection, the N6 Director, one of two Account Technical Representatives, and the Electronic Key Management System (EKMS) Assistant positions were vacant. Further, the Information Assurance Manager retired within a month of our inspection.

Facilities, Safety and Occupational Health, Environmental, Energy Conservation, Privatized Family Housing, and Barracks

Facilities Management
NAS Pensacola has an overall Installation Figure of Merit (IFOM) composite rating of 75 out of 100 per the Facility Readiness Evaluation System, below the same measure for CNRSE at 78 and all Navy installations at 81. The IFOM for NAS Pensacola is not likely to improve with the declining facility sustainment funding. Additionally, there is a critical need for military construction funding to support shortfalls in student dormitory housing.

Safety and Occupational Health
NAS Pensacola Safety and Occupational Health programs are not compliant. Workplace inspections are not properly specified in the Base Operating Support contract and thus not occurring. Further, Personal Protective Equipment program services and Fall Protection program services are minimal to non-existent. These repeat deficiencies were previously documented in the 2012 Navy Region Southeast Occupational Safety and Health Management Evaluation and the 2014 Regional Operations Assessment and Assistance Team report.

Security Programs and Cybersecurity/Technology

Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection
NAS Pensacola’s Antiterrorism Force Protection program is not compliant with governing instructions. 

(b) (7)(e)
Information Security
NAS Pensacola’s Information Security program is not fully compliant with governing instructions. The NAS Pensacola Information Security directive does not have all the required information security elements of a command security instruction.

Personnel Security
NAS Pensacola’s Personnel Security program is not fully compliant with governing instructions. The NAS Pensacola Personnel Security directive is missing several required elements.

Operations Security
NAS Pensacola does not have an Operations Security (OPSEC) program in place as required by governing instructions. This discrepancy was self-identified by the installation and an OPSEC Officer and OPSEC Assistant have recently been assigned.

Counterintelligence Training
Counterintelligence (CI) training is not fully compliant with governing instructions. Initial CI training is not being completed within 30 days of new employees reporting aboard.

Cybersecurity
NAS Pensacola’s Cybersecurity program is not fully compliant with governing instructions. NAS Pensacola does not have an Information Systems Security Manager or an Information Systems Security Officer. NAS Pensacola does not have an IT program director who provides oversight, requirements validation, budget preparation, or other functions for the installation.

Personally Identifiable Information
Personally Identifiable Information (PII) is not fully compliant with governing instructions.

Emergency Management
Emergency Management (EM) at NAS Pensacola is not fully compliant with governing instructions. The NAS Pensacola EM Officer has a significant scope of responsibilities, warranting a manpower assessment. The latest Installation EM plan revision was not reviewed by the Commanding Officer, a repeat finding from a September 2015 Higher Headquarters Operational Assessment. We also found no evidence of a formal EM training continuum for personnel or an EM training team.

Quality of Life and Community Support
We found that services and programs, including the commissary, galleys, and Navy College/Educational Services were effective in supporting quality of life for the NAS Pensacola community.

Command Managed Equal Opportunity
The Command Managed Equal Opportunity program manager works seven miles from the main part of the installation and is located in a facility that is not accessible without a passcode; this is a barrier for personnel to file a complaint or obtain services.
Medical/Dental Support
Naval Hospital Pensacola is still adjusting to the impact of implementing Bureau of Medicine and Surgery’s study, *Navy Hospitals in CONUS: Current State and Future Direction* recommendations that led to major changes to the hospital’s capabilities and shifted resources to other areas. Naval Hospital Pensacola’s leadership needs to educate the beneficiary population continuously, particularly retirees, to help them adjust to the changes. We were impressed with the handling of Sailors admitted to local hospitals for mental health reasons.

Morale, Welfare, and Recreation
The Family Fitness Center on Corry Station provides classes and equipment for children and offers areas where parents can exercise while keeping an eye on their children. This thoughtful concept promotes health and wellness for the entire family.

Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention
The NAS Pensacola Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention program is well-run and provides excellent support to a predominantly young student Sailor population. Though it provides a number of food and off-duty recreational activities, the Portside Enlisted Club could improve its efforts to de glamorize alcohol.

Religious Programs
NAS Pensacola’s Command Religious program team operates with a cooperative and collaborative spirit to a high degree that we do not often see. A high degree of coordination and mutual support across commands as evidenced by the number and quality of volunteer programs.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Response
The Sexual Assault Case Management Group (SACMG) is well-managed. The NAS Pensacola Commanding Officer’s practice of explaining the purpose of the monthly SACMG facilitates victim updates, direct system response, coordination, accountability, and victim access to quality services. This proactive SACMG approach is making a difference, particularly for an installation with a large high risk demographic.

We noted significant deficiencies in SAPR programs specific to NAS Pensacola headquarters. CNIC sent an individual to interview SARC S and Victim Advocates (VA) in February 2016 to assess these concerns.

NAS Pensacola SARC S and VAs also reported concerns with local NCIS support, specifically the treatment of SA victims and the seizure of cell phones for extended periods. An NCIS Supervisory Special Agent was assigned to NAS Pensacola in October 2015 to address the challenges. Additionally, a team of NCIS Agents from the Southeast Field Office visited NAS Pensacola in February 2016 to ensure proper care and program support for sexual assault victims.
Suicide Prevention
The Suicide Prevention program requires improvement. Required individual and watchstander training was not completed, suicide prevention resources and local contact information were not posted, and there was no crisis plan as required by governing instructions.

Voting Assistance
The Installation Voting Assistance (IVA) program is deficient. The IVA office is not clearly advertised, nor physically located in an area accessible by the installation’s populace; voicemails and emails requesting voting assistance were not returned within the required three business days; and the IVA office does not have a network capable of quickly disseminating voting information throughout the installation.
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Areas/Programs Assessed

- **Mission Performance**
  - Command Relationships
  - Command Communications
  - Personnel Support Detachment
  - Total Force Manpower
  - Funeral Honors Support
  - Air Operations
  - Port Operations
  - Human Resources Program Support
  - Equal Employment Opportunity
  - Information Technology Infrastructure

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

- **Security Programs and Information Assurance**
  - Command Security Overview
  - Information Security
  - Personnel Security
  - Industrial Security
  - Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection
  - Operations Security
  - Counterintelligence Training
  - Cybersecurity
  - Personally Identifiable Information
  - Emergency Management

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

- Senior Enlisted Engagement
Observations and Findings

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 Naval Air Station (NAS) Pensacola. In performing our assessment, we relied primarily on the draft Commander, Navy Region Southeast (CNRSE) Instruction, Mission, Functions, and Tasks of Naval Air Station Pensacola, and 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
- Personnel Support Detachment
- Total Force Manpower
- Funeral Honors Support
- Air Operations
- Port Operations
- Human Resources Program Support
- Equal Employment Opportunity
- Information Technology Infrastructure

The Mission Team examined these areas principally from the perspective of the Naval Station’s ability to support enduring tenant command missions, as well as unplanned fleet support requirements. We were able to conduct an in depth examination of the Naval Station’s mission accomplishment and the 2015 Commander, Navy Installations Command (CNIC), Commander in Chief’s Annual Award for Excellence winner is effectively meeting its mission to efficiently deliver readiness from the shore.

Despite similar resource constraints observed throughout the CNIC enterprise, NAS Pensacola has demonstrated the ability to meet new, emerging requirements without degrading enduring tenant command mission support. The installation responded well to the expanded presence of the United States Air Force (USAF) 479th Flying Training Group and commensurate increased hangar and airspace requirements, a significantly larger Center for Information Dominance student throughput than originally planned, as well as the Egyptian Navy’s Fast Missile Craft ground and waterborne training requirements.

Command Relationships

The NAS Pensacola Commanding Officer has forged strong, personal relationships with the 13 major tenant commanders:  Center for Information Dominance, Corry Station; Center for Naval Aviation Technical Training (CNATT); Commander, Training Wing Six, Marine Aviation Training Support Groups 21 and 23; Naval Aviation Schools Command; Naval Air Technical Training Center (NATCC); Naval Hospital Pensacola; Naval Education Training Command (NETC); Navy
Medicine Operational Training Center; Naval Education and Training Professional Development and Technology Center; USAF 479th Flying Training Group, and NAS Pensacola. These relationships were forged through informative and effective monthly leadership meetings, quarterly Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) drumbeat forums, ad hoc conferences, and informal social gatherings. The well-informed major commanders serve as information conduits for the remaining 113 tenant commands that reside within their respective chains of command.

Command Communications
NAS Pensacola’s Commanding Officer has established a Twitter account to communicate time-sensitive messages, conducts town halls to address housing and other local installation issues, engages with the Escambia County Planning Board and Escambia County Commissioners on a regular basis, participates in monthly Military Affairs Committee meetings, and conducts interviews with local television outlets as required. For example, local television interviews were conducted to announce changes that affected public access to the National Naval Aviation Museum, Barrancas National Cemetery, and the Pensacola Lighthouse. The NAS Pensacola Executive Officer and Command Master Chief conduct monthly meetings with tenant command counterparts and weekly Department Head meetings that include representatives from Naval Supply System Command Fleet Logistics Center, Public Works Center, Naval Hospital Pensacola, and the Saufley Field Federal Prison Camp’s Warden. The Executive Officer and Public Affairs Officer also conduct a one-hour monthly radio show to discuss upcoming events. Additional NAS Pensacola communication efforts include a weekly printed newsletter, a Facebook page, a Public Affairs Office Twitter feed, and marquee messages at the main gate. With a predominant millennial demographic and large student walking campus population, we recommend an installation-wide communication strategy that prioritizes social media over printed material as well as the addition of another message marquee.

Recommendation 1. That NAS Pensacola procure and place an additional marquee in the vicinity of the CNATT/NATCC walking campus to ensure timely message transmission to the installation’s large student population.

Personnel Support Detachment
NAS Pensacola Personnel Support Detachment (PSD) processes demonstrated marked improvement over those inspected during our 2010 area visit. All major programs to include Active Component gains and losses, reenlistments and extensions, retirements, basic allowance for housing (BAH), and Special Pay programs are compliant with existing Navy policy. PSD Pensacola supports 318 commands encompassing 230,000 active, reserve, dependent, and retired personnel. It is one of five Navy Passenger Transportation Offices and one of four Navy Travel Processing Centers (TPC) in the Navy. Despite its large area of responsibility, PSD Pensacola maintains a 99 percent timeliness rate and 97 percent accuracy rate resulting in a 1 of 3-large PSD category ranking and 6 of 43-PSD ranking. The PSD has an 11-day turnaround time upon receipt of a valid travel claim from the submitting command. Of note, PSD Pensacola does not track initial travel claim error rates upon receipt from tenant Command Pass Coordinators (CPC). A travel claim voucher that contains errors is simply returned to the
submitting command CPC and eventually on to the member for correction. Timeliness metric measurement commences when the PSD receives an error-free travel claim. Total time from initial submission to final PSD processing is a better metric with respect to the impact on Sailor quality of life. Further, its measurement will provide data necessary to identify all barriers and effect total process improvement.

**Recommendation 2.** That PSD Pensacola measure total time from initial travel claim submission to liquidation to identify tenant commands that require training to reduce initial submission errors.

**Total Force Manpower**

NAS Pensacola is well-manned per its Activity Manpower Document billet structure with 491 of 516 authorized billets. Military officer billets are filled at 93 percent with enlisted billets filled at 103 percent due to the temporary assignment of limited duty and pregnant personnel to the installation. Temporarily assigned personnel provide additional watchstander capacity, thus alleviating the burden on permanently assigned personnel.

The command expressed concern over the regionalization of some billets. Specifically, the regionalization of N1, N5, and N8 billets has resulted in the installation’s Executive Officer serving as the onsite action officer and principal conduit for coordination and communication with CNRSE for these matters, in addition to his other assigned duties. There was no evidence of the methodology behind the CNRSE decision to regionalize the N1, N5, and N8 billets. Though attractive from a budgetary standpoint, the regionalization of functions appears, at least anecdotally, to negatively impact installation operations.

There is no record that a Shore Manpower Requirements Determination (SMRD) or similar assessment has been performed, or is scheduled to be performed, to validate NAS Pensacola manpower. In accordance with OPNAVINST 1000.16L, Navy Total Force Manpower Policies and Procedures, manpower authorizations for shore activities comprise the personnel entitlement of Navy commands to perform assigned tasks per the mission, functions, and tasks.

**Recommendation 3.** That NAS Pensacola request a desk audit to determine and document the impact of regionalizing the N1, N5, and N8 billets on the Executive Officer.

**Recommendation 4.** That NAS Pensacola request an SMRD or similar assessment per OPNAVINST 1000.16L.

**Funeral Honors Support**

Major tenant commanders expressed gratitude for the installation’s decision not to burden tenant commands with additional manpower requirements. We observed that this is creating an undue strain on NAS Pensacola Funeral Honors support personnel. NAS Pensacola HQ staff has 11 Sailors, 9 full-time and 2 part-time, dedicated to funeral honors support requirements. The Pensacola support area is defined by CNRSEINST 1770.2E, Funeral Honors Support Program within the Southeast Region, and includes 4 counties in Florida and 10 counties in Alabama. In fiscal year 2015 (FY15), NAS Pensacola performed 542 funerals and demand has steadily increased for the past four years. In accordance with NAVPERS 15555D, Navy Military Funerals,
the Funeral Honors Support program coordinator is authorized to levy requirements on other naval activities in the area when personnel resources at the activity assuming responsibility for providing military funeral honors are insufficient. We recommend that NAS Pensacola pursue additional Navy Reserve manpower through either full-time Active Duty for Special Work or drilling Reservist volunteers at Navy Operational Support Center Pensacola. Both Reserve options are available at no additional cost to NAS Pensacola. Further, we believe there are pools of students either awaiting instruction or that have recently completed training and are awaiting transfer that could assist with funeral honors.

**Recommendation 5.** That NAS Pensacola leverage Navy Reservists and/or student pool population awaiting instruction/transfer to assist with funeral honors support requirements.

**Air Operations**

Funded airfield improvements are scheduled to commence in FY17 that will impact flight training at NAS Pensacola, particularly during periods when the airfield is restricted to single runway operations. The Air Operations Department has been proactive in its tenant command engagement, phased approach, and utilization of the Naval Aviation Simulation Model (NASMOD) to identify and mitigate operational impacts of planned improvements. NASMOD is a simulation model designed to address airspace, airfield, and aircraft range capacity. This model offers the ability to adjust variables to identify and assess airfield operational barriers and constraints. NAS Pensacola will use this model to evaluate single runway limiting factors and determine what adjustments can be made in order to minimize the impact to training production requirements.

Consistent with many locations, NAS Pensacola airfield facility recapitalization requirements exceed available resources. Hangars 1853 and 1854 are dated, with degrading facility condition indices that are beginning to negatively impact mission performance. Military Construction (MILCON) Project P-840, a new, combined hangar facility to replace both hangar 1853 and 1854, currently ranks number four on the NAS Pensacola MILCON Integrated Priority List at $68.4M. NAS Pensacola and CNRSE leadership is seeking resource sponsorship in parallel through both CNIC and Director, Air Warfare (OPNAV N98) to fund this needed MILCON project.

**Port Operations**

NAS Pensacola Port Operations had an A-76 study done in 1999, resulting in all contractor Manning with the exception of a Chief Warrant Officer billet, GS-11 Contracting Officer Representative, and GS-5 Administrative Assistant. This contractor Manning model has proven to be a resounding success and has been adopted throughout CNRSE. The existing contract is comprehensive and accommodates extensive training, drill, and exercise requirements. The contractor maintained equipment is in excellent condition and Port Operations enjoys minimal personnel turnover and a majority of the contractors have prior Navy experience.

Port Operations maintains a strong relationship with the Coast Guard and discussions are ongoing concerning the potential home porting of three or four medium endurance cutters in FY17. The Coast Guard is also considering home porting larger Offshore Patrol Cutters in FY22.
Minor pier repairs are necessary to homeport the medium endurance cutters and Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC) and Coast Guard negotiations are ongoing to fund and execute these repairs. Pier modifications for the larger offshore patrol cutters are more involved and will require additional collaboration due to the significant funding requirements. As a non-Navy homeport, NAS Pensacola Port Operations are minimally funded and the port is no longer dredged to the 48-foot Navy standard. Current mission requirements do not justify further dredging though this will be required in the event that the offshore patrol cutters are home ported in Pensacola.

The innovative nature of the Port Operations team recently resulted in the successful employment of a Port Security Barrier (PSB) for the USS Independence (LCS 2). The team safely and effectively worked through multiple challenges for a never before operationally deployed system that was tested in the sheltered waters of Pearl Harbor. NAS Pensacola Port Operations drafted standard operating procedures and safety redlines for PSB deployment to account for tidal currents, elevated sea states, and inclement weather.

**Human Resources Program Support**

CNRSE provides human resources (HR) services to the Pensacola area. CNRSE N1 and the NAS Pensacola civilian HR staff work in a collaborative manner to recruit, develop, and retain a skilled civilian workforce. CNRSE N1 and the NAS Pensacola HR Director (HRD) meet with tenant commands to discuss hiring metrics, end-strength, full-time equivalents (FTEs) controls vs. onboard, Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO), and N1 initiatives to support installations. CNRSE and the Pensacola HRD both expressed concern over delays associated with obtaining pre-employment medical examinations for civilian positions. An Optional Form 178, Certificate of Medical Examination, requires completion by the medical officer conducting the physical with a recommendation to: (1) hire or retain; describe limitations, if any; or (2) take action to separate or not hire with explanation. The CNIC onboarding Center of Excellence Team schedules physicals for civilians when a tentative employment offer is extended. However, scheduling physicals with medical treatment facilities outside of the Pensacola area is often untimely. Further, medical officers conducting the physicals occasionally decline to sign the document for civilians who are not assigned to their serviced command or Region, resulting in additional administrative delays. The CNRSE HRD contacted Navy Medicine East and West Regional Commanders for assistance on this matter. Navy Medicine East subsequently issued notification that all Department of the Navy (DON) physical examination requests should be prioritized regardless of location. Navy Medicine West had not yet responded at the time of our inspection.

**Civilian Hiring Process**

NAS Pensacola major tenant commands expressed concern with the centralized, regional civilian hiring process. Specifically, Commanders stated that personnel losses due to retirement or transfer result in significant billet gaps.

As depicted in Table 1, the average time for NAS Pensacola to complete the hiring process (end-to-end) for civilian positions was 110 days for Merit Promotion hires and 104 days for
Delegated Examining hires. Both metrics extend well beyond the goal of 80 days specified in DON Targets and Timelines guidance. Certification delay, a process performed by the Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR) Stennis Operations Center, is the primary cause of the lengthy overall civilian hiring process. Further, we discovered that backlogs at the OCHR Stennis Operations Center have resulted in workload being diverted to the OCHR San Diego and Philadelphia Operations Centers in recent years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY15 (Measured in Days)</th>
<th>DON Goal</th>
<th>Merit Promotion</th>
<th>Delegated Examining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metric I – Cert Issue</td>
<td>≤25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric II – Announcement Time</td>
<td>≤10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric III – Cert Return</td>
<td>≤20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric IV – Job Offer to EOD</td>
<td>≤20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric V – End-to-End</td>
<td>≤80</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Position Fills</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. FY15 NAS Pensacola recruitment average timelines

**Equal Employment Opportunity**

The CNRSE EEO/Diversity office services NAS Pensacola and is compliant with Department of the Navy Civilian Human Resources Manual. NAS Pensacola EEO policy statements are current, widely disseminated, and posted on installation bulletin boards. The Deputy EEO Director provides monthly briefings to NAS Pensacola leadership presenting information concerning EEO structure, a workforce snapshot, number and type of EEO complaints, reasonable accommodations, and planned activities.

The NAS Pensacola civilian workforce consists of 316 civilian employees; overall, we observed a low female civilian employee population. NAS Pensacola plans to address this by reviewing applicant pools, identifying recruitment methods, educating managers on appointments, as well as evaluating recruitment strategies and new hire processes. Further, NAS Pensacola would benefit from incorporating a Federal Employee Viewpoint (FEV) survey in conjunction with the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) Organizational Climate Survey (DEOCS) survey.

NAS Pensacola employees filed three EEO complaints in FY15 and FY16 with Alternative Dispute Resolution actions pending. During our inspection, a conversation with a local Union Steward from American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), Local 1960, revealed a lack of trust between employees and management. To address this issue, we recommend CNRSE provide Labor and Employee Relations (LR/ER) assistance. An experienced LR/ER Advisor onsite in Pensacola is needed on a regular basis to improve employer-employee relationships. Additionally, the LR/ER Advisor is needed to represent management while engaging in good faith bargaining with the Unions to facilitate timely resolution of collective bargaining and administrative grievances.
We observed confusion and a general lack of knowledge of the differences between civilian employee collective bargaining grievances and EEO complaint reporting processes. As a result, we recommend that the CNRSE EEO/Diversity office and LR/ER Advisor provide onsite training to NAS Pensacola leadership, the NAS Pensacola Command Assessment Team, and AFGE Local 1960 on a regular basis. Further, the NAS Pensacola Command Managed Equal Opportunity (CMEO) inadvertently became involved in civilian employee collective bargaining grievances and the EEO complaint reporting process during past command assessments. The inspection team provided onsite training to the CMEO to ensure these matters are directed to the CNRSE EEO/Diversity office in the future.

**Recommendation 6.** That NAS Pensacola incorporate the FEV survey in conjunction with the DEOCS to get a more accurate and holistic view of the overall command climate.

**Recommendation 7.** That the CNRSE LR/ER Advisor regularly participates in onsite visits to NAS Pensacola to improve employer-employee relationships and facilitate timely resolution of administrative and employee collective bargaining grievances.

**Recommendation 8.** That the CNRSE EEO/Diversity office and the LR/ER Advisor provide training to NAS Pensacola leadership, the NAS Pensacola Command Assessment Team, and AFGE Local 1960 on civilian employee collective bargaining grievances and EEO complaint reporting processes.

**Information Technology Infrastructure**

NAS Pensacola N6 is responsible for providing information technology services and Base Operating Support (BOS) to NAS Pensacola and outlying commands. We observed that Pensacola N6 is not aligned with the CNIC N6 CONUS, Hawaii, Joint Region Marianas Installation, and Region Staffing Model guidelines, dated 12 September 2014. NAS Pensacola’s N6 staff is billeted for six personnel, but is operating at 50 percent Manning for day-to-day workload requirements. Potential emergent issue responses are not sustainable and require attention.

NAS Pensacola acquisition processes, networks, and IT assets comply with Clinger-Cohen Act requirements, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, Federal Acquisition Regulations, and DoD and DON Chief Information Officer policy requirements.

**Recommendation 9.** That the NAS Pensacola N6 department align with CNIC N6 CONUS, Hawaii, Joint Region Marianas Installation, and Region Staffing Model guidelines.
FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENERGY CONSERVATION, PRIVATIZED FAMILY HOUSING, AND BARRACKS

Facilities Management
Per the Facility Readiness Evaluation System, the composite Installation Figure of Merit (IFOM) rating, which considers condition, configuration, and capacity for all sites associated with NAS Pensacola, is 75 out of 100. This is below the same measure for Navy Region Southeast (78) and all Navy installations worldwide (81). NAS Pensacola’s IFOM is not expected to improve given declining facility sustainment funding used for preventive, corrective, and recurring building maintenance. More than a quarter of NAS Pensacola’s infrastructure was built 50 or more years ago, and several of those buildings are designated as historical facilities on the National Register of Historic Places, making exterior repairs and renovations more expensive. Additionally, we noted a critical need for MILCON and centralized Special Project funding to support shortfalls in student dormitory housing capacity, as well as airfield and hangar facility condition and configuration.

Safety and Occupational Health
We assessed NAS Pensacola Safety and Occupational Health (SOH) programs for compliance with 29 U.S.C. 651-678, Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; 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

In a 2001 A-76 study, safety programs at NAS Pensacola were outsourced to the BOS contract. The Safety Annex of the BOS contract, as currently written, does not adequately specify
performance requirements and falls short of compliant installation safety services. For this reason, NAS Pensacola SOH programs are not compliant.

Prior to our inspection, the NAS Pensacola Safety Manager provided a program self-assessment that identified many of the deficiencies noted in this section of the report. These are considered repeat deficiencies documented in the 2012 Safety and Occupational Health Management Evaluation (SOHME) report and the 2014 Regional Operational Assessment and Assistance Team (ROAAT) report. NAS Pensacola and Navy Region Southeast are considering the merits of in-sourcing safety services to improve program effectiveness at a potentially lower cost.

Issue Paper D-1 addresses this in further detail.

Contract Performance Oversight
The Performance Assessment Representative (PAR) does not conduct adequate oversight of safety inspections performed by the contractor. The PAR stated that he reviews completion of inspections, but we found little evidence of reviews for quality and thoroughness of hazard identification. We note the PAR assigned at the time of inspection has received minimal SOH training.

The NAS Pensacola Safety Manager stated that he has been providing regular feedback to the NAVFAC BOS Contracting Officer on safety program performance discrepancies, but repeat deficiencies from the 2012 SOHME and 2014 ROAAT reports remain unresolved.

**Deficiency 1. NAS Pensacola Safety program contract services do not receive adequate oversight. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, Chapter 0901.**

Workplace Inspections
Contract personnel conduct facility safety inspections, input the results (deficiencies) into the Enterprise Safety Applications Management System, and inspect corrective actions prior to closure of deficiencies. However, building occupants are not notified or questioned as required. Additionally, contract safety personnel do not verify that the deficiency is posted; or that interim controls are in place, sustained, and followed up until correction. A random sampling of five buildings recently inspected by the contractor revealed that these inspections occurred when workers were not present and not all hazards were identified. This shortfall is a repeat deficiency as noted above.

**Deficiency 2. NAS Pensacola workplace inspections do not meet requirements. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, Chapter 0903.**

Fall Protection and Other Safety Program Shortfalls
Although the BOS contract lists Fall Protection as a program, the contract language is vague. Additionally, the contractor does not have qualified personnel to perform all functions. While NAS Pensacola personnel have been trained and are working to improve the program, the Fall Protection program manager retired in December 2015 and a replacement has not yet been hired.
NAS Pensacola could not provide documentation on hazard assessments of workplaces for the determination of personal protective equipment, hearing conservation, and sight conservation requirements, though these program areas are listed in the BOS Safety Annex Attachment J-0404000-06.

The contractor safety staff performs ergonomic surveys upon request by personnel throughout NAS Pensacola; however, no proactive screening surveys are conducted to identify workstations, work procedures, and processes where ergonomic hazards can be reduced or eliminated as required.

The NAS Pensacola BOS contract requires enforcement of a Hazardous Material Control and Management plan. While this plan is in place, we found no evidence of consistent inspections to ensure proper labeling and storage of hazardous materials throughout the installation as required.

**Deficiency 3.** NAS Pensacola has not completed a fall assessment or conducted a fall survey, which is a repeat finding since 2012. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.23G, Chapter 13.

**Deficiency 4.** NAS Pensacola has not conducted hazard assessments. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.23G, Chapter 12.

**Deficiency 5.** NAS Pensacola is not performing ergonomic screening surveys as required. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.23G, Chapter 23.

**Deficiency 6.** NAS Pensacola is not conducting inspections to ensure proper labeling and storage of hazardous materials. Reference: OPNAVINST 5100.23G, Chapter 7.

**Environmental**

**Environmental Readiness**
A review of NAS Pensacola operations that considered all major environmental compliance and conservation program areas was conducted with a focus on solid waste, air quality, storm water, hazardous waste, spill planning and response, storage tanks, natural resources, cultural resources, and environmental management. The review included site visits, document reviews, and staff interviews, and confirmed that the environmental staff is knowledgeable and working diligently to support both mission readiness and environmental compliance. We assessed the program as effective, but not fully compliant with governing directives.

**Environmental Management System**
The NAS Pensacola Environmental Management System (EMS) was last reviewed in depth by NAVFAC in 2014 with five major non-conformances and one minor non-conformance; we found these had been appropriately corrected. The Environmental Policy and other essential EMS documents were reviewed and found in compliance.
Solid Waste Management
NAS Pensacola Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) manages and operates the recycling program for the installation and receives oversight by PWD Environmental. The program is effective, with opportunities for expanding the number of recycling collection sites. This program is essential to meeting the 50 percent landfill diversion requirement levied in Executive Order 13693. However, examination of the landfill data indicates that the annual quantity of non-hazardous solid waste reported is an estimated figure (6,400 tons for every year sampled). Additionally, the NAS Pensacola Solid Waste Manager is concerned that NAS Pensacola MWR may discontinue management and execution of the installation’s Qualified Recycling Program, which is required by OPNAVINST 5090.1, Environmental Readiness Program, for activities generating greater than 1-ton per day.

**Deficiency 7.** NAS Pensacola is not keeping accurate data with respect to non-hazardous solid waste. Reference: OPNAVINST 5090.1D, paragraph 28-3.1.e.

**Recommendation 10.** That NAS Pensacola address intermediate and long-term plans for management and execution of recycling programs. Reference: OPNAVINST 5090.1D, paragraph 28-3.1.c.(2).

Spill Prevention and Response Planning
We observed effective program management, response equipment condition, and proficient skill levels of the NAS Pensacola Spill Response team, which maintains a good regimen of spill drills and exercises. However, the Port Operations Officer self-reported that staffing levels provided by the current contract (18 FTE and 4 part-time personnel) do not comply with NAS Pensacola Facility Response Plan (FRP) requirements to respond to the most probable spill scenario. Additional funds should be pursued or the FRP should be revised and resubmitted for approval by the Coast Guard Sector Mobile and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 4.

**Deficiency 8.** Staffing of the NAS Pensacola Spill Response team does not comply with the Coast Guard-approved Facility Response Plan. Reference: Coast Guard Sector Mobile/EPA Region 4 FRP for NAS Pensacola.

Hazardous Materials Management
The Hazardous Materials program is operated by Fleet Logistics Center (FLC). We observed that Authorized User Lists (AULs) and inventories are well-managed, material availability issues are properly addressed, and hazardous material request procedures are specified and communicated. However, other procedures are not well communicated to final users. For example, the FLC Material Manager stated a willingness to receive partial containers and used hazardous materials under certain conditions (notably, adequate shelf life remaining), but this practice is not widely known or implemented by users. Reuse of partial containers is required by OPNAV M-5090.1, Environmental Readiness Program Manual, as one of the essentials of Consolidated Hazardous Material Reutilization and Inventory Management program compliance.

Issue Paper D-2 addresses this in further detail.
Cultural Resources Program
NAS Pensacola manages an extensive Cultural Resources program, including archaeological resources and excavation permits. Balancing available resources with increased demand of cultural resources (CR) efforts stemming from Hurricane Ivan damage continues to present program challenges. Joint efforts with the Coast Guard, University of West Florida, and other non-profit groups are underway to address some of these issues. Changes in NAS Pensacola procedures are helping to limit access to undiscovered artifacts per the Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979. While the CR program is effective, the Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan was awaiting Commanding Officer signature at the time of inspection. This is a required item for program compliance.


Drinking Water
NAS Pensacola makes and distributes drinking water to NAS Pensacola and Corry Station via ten deep groundwater wells. Program management and documentation reviews, as well as a site visit to the water plant on Corry Station, collectively indicate that water is properly treated and distributed in accordance with OPNAVINST 5090.1D, Safe Drinking Water Act Compliance Ashore. A copy of the latest Florida Department of Environmental Protection compliance inspection report from September 2014 was provided. No major deficiencies were noted, and all minor deficiencies had been corrected.

Energy Conservation
The NAS Pensacola Energy Conservation program is compliant and on track with Executive Orders and the Navy’s energy and potable water conservation goals. The Installation Energy Manager is a member of the NAS Pensacola Zone Inspection team to get a boots-on-the-ground understanding of energy conservation opportunities and efficacy of conservation behavior messaging. In addition to numerous LED lighting and other projects, the Navy’s renewable energy targets will benefit from the 65MW photovoltaic array under construction at Saufley Field. Power production is expected by the end of 2016.

Public-Private Venture Family Housing
The Navy Housing office is providing quality referral services and has a one-of-a-kind Volunteer Realtor program to assist personnel desiring to rent in town. A review of program management and unit maintenance records, as well as site visits, collectively indicate that NAS Pensacola Public-Private Venture Family Housing is well maintained and operated. Feedback from housing occupants has been positive for several years (93 percent customer satisfaction rating exceeds the CNIC goal of 90 percent). Occupancy rates average 96 percent or higher exceeding the CNIC goal of 95 percent.
Barracks
A review of program management and barracks maintenance records, as well as site visits, provided positive indicators that barracks and dormitories are effectively maintained and operated, amidst a significant volume of students and permanent party Sailors housed at NAS Pensacola and Corry Station. Given the high number of student throughput, NAS Pensacola has been granted several waivers from OPNAV N46 with regard to the minimum net square footage allocated to each Sailor. As a result, several dormitories and a few barracks have been assigned more occupants than the designed occupancy level without corresponding upgrades to the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) system. This presents cooling and humidity challenges in the summer months. We noted that NAS Pensacola has an effective barracks inspection and habitability inspection program, and recommend that the team consider proactively spot checking dormitories for humidity, temperature, and air exchange until newly constructed dormitory projects and repairs to existing facilities are completed.

Recommendation 11. That NAS Pensacola, in coordination with Naval Hospital Pensacola, conduct air quality spot checks in dormitories with increased student loading until dormitory projects are completed.

In addition to ongoing barracks repairs, we observed flooring problems in the Marine NATTC barracks that require correction. For these reasons, projects submitted for program funds in the FY18 and FY19 Program Objective Memorandums (POMs) are critical to sustaining the intermediate and long-term viability of quality student housing. In the same vein, we recommend identifying barracks and dormitory repair projects now that are relevant to the NAS Pensacola Installation Development Plan to help forecast barracks project funding requirements. Finally, we commend Navy Region Southeast’s approach to resident laundry by leasing washers and dryers vice purchasing; this was a considerable improvement since our last visit in 2010 where we documented a shortfall of functional laundry equipment for resident use.

Recommendation 12. That NAS Pensacola PWD consider development of project packages for known barracks and dormitory repair projects.
SECURITY PROGRAMS AND CYBERSECURITY/TECHNOLOGY
The Security programs and Cybersecurity/Technology Team used survey and focus group responses, document review, and face-to-face interviews to assess the following areas:

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

**Command Security Overview**
NAS Pensacola security responsibilities are split between two key departments working in separate buildings on NAS Pensacola. The Installation Security Officer works in the Installation Security Department with a staff of military and civilian personnel responsible for physical and Antiterrorism Force Protection (ATFP) of the installation. The Command Security Manager (CSM) works in the installation’s Administration Department and is assigned as the Assistant Administration Officer. The CSM is responsible for information, personnel, and industrial security matters at NAS Pensacola, including tenant command support.

NAS Pensacola does not have a dedicated Special Security program. Due to the small number of Sensitive Compartmented Information (SCI) indoctrinated personnel and no installation need for a SCI Facility, NAS Pensacola has a working agreement with the Special Security Officer (SSO), Center for Information Dominance (CID), Corry Station, who handles Special Security administrative matters. This arrangement appears adequate to the current requirement; however, the commands have not codified the arrangement in a Security Servicing Agreement (SSA) or memorandum of understanding.

NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E, Information and Personnel Security, contains the majority of the command’s security policies. NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not have all required elements of a command security instruction, as required by SECNAV M5510.36, Department of the Navy Information Security program, and SECNAV M5510.30, Department of the Navy Personnel Security Program. Examples of missing elements include chain of command relationships, applicable SSAs, and industrial security.

**Deficiency 10.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not meet the minimum required elements of a Command Security Instruction. References: SECNAV M 5510.36, Exhibit 2A; SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C.
**Deficiency 11.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not adequately delineate unique command security requirements; it is an inadequate supplement to SECNAV M5510.36. Reference: SECNAV M5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 1.

**Deficiency 12.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E establishes incorrect periodicity for CI training. Reference: DoDD 5240.06, Counterintelligence Awareness and Reporting, Enclosure 3, paragraph 3a.

**Deficiency 13.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not contain Deficiency 11.

**Deficiency 14.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not establish procedures for visitors nor access to classified information. Reference: SECNAV M5510.36, Exhibit 2a, paragraph 2p.

**Deficiency 15.** NAS Pensacola does not annotate on the command organization chart that the CSM is afforded direct access to the Commanding Officer. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2-2, paragraph 3.

**Information Security**

The NAS Pensacola Information Security program is not fully compliant with SECNAV M5510.36. NASPCOLAINST 5510.1D does not have all required information security elements of a command security instruction.

**Deficiency 16.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not assign specific responsibilities for briefings and debriefings. References: SECNAV M5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2h; SECNAV M5510.30, Department of the Navy Personnel Security Program, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(3).

**Deficiency 17.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not cite and append SSAs with the SSO, CID, and Corry Station. Reference: SECNAV M5510.36, Exhibit 2A, paragraph 2d.

**Deficiency 18.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not specify Deficiency 16.

**Deficiency 19.** NAS Pensacola does not ensure civilian personnel whose duties significantly involve the handling, creation, or management of classified information is documented on performance evaluations. References: DoDM 5200.01, Volume 1, Enclosure 2, paragraph 7h; SECNAV M5510.30, Section 2-2, paragraph 2k; SECNAV M5510.36, Section 2.1, paragraph 5h.


**Deficiency 21.** The CSM does not maintain liaison with the command’s Public Affairs Officer to ensure that proposed press releases and information intended for public release are subjected to a security review. References: SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 2-2, paragraph 1h; SECNAV M-5510.36, Section 8-8, paragraph 1.
Personnel Security

NAS Pensacola’s Personnel Security program is not fully compliant with SECNAV M5510.30, Department of the Navy Personnel Security Program. NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not contain all the required Personnel Security elements of a Command Security Instruction, per SECNAV M5510.30. Specific missing items are stated in the deficiencies below.

NAS Pensacola self-reported process issues related to the generation and administration of required background investigations. The CSM is executing a plan to rectify the issues.

**Deficiency 22.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not contain procedures for processing classified visit requests to or from NAS Pensacola. Reference: SECNAV M5510.30, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(5).

**Deficiency 23.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not contain a list of areas within the command authorized for general visiting and clearly identify all areas that are off-limits to visitors. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(5).

**Deficiency 24.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not formulate guidelines for foreign travel briefings and identify the individual responsible for the briefing/debriefing. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(6).

**Deficiency 25.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not assign responsibilities for final preparation of investigation requests. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(8).

**Deficiency 26.** NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E does not establish procedures for documenting clearance and command access in the Joint Personnel Authentication System (JPAS). Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Appendix C, paragraph 1b(9).

**Deficiency 27.** There are discrepancies between the access determination levels and position sensitivity determinations for several personnel in JPAS. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 1-5, paragraph 15e.

**Deficiency 28.** Position sensitivity levels are not accurately reflected in numerous position descriptions (PDs). Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 5-3, paragraphs 1a and 1b.

**Deficiency 29.** IT position level designations for all users at NAS Pensacola are not annotated within JPAS. Reference: SECNAV M-5510.30, Section 5-2, paragraph 6.

**Deficiency 30.** On at least one occasion, NAS Pensacola

**Recommendation 13.** That NAS Pensacola update its Command Security Instruction, NASPCOLAINST 5510.10E, to document current policy and procedures for revocation and retrieval of Common Access Cards (CACs) from departing contractors, foreign nationals, and government civilians.
**Industrial Security**

NAS Pensacola does not require an Industrial Security program, since it does not engage in industrial support requiring access to classified information. NAS Pensacola’s security instruction does not include any description of how the command might support industrial personnel from other commands.

**Recommendation 14.** That NAS Pensacola include a section in their security instruction that incorporates requirements for SSA in the event industrial support from another command requires access to classified information.

**Physical Security and Antiterrorism Force Protection**

We assessed NAS Pensacola’s Physical Security and ATFP. Due to the wide range of our findings, our assessment is broken up into several sub-sections:

- Overview
- ATFP Program
- Physical Security Program
- Naval Security Force Staffing and Administration
- Access Control

**Overview**

NAS Pensacola’s ATFP program is not compliant with DoDI 2000.16, DoD Antiterrorism Standards, and OPNAVINST F3300.53C, Navy Antiterrorism Program. During our Area Visit, NAS Pensacola participated in Exercise Solid Curtain-Citadel Shield 2016 (SC/CS16).

NAS Pensacola’s Physical Security program is not compliant with OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2. Multiple deficiencies exist across several sub-programs.

**Antiterrorism Force Protection**

In November 2015, NAS Pensacola requested a deviation from the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD(I)) Directive Type Memorandum (DTM) 09-012, Interim Policy Guidance for DoD Physical Access Control, due to the request was at OPNAV (N46) for review and approval.
We recommend re-evaluation of the temporary ECP arrangement against the Entry Control Point Procedures delineated in NTTP 3-07.2.1.

NAS Pensacola has a minimum-security Federal Prison located on Saufley Field and hosts the Escambia Boys Base located on Corry Station. The personnel incarcerated at these facilities are not vetted and proofed to the standards in USD(I) DTM 09-012 or per DoD 5200.08-R, Physical Security Program, requirements for visitors to DoD Installations.

Vehicle inspections were observed at the installation's Commercial Vehicle Inspection Station (CVIS). The following observations were noted:

- The inspectors lacked an installation-specific vehicle inspection checklist, as described in NTTP 3-07.2.3, Law Enforcement and Physical Security.
Upon notification of these significant issues, the installation security department was responsive and immediately began to address these issues.

NAS Pensacola is not compliant with the requirements of OPNAVINST 5530.14E for assigning qualified personnel to NSF duties. We conducted a comparison of the NSF training records, current NSF watchbills and Ready for Issue Arms Room Accountability Logs and found that:

- Revise access control regulations to match those currently being employed at NAS Pensacola
- (b) (7)(e)

Physical Security Program
The Physical Security program at NAS Pensacola is not compliant with governing directives. NASPCOLAINST 5530.8, Naval Air Station Pensacola Physical Security Plan, requires revision to clarify command policies and correct errors. Specific examples include:

- Revise access control regulations to match those currently being employed at NAS Pensacola
- (b) (7)(e)
• Revise the list of command designated restricted areas
• Revise the Physical Security Inspections and Survey regulations to ensure all required buildings are inspected and surveyed by trained personnel
• Revise automated access control regulations to ensure equipment installed to perform automated access control is in accordance with higher order directives

The installation’s survey and inspections program is not compliant with NTTP 3-07.2.3 and OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2. During our assessment, we reviewed several completed inspections and surveys. Each survey lacked required details and did not contain all pages of the required Physical Security Evaluation Guide (DD Form 2637). Further, none of the inspection reports had been reviewed and approved by the NAS Pensacola Commanding Officer. Additionally, we found that the survey and inspections program requires modification to ensure all required buildings and areas are inspected and surveyed.

The installation’s key and lock program is not compliant with NTTP 3-07.2.3 and OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2. During the inspection, we noted a Restricted Area secured with chains and padlocks that were not procured and installed by the installation. NAS Pensacola reported that the locks were procured, installed, and controlled by the BOS contractor.

The installation’s list of Restricted Areas is not complete; it does not include all tenant activities’ Restricted Areas. We also found that the existing list of Restricted Areas is annotated to reflect levels of restriction (e.g. Level One, Level Two, or Level Three) but we recommend a review of these areas against the definitions of Restricted Areas found in OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2 to verify the appropriate level of protection is in place.

NSF Staffing and Administration

There are nine civilian hiring actions underway; six candidates were scheduled to attend the March 2016 ASF Academy.

We conducted a review of the installation’s Data Housing and Reporting Tool (DHART) account utilizing CNICINST 3502.2 requirements. DHART is an online repository of security force training and qualification records maintained by CNIC. NAS Pensacola is not compliant with CNICINST 3502.2 DHART recordkeeping requirements.

• Of 172 NSF members at NAS Pensacola, 82 records were entered into DHART and those records are not being maintained. CNICINST 3502.2 requires qualifications, all completed training, individual training, and tracking of training/qualifications to be documented in DHART.
• Not all required NAS Pensacola security staff have access to DHART. For example, Watch Commanders, Leading Chief Petty Officers, and other supervisors lack DHART...
access. This is contrary to CNICINST 3502.2 and prevents supervisors from providing oversight of training and qualification records and from reviewing NSF member DHART records prior to watchbill approval.

We reviewed paper NSF training records utilizing the requirements of OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2, OPNAVINST 3591.1F, CNICINST 5530.14A, and CNICINST 3502.2. Non-ASF paper training records were compliant with all requirements; however, the paper records did not match the DHART database.

**Access Control**

There are specific areas at Corry Station where installed automated access control equipment could not be validated to ensure it provides access to only authorized personnel. During the inspection, we noted two turnstiles and one automated gate installed on the installation’s perimeter fence that appear to be have been installed by, and are under control of, tenant commands. Specifically:

- One turnstile located off the installation, behind the northeast corner of the Navy Exchange (NEX), was installed by CID for their students to access Corry Station. The responsibility of installation physical security resides with the Commanding Officer, NAS Pensacola, as delineated in OPNAVINST 5530.14E; therefore, this particular turnstile does not fall under the cognizance of the Commanding Officer, CID. *(b) (7)(e)*

- One turnstile located on the north fence line of the VA Hospital (which is off installation) does not meet the minimum required Automated Entry Control System (AECS) standards contained in Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) 4-022-01, Security Engineering: Entry Control Facilities/Access Control Points, and UFC 4-022-03, Security Fences and Gates. We determined that the VA Hospital has control over this turnstile. *(b) (7)(e)*

- One Automated Vehicle Gate (AVG) located on the northeast corner fence of the VA Hospital, is not under the control of NAS Pensacola, but instead under the control of the VA hospital. NAS Pensacola Security reported to our team that the purpose of the gate was to facilitate Federal Fire and EMS response to the VA Hospital from Corry Station. The control of the AVG is contrary to OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2. *(b) (7)(e)*
Deficiency 36. NAS Pensacola does not have NSF members with Navy Enlisted Classifications 2002 (Military Police Investigator) and 2006 (MWD Kennel Master). Reference: CNICINST 3502.2, Enclosure (1), Figure 2-1 (Required Critical Schools).

Deficiency 37. Not all NSF personnel attend Guard Mount before assuming assigned watches. Reference: NTTP 3-07.2.1, Section 7.5.1.

Deficiency 38. Inspectors at the CVIS are not using installation-specific vehicle inspection checklists. Reference: NTTP 3-07.2.3, Section D.6.3.10.

Deficiency 39. Physical Security inspections and surveys are not completed for all required facilities: References: NTTP 3-07.2.3, Appendix O, Section O.9; OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2, Enclosure (1), Articles 0201 and 0203.

Deficiency 40. Physical Security inspections reports are not reviewed and approved by the Commanding Officer. Reference: OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2, Enclosure (1), Article 0203, paragraph b.

Deficiency 41. Not all restricted areas on NAS Pensacola are designated in writing by the Commanding Officer. Reference: OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2, Enclosure (1), Article 0210, paragraph g(1).

Deficiency 42. The AVG located on the northeast corner fence of the VA Hospital and the turnstile at the northeast fence of the NEX with Corry Station are not under the control of NAS Pensacola, but instead are under the control of the VA Hospital and CID Corry Station, respectively. Reference: OPNAVINST 5530.14E CH-2, Enclosure (1), Article 0101, paragraph a.
Deficiency 46. NAS Pensacola has not implemented DHART as the training repository to track all NSF training and qualifications. References: CNICINST 3502.2, Enclosure (1), Articles 0301, 0401, 1007, 1102, and Figure 11-1.

Recommendation 15. That NAS Pensacola re-evaluate the temporary ECP arrangements against the ECP procedures delineated in NTTP 3-07.2.1, Section 7.10.5.4.2.

Recommendation 16. That NAS Pensacola verify and/or enter into formal agreement with the VA on the operation of the turnstile and AVG on the VA Hospital-Corry Station Boundary.

Recommendation 17. Operations Security

Operations Security (OPSEC) at NAS Pensacola is not compliant. NAS Pensacola does not have an OPSEC program in place, as required by OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Operations Security. The OPSEC Officer and OPSEC Assistant were recently assigned and have not had time to attend required training or develop their program. Our review of OPSEC records confirms that prior to the new OPSEC Officer assuming his duties, OPSEC tasks at NAS Pensacola were not occurring.

NAS Pensacola does not have a commander-approved Critical Information List (CIL), as required by DoDM 5205.02-M, Operations Security (OPSEC) Program Manual. The CIL provides the NAS Pensacola workforce, contractors, and subordinate commands unclassified, but sensitive information, which, if compromised, would endanger national security or security of DON personnel and families on Navy installations.

NAS Pensacola does not review contracts for OPSEC elements (as appropriate), or provide oversight over subordinate command OPSEC programs, as required by OPNAVINST 3432.1A.

DoD 5205.02-M requires a shared responsibility (of reviewing intended public releases) between the OPSEC Officer, Public Affairs, Information Security, Web administrators, and other officials designated by the Commander. NAS Pensacola is not coordinating efforts for the public release of information.

Deficiency 47. NAS Pensacola does not have an OPSEC instruction. Reference: OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5n.

Deficiency 48. The OPSEC program does not receive command level attention and support. References: CJCSI 3213.01D, Enclosure A, paragraph 6; NTTP 3-54M, Operations Security (OPSEC), Section 2.1.

Deficiency 49. The OPSEC Officer has started a turnover binder, but could not show that NAS Pensacola ensures OPSEC programs and plans are exercised or evaluated through regular assessments. Reference: OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5f.

Deficiency 50. NAS Pensacola does not coordinate with other OPSEC program officers/assistants at Pensacola to implement OPSEC awareness, training, and assessments. Reference: OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5i.
**Deficiency 51.** The NAS Pensacola OPSEC Officer and Assistant have not attended the OPSEC fundamental training course. Reference: DoDM 5205.02-M, DoD Operations Security (OPSEC) Program Manual, Enclosure 7, paragraphs 2a and 2b.

**Deficiency 52.** NAS Pensacola lacks an OPSEC training program to provide initial and refresher training. References: DoDM 5205.02-M, Enclosure 7, paragraphs 3a and 3d; OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Operations Security, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5k.

**Deficiency 53.** NAS Pensacola does not have an active OPSEC awareness campaign. Reference: NTTP 3-54M, Appendix A.

**Deficiency 54.** The NAS Pensacola OPSEC Officer does not formally review contracts for OPSEC requirements. References: DoDM 5205.02-M, Enclosure 6, paragraph 1a; and OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5d.

**Deficiency 55.** NAS Pensacola does not ensure classified and unclassified contract requirements properly reflect Operations Security (OPSEC) responsibilities in contracts, where applicable. References: DoDM 5205.02-M, Enclosure 6, paragraph 1a; and OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Operations Security, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5d.

**Deficiency 56.** The NAS Pensacola OPSEC Officer and CSM are not involved in the review process of information intended for public release. References: DoDM 5205.02-M, Enclosure 5, paragraph 1a; OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5n(3).

**Deficiency 57.** NAS Pensacola does not conduct required specialized training for OPSEC Officers/Coordinators, Public Affairs personnel, 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); CJCSI 3213.01D Joint Information Operations Security, Enclosure A, paragraph 6i(2).

**Deficiency 58.**NAS Pensacola does not have a Commanding Officer approved CIL. References: DoDM 5205.02-M, Enclosure 3, paragraph 3a(2)(a); OPNAVINST 3432.1A, Enclosure (1), paragraph 5c.

**Recommendation 18.** That NAS Pensacola modify their public release review process to include the OPSEC Officer, the CSM, web administrators, Public Affairs Officer, and other officials designated by the commander who also share responsibility for the release of information.

**Recommendation 19.** That NAS Pensacola expand attendance of the OPSEC Working Group to include the CSM, Public Affairs Officer, Contracting Officer, CORs, and Legal Officer.

**Counterintelligence Training**

CI training to NAS Pensacola personnel is not fully compliant with DoDD 5240.06, Counterintelligence Awareness and Reporting (CIAR).

**Deficiency 59.** CI awareness training is not provided to personnel within 30 days of initial assignment or employment to NAS Pensacola. Reference: DoDD 5240.06, Enclosure 3, paragraph 3a.
Deficiency 60. Records for the completion of CI awareness training at NAS Pensacola do not contain all the required elements. Reference: DoDD 5240.06, Enclosure 3, paragraph 3d.

Cybersecurity
NAS Pensacola’s Cybersecurity program is not fully compliant with governing directives. NAS Pensacola does not have an ISSM or an Information Systems Security Officer (ISSO) as required by SECNAV M-5239.1, Department of the Navy Information Assurance Manual. NAS Pensacola does not have an IT program director who provides oversight, requirements validation, budget preparation, and other functions for the installation, as required by the DoD 8570.01-M, Information Assurance Workforce Improvement Program.

Deficiency 61. NAS Pensacola does not have an ISSM or ISSO who is responsible for implementing and maintaining NSA Pensacola’s information system and network security requirements. Reference: SECNAV M-5239.1, Sections 2.4.9-2.4.10.

Deficiency 62. NAS Pensacola does not have an IT installation program director to provide oversight, requirements validation, budget preparation, portfolio, application management, installation communication management, and IT project manager for NAS Pensacola. Reference: DoD 8570.01-M, Chapter 4, Section C4.2.3.

Deficiency 63. NAS Pensacola does not have appointment letters for Cyber Workforce members. References: SECNAV M5239.1, Section 2.4.9; DoDI 8500.01, Cybersecurity, Enclosure 3, paragraph 10b.

Deficiency 64. (b) (7)(e)

Deficiency 65. NAS Pensacola personnel performing cybersecurity functions are not all categorized and coded with the Cybersecurity Data Element, to include all positions within the IT Management 2210 occupation series. References: United States Office of Personnel Management (OPM) Memorandum for Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies, Subject: Special Cybersecurity Project of July 8, 2013; DON CIO memorandum of 08 April 2015, Enclosure (1), paragraph 6b.

Deficiency 66. (b) (7)(e)

Personally Identifiable Information
Personally Identifiable Information (PII) at NAS Pensacola is not fully compliant with governing directives. Overall, we found that the installation manages PII effectively. (b) (7)(e)

CNIC N3AT Headquarters Program Director (HPD) Advisory, Implementation of Department of Navy Local Population ID Card/Base Access
Registration (SECNAV Form 5512/1) Form dated 14 September 2014, requires installations keep hardcopy of all completed SECNAV Form 5512/1 forms for a minimum of three years or until the Department of Justice (DOJ) conducts their periodic audits (whichever is greater).

Additionally, we observed the following items of interest:

- SECNAV 5512/1 forms left on the counters of the Visitor Control Center
- No way to secure SECNAV 5512/1 forms at the ECPs prior to transport to the VCC for retention
- Cover sheet or folders were not used to protect completed SECNAV 5512/1 forms

Recommendation 20. That NAS Pensacola request deviation from CNIC HPD Advisory (dated 14 September 2014) through CNRSE to establish an alternate and more secure method to capture PII information found on SECNAV form 5512/1 used at the VCC.

Emergency Management

Emergency Management (EM) at NAS Pensacola is not fully compliant with OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Department of the Navy Emergency Management Program. CNRSE designates NAS Pensacola as a Group 2 installation, as defined in CNICINST 3440.17, Navy Installation Emergency Management Program Manual. We observed that the installation’s Emergency Operations Center (EOC) does not have all the capabilities required for a Group 2 installation.

NAS Pensacola has 126 tenant commands representing the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and Coast Guard. The diverse composition, number, and locations of the tenant commands make EM at NAS Pensacola challenging. With only one EM manager on staff, it would be prudent for NAS Pensacola to conduct a manpower study to determine the appropriate number of FTEs required for the EM mission.

We reviewed NASPCOLAINST 3440.17, NAS Pensacola Emergency Management Program. There is no record of an annual review of the Installation EM Plan for the past year, as required by OPNAVINST 3440.17A. This is a repeat finding from the Higher Headquarters Operational Assessment conducted at NAS Pensacola in September 2015. NAS Pensacola’s EM plan is not aligned to other local EM/contingency plans and the installation could not prove that it has
visibility on the plans of local surrounding municipalities and installations, as required by OPNAVINST 3440.17A.

**Deficiency 68.** NAS Pensacola could not prove that its EM plan is consistent with state and county EM plans. Reference: OPNAVINST 3440.17A, paragraph 7n.

**Deficiency 69.** NAS Pensacola has not developed resource management objectives and implemented resource management procedures. References: DoDI 6055.17, DoD Installation Management Program, Enclosure 3, paragraph 4b(1); OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2), paragraph 2c.

**Deficiency 70.** NAS Pensacola self-reported that they have zero Category 1 (mission-essential) personnel aboard the installation. Reference: OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2), paragraph 3b(1).

**Deficiency 71.** NAS Pensacola’s EM Plan, dated August 2015, has not been reviewed and approved by the Commanding Officer. Reference: OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2), paragraph 5b.

**Deficiency 72.** NAS Pensacola did not conduct required individual assessments, which comprise an installation’s EM assessment. References: OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2), paragraph 5d and Figure 3.

**Deficiency 73.** NAS Pensacola has not developed support agreements with civil first responders and emergency responders, to include local municipal EM agencies. References: OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2), paragraph 7h; OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2), paragraph 14c.

**Deficiency 74.** NAS Pensacola was unable to demonstrate that the installation EM plan is coordinated with Federal, State, local, other service or private response and recovery partners. Reference: OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2), paragraph 8b.

**Deficiency 75.** NAS Pensacola is not compliant with the minimum standards of Navy EM Standard 8 (Training). Reference: OPNAVINST 3440.17A, Enclosure (2), paragraph 9.

**Deficiency 77.**

**Deficiency 78.**

**Recommendation 21.** That NAS Pensacola conduct a manpower study to determine the appropriate number of FTEs required to support the EM mission.
QUALITY OF LIFE AND COMMUNITY SUPPORT

The Quality of Life and Community Support Team assessed 18 areas and programs. The findings below reflect responses from survey respondents, onsite focus group participants, document review, facility site visits, and face-to-face personnel interviews.

The following programs and functions were reviewed:

- Casualty Assistance Calls Program
- Child and Youth Programs and Child Development Centers
- Navy Exchange
- Transition GPS
- Command Managed Equal Opportunity
- Commissary
- Fleet and Family Support Center
- Medical/Dental Support
- Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Programs
- Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention
- Navy College/Education Services
- Galleys
- Overseas Screening
- Religious Programs
- Sexual Assault Prevention and Response
- Suicide Prevention
- Voting Assistance

The Casualty Assistance Calls program, Child and Youth programs, Child Development Center, Galleys, NEX, Overseas Screening, and Transition GPS (Goals, Plans, Success) programs at NAS Pensacola adequately support the community.

Command Managed Equal Opportunity

The CMEO program manager works seven miles from the main part of the installation and is located in a facility that is not accessible without a passcode; this is a significant barrier for members wishing to file a complaint or obtain services. NAS Pensacola uses DEOCS as the primary method to assess command climate per OPNAVINST 5354.1F, Navy Equal Opportunity Policy (EO Manual). A review of recent surveys revealed that while only 11 percent of civilians participated in the DEOCS, most of the negative comments on the survey expressed civilian employee concerns. NAS Pensacola does not have a local EEO and there are no designated EEO liaisons in the Region. As a result, the CMEO inappropriately engaged in EEO matters on a few occasions as previously discussed in this report.

Recommendation 22. That the NAS Pensacola CMEO office be moved to a more central, service member frequented location to improve accessibility.
Commissary
The NAS Pensacola commissary provides quality goods at reasonable prices. We observed that produce and meats were well within “sell-by” date standards and there appeared to be a variety of products for customers to choose, although the organic produce selection was limited. Focus group customers expressed concern that produce purchased within the “sell by date” spoiled more quickly than similar items purchased at local grocery stores. The commissary manager was unaware of this issue and plans to look into the matter.

Medical/Dental Support
Naval Hospital Pensacola is meeting its mission to provide medical and dental support to active duty Sailors, their families, area commands, and other DoD beneficiaries. The Patient Centered Medical Home primary care initiative is well-executed and patient access to care and quality of care are excellent.

The hospital is adjusting to the implementation of Bureau of Medicine and Surgery’s (BUMED) study, Navy Hospitals in CONUS: Current State and Future Direction, which significantly changed Naval Hospital Pensacola’s capabilities and shifted resources to other areas. Shifting resources included changing the Emergency Department to an Urgent Care Clinic, closing the Intensive Care Unit, decreasing specialty inpatient services, and moving complex specialty care into the community. The hospital is adjusting to meet demand and attempting to mitigate both expected and unanticipated impacts of this transition. For example, the Urgent Care Clinic has developed a robust clinical decision process for patients who may need a higher level of care and regularly coordinates with the NAS Pensacola Fire Department, who provides ambulance services. The hospital is also continuing to address the system interface issues between the Naval Hospital’s primary care mission and specialty care now provided by local healthcare organizations. A major challenge is the need to educate the beneficiary population continuously, particularly retirees, to help them adjust to the changes.

Naval Hospital Pensacola has developed a process to ensure mental health needs for its elevated risk student population are not neglected. Naval Hospital Pensacola has no inpatient psychiatric capability and patients are referred to local hospitals for admission. The Behavioral Health Department keeps in close contact with the local hospitals. When a patient is ready for discharge, a psychiatric technician and duty driver transport the patient back to Naval Hospital Pensacola to ensure the patient has the appropriate medications and that they schedule a follow up appointment before transporting the patient back to their parent command. We consider this “warm handoff” process to be a best practice.

Morale, Welfare, and Recreation
The Portside Enlisted Club provides a number of food and off duty recreational activities aimed at the large student population. However, we observed a decided lack of the right spirit regarding alcohol. Although they take measures to mitigate the risk of underage drinking such as wrist bands, hand stamps, video surveillance and roving staff, we are concerned that the student population is receiving mixed messages that undermine the Navy’s policy of deglamorizing excessive alcohol use.
There are three MWR fitness facilities aboard NAS Pensacola: the Radford Fitness Center and Gym, Portside Fitness Center, and Wenzel Fitness Center on Corry Station. The variety of programs offered by the fitness centers is excellent, but they are highly utilized and sometimes overwhelmed. The Portside and Wenzel fitness centers are relatively small facilities housed in older buildings and serve large student populations. Nearly half of the 26 MWR-related survey comments were complaints about the physical condition of fitness spaces at the Wenzel Fitness Center and size of the Portside Fitness Center. The MWR Director has taken a number of steps to address these issues, including the conversion of a racquetball court at the Portside Fitness Center to ease crowding, new air-conditioning with larger ceiling fans and insulation, continuing to monitor air quality, and advocating for MILCON submittal. The Family Fitness Center on Corry Station is a particularly well executed program. The kid friendly equipment, clear glass partitions and proximity to parents allow the entire family to participate in fitness activities and promote a healthier lifestyle.

**Navy Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention**

NAS Pensacola is compliant with all aspects of OPNAVINST 5350.4D, Navy Alcohol and Drug Prevention Program. In addition, NAS Pensacola has memoranda of agreements (MOAs) to support four tenant commands. However, tenant commands are not providing updated rosters to the NAS Pensacola Urinalysis Program Coordinator (UPC), are not listing the UPC on check in/out sheets, and command points of contacts are not identified in the event of a positive drug test.

**Recommendation 23.** That NAS Pensacola reissue MOAs with tenant commands to clearly identify command responsibilities.

**Navy College/Educational Services**

The NAS Pensacola Navy College office administers a number of programs and provides educational counseling to all tenant commands, their dependents, and the retiree community. The NAS Pensacola Navy College program management reflects an aggressive on-going outreach program to inform and support service members and eligible users. We observed that while the office has three authorized staff positions, it is manned by one person and no additional hires are projected due to anticipated POM-17 cuts. We also noted that civilian institutions offering courses aboard NAS Pensacola are operating under expired MOAs.

**Recommendation 24.** That NAS Pensacola update MOAs with all civilian institutions offering courses on the installation.

**Galleys**

NAS Pensacola manages three galleys: the Jet Port Café (NATTC Galley), the Emerald Coast Café (NAS Pensacola), and the Gold Coast Café (Corry Station). The Food Service manager oversees 3-military members, 3-DoD civilians, 15-contract managers, and 312-contract employees. We found the galleys to be clean, well-organized, and operated by a professional and helpful staff. The galleys feed approximately 2.8 million total meals, 95 percent of those to personnel receiving rations-in-kind. The Jet Port Café accepts cash; NAS Pensacola is revising its security procedures for the transportation of funds from the galley to the bank for deposit.
Religious Programs

Religious Programs teams on NAS Pensacola operate with a cooperative and collaborative spirit to a high degree not often seen. We visited five Religious Programs teams and one Chaplains Religious Enrichment Development Operation satellite program that serve NAS Pensacola, Corry Station, and the Naval Hospital. NAS Pensacola chapel staff consists of three Chaplains, two Religious Program (RP) Specialists, one contract Priest, one civilian employee, and five students in a Limited Duty or pregnant status. Ten worship opportunities (Protestant, Catholic, Latter Day Saints) are provided by the NAS Pensacola chapel staff throughout the week. Prayer space is provided to Muslim personnel upon request and Jewish service members are connected with a local synagogue.

The chaplains participate in various command indoctrinations to inform personnel of religious ministries opportunities and to inquire of any facilitation issues. The Religious Programs team collaborates with NETC Chaplains to ensure that they are caring for the large installation population.

Naval Hospital Pensacola has one Chaplain and two RP Specialists. There is a gapped Chaplain billet at the hospital, which makes it difficult for the Chaplain to visit the 10-branch clinics that are spread throughout the coverage area; he relies heavily upon non-BUMED chaplains near those clinics. There is one contract Roman Catholic Priest that supports the hospital’s religious ministry. In the case of his absence, the contract Priest from NAS Pensacola provides coverage. Prayer space and materials are provided for four Muslim staff members.

Naval Aviation Schools Command has one Chaplain, but no RP billet. The command provides Chaplain’s assistants in the form of students on limited duty or those being redesignated to other Navy Enlisted Classifications or Military Occupational Specialties. Ministry support is provided to approximately 1,400 students and staff including Sailors and Marines who train air crew, rescue swimmers, and flight students. We observed an excellent Religious program, noting that the Chaplain appears to have the pulse of the command as evident by the reactions of people as we conducted walk around tours.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Response

We found that the NAS Pensacola SAPR program was providing generally effective services to the area. The Sexual Assault Case Management Group (SACMG) is well managed and the NAS Pensacola Commanding Officer provides outstanding opening remarks to all members. The Commanding Officer’s practice of explaining the purpose of the monthly SACMG facilitates victim updates, direct system response, coordination, accountability, and victim access to quality services. This is considered a best practice. This proactive SACMG approach is making a difference, particularly for an installation with a large high risk demographic.

NAS Pensacola has noted a significant decrease in sexual assault (SA) reporting in the past two years, which is noteworthy in an environment where many personnel are in the typical at risk population of 18-21 years old. While unable to draw specific conclusions, there may be a
potential correlation between lengthy seizure of personal cell phones and previous treatment of SA victims by NCIS Agents.

We met with the newly assigned NCIS, Supervisory Special Agent for General Crime who was specifically chosen to address the many challenges at the NCIS Pensacola Field Office. We also conducted phone conversations with the Assistant Special Agent in Charge, NCIS Southeast Field Office. It was relayed that the NAS Pensacola NCIS office was without a Lead Agent for a significant period of time, when complaints concerning SA victim treatment and cell phone seizures occurred. During the new Supervisory Special Agent’s short time at NAS Pensacola, he has worked to establish a climate centered on victim care and restore relationships with the Sexual Assault Response Coordinators (SARCs), the Victim Legal Counsel, Unit Victim Advocates, the civilian victim advocate (CVA) and installation leadership.

In addition to NCIS concerns, we observed Fleet and Family Support Center (FFSC) organizational problems. The FFSC Director, a prior SARC, had inserted herself into some elements of the SAPR process. SARCs reported that they did not have the freedom to contact commanding officers directly without first going through the FFSC Director. Additionally, the FFSC Director provided opinion and direction rather than allowing the SARCs to engage directly with OPNAV N17 or CNIC in the absence of the Region SARC. Lines of communication in SA cases are expressly between the SARC, SAPR Victim Advocate, SA victim, and the Commander or Commanding Officer. This matter was addressed during the area visit.

The CVA is not supervised directly by the SARCs, as in other locations, but instead by the FFSC Director. This causes additional friction within the SAPR program.

A best practice observed in other area visits is that individual SARCs are assigned responsibility for specific tenant commands to foster enduring relationships and to improve command SAPR program support and oversight. We observed that neither of the two Pensacola SARCs are assigned specific responsibility for any of the 126 tenant commands. We recommended this best practice during our discussions with the NAS Pensacola SARCs and the FFSC Director.

Finally, NAS Pensacola has not completed required training for military, civilians, and civilians who supervise service members. NAS Pensacola had not conducted a command review of all NAVPERS 1070/887 or FC 91 documents Official Military Personnel File (OMPF) of permanent personnel.

**Deficiency 79.** NAS Pensacola has not conducted required training for military, civilians and civilians who supervise service members. References: DoDI 6495.02 CH-2, Enclosure (10), paragraph 1b, 2, 3e, and f; SECAVINST 1752.4B, Enclosure (3), paragraph 2d and Enclosure (10), paragraph 2b; OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraphs 22f, Appendix 2B (page 2B-3), and Chapter 10.

**Deficiency 80.** NAS Pensacola has not conducted a command review of all NAVPERS 1070/887 or FC 91 documents OMPF of permanent personnel. Reference: OPNAVINST 1752.1C, Chapter 2, paragraph 15ab, and Appendix 2B (page 2B-1).
Recommendation 25. That NAS Pensacola assign individual SARC’s responsibility for specific commands to ensure continuity and active engagement with the supported command.

Suicide Prevention
The NAS Pensacola Suicide Prevention program is not compliant with governing directives. Though some effective program elements are in place, NASPCOLAINST 1720.4A, Suicide Prevention Program, requires update to align with current policy. The Suicide Prevention Coordinator routed a revised NASPCOLAINST 1720.4B instruction that meets new program requirements for signature during our inspection.

NAS Pensacola was unable to provide Suicide Prevention training completion data for FY14. FY15 training compliance was 73 percent for military and zero percent for civilian staff and full-time contractors. NAS Pensacola is on track to complete FY16 Suicide Prevention training for military personnel. Required Suicide Prevention training for civilians and full-time contractor personnel is not being conducted, as required by OPNAVINST 1720.4A, Suicide Prevention Program.

Command Duty Officers and watchstanders did not receive formal training in responding to suicide-related behavior calls. We did note, however, that response protocols and prepared resources are in place in the watchstander binder. NAS Pensacola provided training to 14 of 105 watchstanders during our visit.

There was no evidence of Suicide Prevention resources or local contact information posted in common locations, such as MWR facilities or other NAS Pensacola establishments to support individuals who may be at risk or are seeking help, as required by OPNAVINST 1720.4A.

Deficiency 81. Suicide Prevention training for military, civilians and full-time contractors has not been completed. References: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraph 5a, 6h, and Enclosure (3), paragraph 1.

Deficiency 82. Watchstander and Duty Officer training has not been conducted to ensure proper crisis response protocols are in place for watchstanders to respond to suicide-related behavior calls. References: OPNAVINST 1720.4A paragraphs 5b, 5c, Enclosure (3), paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 10, and 11.

Deficiency 83. NASPCOLAINST 1720.4B needs to be reviewed and updated to ensure compliance with the requirement to establish a crisis intervention plan to support those who seek help, and take appropriate safety measures for those at high risk. References: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraphs 5b, Enclosure (3), paragraphs 4, 6, 9, and 11.

Deficiency 84. Suicide Prevention resources and local contact information is not posted or readily available throughout installation establishments. References: OPNAVINST 1720.4A, paragraph 5c, and Enclosure (3), paragraphs 5 and 10.

Recommendation 26. That NAS Pensacola add the Suicide Prevention Coordinator to the command check-in sheet for newly reporting staff.
Installation Voting Assistance
The Installation Voting Assistance (IVA) program is not compliant with governing directives. The IVA office was not clearly advertised and not physically located in an accessible area, IVA office voicemails and emails were not returned within the required three business days, and the IVA office does not have a network to disseminate voting information quickly through the installation, as required by DoDI 1000.04, Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP).

Deficiency 85. The IVA office is not located in a well-advertised space or physically co-located with an existing office that receives extensive visits by service (Air Force, Army, Coast Guard, and Marine) personnel, family members, and DoD civilians. Reference: DoDI 1000.04, Enclosure 4, paragraph 3.

Recommendation 27. That the NAS Pensacola IVA work closely with tenant commands to establish a VAO network and communications capability to disseminate voting information quickly throughout the installation.

Tenant Command Voting Assistance
We reviewed the Voting Assistance program for 12 tenant commands in the Pensacola area. We found deficiencies in voting training, maintaining a standard voting assistance email address, and lack of command oversight for voting assistance. Concerns included insufficient training, failure to establish a standard voting assistance email address, and lack of command oversight for voting assistance.

Deficiency 86. Multiple NAS Pensacola tenant commands have not conducted annual voting training nor retained unit level training completion records, to include dates and attendees, for at least one calendar year. Reference: DoDI 1000.04, Enclosure 4, paragraph 2.s.

Deficiency 87. Multiple NAS Pensacola tenant commands have not established and maintained a standard voting assistance email address. Reference: DoDI 1000.04, Enclosure 4, Paragraph 2.r.

Deficiency 88. Multiple NAS Pensacola tenant commands have not conducted continuous command evaluations of the Voting Assistance program. Reference: DoDI 1000.04, Enclosure 4, paragraph 2.o.
Senior Enlisted Engagement

The NAVINSGEN Command Master Chief (CMDCM) engaged in various enlisted leadership groups, both junior and senior. A separate meeting was held with local Command Master Chiefs (CMC) and Senior Enlisted Leaders (SEL) to get a sense of the quality of family life and the single Sailor experience at NAS Pensacola. The NAVINSGEN CMDCM also participated in focus groups with spouses and Ombudsmen.

During discussions with tenant command CMC/SELS, the enlisted leadership concurred with issues brought up by Sailors and Ombudsmen in our survey and focus groups. Additionally, they voiced concerns regarding NATTC throughput, the excessive number of Sailors awaiting instruction and transfer, and the potential negative impacts on service time in the Fleet. Sailors routinely wait 3-10 months to receive orders and subsequent transfer from their respective A-schools.

During focus groups, Sailors and Ombudsmen indicated that adequate services were provided to support them within the Region. Various sites were visited to assess Sailor quality of life conditions at NAS Pensacola, Corry Station, and Saufley Field to include barracks, galleys, liberty center, gymnasiums, and other locations. In general, Sailors expressed satisfaction with the quality and level of service provided by the commissary, galleys, NEX, FFSC, and gym facilities.

Sailors reported that career management programs were well-established at a majority of the commands and that most senior enlisted leaders were engaged with the career development board process.

The top concerns shared by Sailors and Ombudsmen were:

- Facilities and installation amenities (Portside Gym overcrowding)
- Installation security (long waits at the gate to access the installation)
- Produce at commissary (short life span after purchase)
- Advertising of installation events (desire for an additional marquee near the NEX complex)

Sailors also had the following additional concerns:

- Barracks (overcrowding and climate control)
- Climate control (lack of ventilation/excessive humidity at gym facilities)
- Manning (shortfalls affecting classroom instruction and watchstanding)

The NAVINSGEN CMDCM also engaged tenant CMC/SELS on the issue of alcohol deglamorization. Tenant commands are working with the installation to address observed Sailor behavior concerns at the Portside Enlisted Club.
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 Pensacola area. Uniforms, grooming, and military bearing were satisfactory.
Appendix A: Summary of Key Survey Results

PRE-EVENT SURVEY
In support of the NAS Pensacola Area Visit held from 8-12 February 2016, NAVINSGEN conducted an anonymous online survey of active duty military and DON civilian personnel from 2 December - 8 January 2016. The survey produced 689 respondents (433 military, 256 civilian). According to reported demographics, the sample represented the NAS Pensacola workforce with a 3.5 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
Quality of life was assessed using a scale from 1 to 10, where 1 is worst and 10 is best. The overall NAS Pensacola area average quality of work life (QOWL), 6.95, was significantly higher than the historical area visit average, 6.39 (Figure A-1). The overall NAS Pensacola average quality of home life (QOHL), 7.72, was significantly higher than historical area visit average, 7.21 (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 installation of each bar. Counts for each rating are shown above each bar. The most frequent rating is shown in blue.
Figure A-2. Distribution of QOHL ratings 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 installation 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. One factor listed in Table A-1 was significantly higher overall than this baseline. Overall, advancement opportunities were identified as having an overall impact on QOWL. Closer examination reveals that civilian (54 percent) and female (42 percent) respondents influenced this result. Civilians more often identified leadership support, leadership opportunities, training opportunities, awards and recognition, 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, training opportunities, awards and recognition, command morale, command climate, and quality of workplace facilities 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>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunities</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of workday</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement opportunities</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and recognition</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command morale</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command climate</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of workplace facilities</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</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 how the SAPR program impacts QOWL, “Briefly describe why you disagreed or strongly disagreed that your command has an effective SAPR program.” There were only a few comments in response to this question, however, the comments are worth noting. Samples include: “…senior leadership in directorate’s meeting making jokes about a sexual assault incident ... they do NOT take the SAPR program serious.” “Many cases presented have been outside the context of a restricted report, jumped the chain of the SAPR program and have been blown way out of proportion.” “Do not see it in action.” “…chain of command [of victim] was told about it but some other staff at command who did not need to know about it were informed violating the [victim’s] privacy in the matter.”

The perceived impact of factors on QOHL life rating is summarized in Table A-2. Interestingly, none of the factors are significantly different from the 20 percent baseline. 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 did express some areas of negative impacts to QOHL. Some expressed concern that the Basic Allowance for Housing (BAH) is insufficient. “BAH is too low to live in a nice neighborhood.” “Even though it is close to Alabama, our prices are still like southern Florida.” “Recent floods and rate hikes for military owners/renters cause new personnel to settle in apartments 40-50 minutes away, live in bad neighborhoods, or use up every dime of their BAH on rent alone. Coupled with utilities (you run your A/C 11 months of the year here in Pensacola) and you’re out of pocket at least 400 each month.”
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>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of school for dependent children</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of childcare available</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping &amp; dining opportunities</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation opportunities</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to spouse employment</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to medical/dental care</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Participants commented on Naval Hospital Pensacola negatively impacting their QOHL. A few relevant quotes include: “Medical care provided is the worst I've experienced in the Navy. I find it difficult to make appointments in a timely manner, know where to go for the appointment - I always have to ask where the provider is located rather than being told - feel like the providers that I have seen are in a rush to get to the next appointment, and do not have a strong connection with the medical providers that I've come to expect in the Navy. I do not fault the individual care providers, but the model of care under which they now are obligated to practice.” “I have had several issues with medical. The way my spouse is treated when I am there in uniform versus when I’m not there is ridiculous. We switched to TRICARE Prime based on feedback from other coworkers and doctors at the urgent care center and we have had nothing but issues. We are considering switching back to standard.” “One of the biggest issues since being stationed here is there is no ER at the Naval Hospital, so we are forced to go out in town most of the time. My wife and kids have had major issues with getting referrals input to the system.”

Participants made comments related to PSD as negatively impacting QOHL. “If you walk in PSD you will see twenty civilians standing around doing nothing.” “PSD is the worst department/tenant command on this base. They have ZERO respect for the active duty members and do very little to help.” “The PSD at NAS Pensacola has no real service. My staff provides 100% of the PSD requirements...” “PSD services are slow and have many errors. My attempt to update my page 2 resulted in 3 months of repeated mistakes on the paperwork and no less than 10 different versions for me to review and sign.”

The NEX was mentioned in participant comments as having a negative impact on QOHL. “It appears the NEX is taking advantage of the military student population, by charging higher amounts for the same items.” “The NEX does not have rating badges for all ratings that are stationed on this base (NAS Pensacola).” “Corry Shope gouges the students. A coke cost $1.25 out of an MWR vending machine and over $2.00 at the Shopette.”
**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 NAS Pensacola. 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, and race discrimination at NAS Pensacola was significantly lower than the 5-year area visit value. The remaining factors were comparable to the 5-year area visit averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Topic</th>
<th>NAS PCOLA%</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>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Sex Discrimination</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Discrimination</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazing</td>
<td>3%</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**

The average ratings for various area support and services were above a 6.5 baseline on a 10-point scale, and no significant differences between the subgroups based on gender. Negative impacts on ratings are based on the previously applied 20 percent baseline or distributional differences between subgroups. The bullets below illustrate the various area support services asked about in the survey.

- FFSC - Overall average; 8.06 (Male; 8.07, Female; 8.00)
- Satisfaction with MWR - Overall average, 8.01 (Male; 8.00, Female; 8.05)
- NEX - Overall average, 7.50 Male; 7.54, Female; 7.21)
- Commissary - Overall average, 7.90 (Male; 7.91, Female; 7.71)
- Healthcare - Overall average, 7.63 (Male; 7.70, Female; 7.04)
- Family Healthcare - Overall average, 7.26 (Male; 7.26, Female; 7.24)
- CDC - Overall average, 8.11 (Male; 7.92,Female; 9.11)
- Residence - Overall average, 7.48 (Male; 7.51, Female; 7.26)
Appendix B: Summary of Focus Group Perceptions

FOCUS GROUPS

From 1-5 February 2016, NAVINSGEN conducted focus groups with various active duty military (57), ombudsmen (6), and civilian personnel (92) for 155 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 quality of life, 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 quality of life for each topic using a standardize Impact Matrix (See Matrix B-1). Note takers transcribed focus group proceedings, which were subsequently coded by the NAVINSGEN staff to protect the confidentiality of participants.

Matrix B-1. Area Visit Impact Matrix

| IMPACT  |
|-----------------|-------|-----------------|
|                | Major | Moderate | Minor          |
| Negative        | Severe negative impact on command climate or quality of life | Negatively impacts mission, job performance, or quality of life, but does not meet any of the Major impact requirements | General distracter that does not meet the Moderate impact standard |
|                 | Unable to accomplish a mission or task | | |
|                 | Accepted substantial risk to accomplish an assigned mission or task | | |
|                 | Deferred key mission readiness tasks | | |
|                 | Clearly violates law or regulation (e.g., Title 10, U.S.C. 32 CFR) or Navy policy | | |
| Positive        | Outstanding aspect of command climate or quality of life | Positively impacts mission, job performance, or quality of life, but does not meet any of the Major impact requirements | General positive effect that does not meet the Moderate impact standard |
Table B-1 lists focus group topics that were expressed as a major impact on the mission, job performance, or quality of life in at least four 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></td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>↓↓↓↓↓↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>↑↓↓↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym</td>
<td>↑↓↓↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>↑↑↑↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Access/Egress</td>
<td>↓↓↓↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWR</td>
<td>↓↑↑↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>↓↓↓↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning/Manpower</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 four 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.

Security and Installation Access
The topics most discussed in the focus groups were security and installation access.

In addition, many participants were unhappy with the process for installation access. Many participants complained about the long lines at the gates and being late to work. Some examples of focus group participants’ comments: “I trust the military, but don’t think the base is safe.” “When the traffic backs up outside, makes me paranoid and something could happen.” “Exchange is open and anyone can go in.” (Note: NEX is outside of the secured installation perimeter.) “How do you keep the base closed with tourist attraction on base? There is a price to pay for security.” “It is the most relaxed base I have been to.” “Seems the guards make it worse to make a point to their boss.” “New check points don’t seem to work.” “Taxis at gate need to unload everyone and inspect car.” “Four lanes wide with only one lane open.” “On weekend it is brutal – painful – I don’t even try anymore.” “ Took up to an hour to get in gate with ID card.” “If you forget your CAC, they won’t let you on with your driver’s license. But they let the tourists on.” “The base access list isn’t at the gate. Bowling alley did everything they are supposed to and the list never got completed by security.” “Security personnel are rude and refuse to work with you.”
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Facilities
The general theme regarding facilities was older building infrastructure. Some examples of focus group participants’ comments: “Building 1853 leaks when it rains. They call people out and they respond quickly. They spackle the area, but it never fixes it.” “Saufley Field barracks room breakers tripped ten times per day last week. Takes two hours to turn them back on via trouble ticket.” “Facilities are aging, original building (NATTC classrooms) were not designed to handle the new technology. 30 computers in a classroom and other electronics put a strain on the AC system. Classrooms are always too hot.” “HVAC does not work in building 3220 and 3460. FAA radar classrooms with computers create a very hot environment. I was sent home before because offices were too hot.” “Building 628 – WWII hospital – replaced roof and still leaks. Black stuff runs down the walls.” “My AC is terrible, very hot or cold (family fitness center).” “There are holes in the walls and need more maintenance.” “The lines on the road are faded throughout the base; both white and double yellow should be repainted.” “The base is pretty dark and could use better lighting.” Enlisted personnel living in the holding barracks do not get inspected by medical staff. But, they get inspected by staff for cleanliness (Building 1094).” “Echo barracks are nice. But transporting people back and forth from work location to barracks and to other venues creates manpower issues.” “Nice to have history of the building, but the standards of leaving the historical value verses making the spaces usable is a difficult balance. Historical always wins.” “People are developing major allergies caused possibly from the mold.” “Workspace AC does not work which contributes to the mold issue.” “Buildings are old and when the AC shuts down, it becomes miserable. There are rats, mold, and leaks within the buildings.”

Gymnasiums
There were positive and negative comments concerning the gym facilities at NAS Pensacola. Positive comments were made about the classes offered, the quality of NAS Pensacola main gym facilities, and the existence of a gym at Saufley Field. Negative comments were made about the gym at Corry Station, the HVAC system, and the hours of operation for the NAS Pensacola gym.

Some examples of focus group participants’ comments:

Corry Station Gym
“The Corry Station gym is not big enough for the population.” “Corry Station gym is old and negatively impacts physical readiness.” “It is too hot to work out in the summer.” “AC is out at the Corry Station gym.” “It is so hot, that they have to use hurricane fans to keep it cool.” “Corry Station gym is not good.” “They spent money on the track, but not on HVAC.”

NAS Pensacola Gym
“The gym at [NAS Pensacola] is good, but there is not enough parking.” “Gym hours should be extended beyond 1800. Should be CAC access after-hours” “Great facilities and equipment.” “Gym hours are too short. Gym is closed on Sundays. This creates overcrowding of the other gym.” “The Radford gym chiller has problems and there are water leaks in women’s room.” “Contractor custodians only clean once per week and do not clean very well.” “The classes
offered are awesome!” “No daycare provided at the gym.” “Classes are fine and it is a nice facility.” “Had to wait over 30 minutes to work out due to the gym capacity.” “I joined an outside gym (referring to the overcrowding and hours of operation).”

Saufley Field Gym
“...love that we have a gym, I am afraid they will close it. Would like them to repair or replace the equipment. I want them to keep the gym open. It makes a significant impact on my QOWL.”

Portside Gym
“API gym is small and not accessible to instructors.” “Portside gym is too small.” “Portside gym has water running down the walls. And the HVAC is bad.” “Staff does not use [Portside] gym because of fear being accused of fraternization.” (Note: Portside gym is close to NATTC; most patrons are junior Sailors assigned as students at NATTC.)

Leadership
Comments from participants regarding leadership fell into positive and negative impacts on QOWL. Demographics did not play a role in the comments from participants. Military and civilian participants both expressed positive and negative impacts. Comments from participants sometimes concerned their direct leadership and other times referred to NAS Pensacola leadership.

Some examples of focus group participants’ comments:

Positive impact comments: “Command leadership is great; all of them are great.” “The base CO visits all the facilities. He is a good CO.” “MWR Director is outstanding.” “Admiral and CO are great! Senior base leadership is down to earth, (they) talk to everyone, friendly; great place to work.” Leadership is “…very observant and XO provides constructive feedback.” “Our new Commander is really smart, great guy. New leave and liberty policy has students excited. He is treating students more like adults.” “New Master Chief is giving the students more leadership. [Will] take stress off of instructor.” “Recently things seem to be going in the right direction. Their hands are more involved. They seem to be listening more to our concerns.” “[Supervisor] is a great boss. [Supervisor] tries to help as much as possible.” “CO visits our facilities. This is a major positive.” “Leadership is very friendly and outgoing. I am very happy with job here.”

Negative impact comments: “It is hard to be here every day.” “There is a lack of or poor planning and leadership not dealing well with personnel affecting efficiency, very frustrating.” “Manager appears to indicate that [supervisor] is not productive as [supervisor] could and should [be] which is not benefiting the Navy.” “Students should be given more leadership opportunities, instead of being babysat by instructors.” “Piss poor management. Leadership does not know what they are doing, cannot execute mission.” “Negative attitudes from leadership - they say to keep morale high but their poor attitude trickles down.”
Morale, Welfare, and Recreation
Participants commented on MWR programs and leadership. Some examples of focus group participants’ comments: “MWR has high quality programs. They facilitate stuff for Sailors and civilians can participate in some of them. Scope is impressive.” “Because MWR reports to CNIC, base CO and tenant commanders can give input for ideas, but they do not carry very much weight.” “Local commanders have no influence on MWR.” “MWR does not want to engage with local leadership.” MWR has...“great programs – sailing classes and rent kayaks.” “Good healthy lifestyles choices.” “Fantastic experiences with MWR.” “Workers are fantastic.” “ITT was terrific.” “The best MWR I’ve seen including Norfolk and San Diego.” “Auto hobby is good, but, not as good as in the past – moderately good.” “The bowling alley is a major positive.” “Personally, I use the beach and bowling alley, movies with family. Major Positive!” “There needs to be more family activities and should have more things for the kids to do.” “More diverse concerts – all they had was country music.” “They only have 3 to 4 activities a year.” “Need something for the whole family can relate to.” “MWR Director is previous XO of base. He is knowledgeable and will stand up for his employees.”

Funding
Participants made comments about how funding negatively impacts mission and job performance. Some examples of focus group participants’ comments: “Tardiness of releasing the budget causes command to expend more time then needed.” “If we don’t have money for expendables, the mission shuts down.” “Medical runs out of supplies, machinery need maintenance, money to maintain computer systems.” “Government workers were sequestered so they weren’t there to do their job - so medical cannot use computer system.” “Just continue to cut and expect us to keep doing what you are doing.” “If they continue to cut, there will be training that does not take place.” “Single point of failure and people won’t get to the fleet.” “Pilots won’t get qualified – so the Fleet is affected.” “Corry seems to have unlimited funds for supplies and certain activities. Here (NAS Pensacola) there never seems to be enough funds.” “Timeframe for correcting facilities issues – it is forcing to request many waivers then later causes us to fail inspection or be out of compliance with requirements.” “It is a combination of facilities, management, funds and budget.” “Work year is shortened after money is authorized. 1st quarter is gone. 9 month year now. Plans should be in place as soon as budget is passed.” “Severe impact.” “Budget is not passed.” “CR environment is constrained.” “Can’t always play catch-up with money.” “Ripple effect – lose ½ year at field activities.” “Morale – people don’t know if they’re going to work. Everything must be by June for contracts.” “Have to spend money for things we don’t need at the end of the year.” Funding “puts things at risk - contractor can’t work without money.” “Quarter one is always a wash.” “Puts pressure on purchasers. Potential impact – potential violation of law and other issues.”

Manning/Manpower
Focus group participants commented on the lack of manpower within the organization, personnel cuts, and the changes in mission without changes to the requirements. Some examples of focus group participants’ comments: “Civilian manpower is disjointed. Spend way too much time tracking taskers and PARs for civilian employees.” “They have a lot people – all at end of career and beginning (referring workforce make up within their organization)” “There
are a lot of question marks over what services civilian HR provided the hospital.”  “There is a chokepoint at HR storefront – one person processing 3 to 4 areas.  The goal was 120 days – they never meet it.  It drags on for 6 months to a year and you may lose money if you don’t process it that year.  Sequestration made it worse. (Referencing the lack manpower at HR.)”  “They create a billet without a person to man it.  They take bodies from HQ to the billets, so HQ mission fails.”  “LIMDU Sailors assist with manning.”  “It’s hard and people are not where they need to be.  Collateral duties are filled by permanent Sailors.  Can’t have enough manning (NAS Pensacola).”  “No designated personnel to assist with personnel transferring to the fleet. Impact to command (CID) is wide.”  “Not getting [enough] people – getting smaller and smaller – job harder and harder – to support throughput of 80 persons (students) a day.”  “We are in survival mode.”  “Some comp time and we have credit hour thing - great thing.  We can use them later when able.”  “Dedicated employees get the job done, but suffer and don’t do as well.”  “You leave off things – quality goes down.”  “I see stress around me.  Everybody getting more and more work with less people.”  “HR puts people in that aren’t qualified.”  “People leave and not replaced.”  “Since 2007, every year cutting personnel.  Still have to same job.”  “Positions are eliminated annually.  NETC - every year reducing billets, yet not stopping work requirements.  Students are increasing, so more growth.”  “In my command we are losing 7 or 8 and gaining only 2.”  “I don’t know how it works, but we are understaffed.”  “Short-handed in instructors.”

Other Topics with Expressed Major Impact

Command Climate
Comments from participants were all positive. Some examples of focus group participants’ comments: “Good about command.  Everything is fine.  Working environment at command is good.  Work stress is moderate.  Stress is low. I like the command very much.”  “I’ve been a civilian for 29 years, last two years here have been awesome.  It used to be hard to take leave here, it is much easier.  Command assessment addressed issues.”  “NETSAFA really cares for people.”  “The hospital is a positive atmosphere.  Not micromanaged.”  “Center for Information Dominance’s new CO is really nice.”

Performance Management
Participants expressed negative comments concerning their experience with their performance management system. Some examples of focus group participants’ comments: “Military personnel rotate through, but don’t look at job classification.  It is a losing battle trying to change classification.  Both military and civilian don’t value us.  95 percent of what is in my PD is outdated.  Management doesn’t tackle it (Note: comment made by a WG employee).”  “My PD says I am a training specialist, but, I am doing program manager work.”  “We are all doing substantially more today than before.  I feel I’ve been taken advantage of.”  “Training and learning things that are not on my PD.  I am uncomfortable with taking training and being held culpable.  I wouldn’t hire me if I knew about this training.”  “Collateral duties side tracking me from my main job.”  “We are going to hire you and you’re going to do what we tell you to do.  They use the bait and switch.”  “Took a two day course on how to operate a piece of equipment, never used it before and I am considered qualified with no practical experience.”
“The civilian appraisal systems are too confusing.” “Some people have not received their evaluations yearly.”

Human Resources, Hiring Process, Pay/Compensation, Award/Recognition
Participants indicated negative feeling towards the new regionalization of the HR function, how long it takes to hire and bring someone on board, and general concerns towards the award and recognition program. Some examples of focus group participants’ comments: “Human resource located in Stennis is negative.” “There is no HR counselling anymore. It has been replaced by a website. Can’t talk to a HR person and talk about retirement. Website is not clear and not efficient on what they do.” “Flex employees have no rights. If boss doesn’t like you, you can be terminated (NAF hourly employee’s perception).” “Word of hiring opportunities are not getting out.” “Candidates are not qualified, have to go with the pool.” “Perceived good ole boys system in the hiring process.” “No O6 left behind. Retires on Friday and a GS12 Monday morning.” “They don’t seem to hire from within. It is hard to move up. Seem to hire from the outside.” “Takes 6 months of constant badgering to get a civilian hired.” “A new hire took a couple of months to be processed in. A couple of months after the job closed before [the selectee] was contacted.” “Award and Recognition program ran out of funds. The guideline for the program is not understood. But is related to performance. This is why evaluations are important, but it solely depends on supervisors.” “People who go above and beyond should be recognized.” “Awards given to those that just do basics.” “Bonuses – pathetic.” “We do so much and the pay does not reflect it.” “There is no upward mobility and feel underpaid.” “NAF employees have no upward mobility.” “29 hour or less rule means we do not get benefits.”

Installation and Command Amenities, Medical and Dental, Personnel Support Detachment, Childcare Services, Food, Commissary, and Navy Exchange
Focus groups participants discussed the poor quality of the fruits and vegetables at the commissary. However, other aspects of the commissary received positive comments. Some Corry Station participants indicated a lack of easily accessible food service facilities. People who live on the installation and do not have transportation expressed the need for a shuttle system to take them around to key locations on the installation, as well as to the hospital, commissary, and big NEX. Participants indicated positive comments concerning the Childcare Services and PSD. Some comments were expressed concerning the cost of food at the NEX located near NATTC buildings.
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>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>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</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>+</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job satisfaction</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership support</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership opportunities</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Hours/Schedule</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement opportunities</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards and recognition</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training opportunities</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command morale</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command climate</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of workplace facilities</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>18%</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>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>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</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>+</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of home</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the school for dependent children</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the childcare available</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping &amp; dining opportunities</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to spouse employment</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to medical/dental care</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>29%</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>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>45%</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>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</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>N</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</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>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>13%</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>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My job is important and makes a contribution to my command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_____ 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>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favoritism</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender/Sex Discrimination</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Harassment</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race Discrimination</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazing</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have adequate leadership guidance to perform my job successfully.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My performance evaluations have been fair.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The awards and recognition program is fair and equitable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Military and civilian personnel work well together at my command.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My superiors treat me with respect and consideration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My command attempts to resolve command climate issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40%</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>331</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D: Issue Papers

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS
Issue Papers that follow require responses to recommendations in the form of Implementation Status Reports (ISRs). If you are an Action Officer for a staff listed in Table D-1, please submit ISRs as specified for each applicable recommendation, along with supporting documentation, such as plans of action and milestones and implementing directives.

- Submit initial ISRs using OPNAV Form 5040/2 no later than 1 August 2016. Each ISR should include an e-mail address for the action officer, where available. This report is distributed through Navy Taskers. ISRs should be submitted through the assigned document control number in Navy Taskers. An electronic version of OPNAV Form 5040/2 is added to the original Navy Tasker Package along with the inspection report, upon distribution.

- Submit quarterly ISRs, including "no change" reports until the recommendation is closed by NAVINSGEN. When a long-term action is dependent upon prior completion of another action, the status report should indicate the governing action and its estimated completion date. Further status reports may be deferred, with NAVINSGEN concurrence.

- When action addressees consider required action accomplished, the status report submitted should contain the statement "Action is considered complete" and should include documentation to substantiate that determination. However, NAVINSGEN approval must be obtained before the designated action addressee is released from further reporting responsibilities on the recommendation.

- NAVINSGEN point of contact for ISRs is [b] (7)(C) [b] (7)(C)

Table D-1. Action Officer Listing for ISRs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMAND</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION NUMBER(S) XXX-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAS Pensacola</td>
<td>003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNRSE</td>
<td>004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAVSUP</td>
<td>005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ISSUE PAPER D-1: INSTALLATION SAFETY SERVICES BY CONTRACT

References:  
(a) OPNAVINST 5100.23G CH-1, Navy Safety And Occupational Health Program Manual  
(b) A-76 Report, Enhanced Residual Government Organization, Centrally Managed Safety Department of June 2001  
(c) NAS Pensacola Base Operating Support Contract, Annex 0404000-Safety

Issue:  
NAS Pensacola government-managed and contractor-delivered installation safety services are not compliant with instruction as a result of overly general requirement specifications and performance measures, and poor performance oversight.

Background:  
Reference (a) is the primary standard for delivery of installation safety services, comprised of 27 programs at this installation. Reference (b) provides the Performance Work Statement for the NAS Pensacola Safety organization, which was comprised of 19-funded and 16-filled billets during the 2001 transition to contract. Currently, five civilian personnel manage the installation safety program and approximately twelve contractors conduct field work and reporting. Reference (c) provides performance objectives and performance standards for safety services required by contract. While these specifications adequately address many of the program areas required by instruction, lack of clarity in contract performance requirements have created gaps in the delivery of safety services. Additionally, inadequate performance assessment of contractor work in this area has magnified these gaps.

Discussion:  
The contracted safety organization is ineffective for two primary reasons: (1) requirements aren’t adequately defined and are consequently underfunded in the current contract, and (2) performance assessment has inadequately enforced the quantity and quality of contractor services. These two problems are most evident in the delivery of workplace inspections and fall protection programs.

The performance objective of Specification Item 3.2 of the Safety Annex requires the contractor to conduct “workplace inspections,” but the related information in the adjacent column repeatedly refers to “facility safety inspections.” This nomenclature conflict has created a focus on safety deficiencies of fixed objects (facility deficiencies), which falls short of the requirements of workplace inspections (that includes a review of moveable obstructions, ladders, machine guards, etc.) required in paragraph 0903 of reference (a).
The assigned Performance Assessment Representative for the Safety Annex of the BOS contract has limited safety training, and stated that customer complaints are the primary means of measuring contractor performance. However, contract safety personnel do not verify that deficiencies are posted and that interim controls are in place, sustained, and followed up on until a deficiency is corrected. A random sampling of five buildings recently inspected by the contractor revealed that these inspections occurred when workers were not present and not all hazards were identified. Finally, the NAVOSH Inspection (including workplace inspections), Fall Protection, and Personal Protective Equipment programs were rated unsatisfactory in the 2014 Regional Operational Assessment and Assistance Team Report (ROAAT) report and remain unresolved.

The current contract is not compliant with instruction. We recommend pursuit of additional funding and modification to the existing Safety Annex to mitigate these shortfalls in the near future and perhaps through the final option year of the BOS contract, which expires in September 2017. Alternatively, if in-sourcing of this function is desired, immediate actions should be taken to ensure A-76 legislative requirements are resolved prior to hiring of government employees to perform this previously out-sourced function.

Recommendations:


004-16. That CNRSE consider funding a modification to the BOS Safety Annex to mitigate safety program compliance shortfalls at NAS Pensacola.

NAVINSGEN POC: [b] (7)(C)
ISSUE PAPER D-2: OPPORTUNITIES FOR REUSE OF HAZARDOUS MATERIAL

References:  
(a) OPNAV M-5090.1, Environmental Readiness Program Manual  
(b) NAVSUP Publication 722, Consolidated Hazardous Material Reutilization and Inventory Management Program (CHRIMP) Manual

Issue: NAS Pensacola hazardous material users are not leveraging opportunities for return and re-issue of partial containers of hazardous material.

Background: References (a) and (b) provide guidance on minimization and control of hazardous material, as well as proper execution of the Consolidated Hazardous Material Reutilization and Inventory Management Program (CHRIMP).

Discussion: Chapter 23 of reference (a), paragraph 23-3.4 states, “that units of issue shall be modified to prevent excess HM disposal by the work center. Serviceable, partially used, or excess HM is returned for potential redistribution, reuse, recycling...” The NAS Pensacola Hazardous Material program is operated by Fleet Logistics Center (FLC), and is generally well managed and executed. However, roles of the central point of issue are not clearly understood by users of hazardous materials, and users have a perception of some reluctance on the part of FLC to receive partial containers for reissue. Although not required as part of CHRIMP compliance, acceptance of empty containers is likely to improve communication, visibility, and cooperation of turn-in and reissue of partial containers.

Recommendation: 005-16. That FLC work with the Environmental Division of NAS Pensacola Public Works Department and hazardous material users to establish and properly communicate procedures for a proactive central point of hazardous material issue and return.

NAVINSGEN POC: [b] (7)(C)