PROGRESS REPORT

PROJECT TITLE: Range Sustainability Services – Cherry Point, Camp Lejeune Range Complex, NC
PROGRESS REPORT NO.: 04
PRIME CONTRACTOR: The Environmental Company, Inc.
PRIME CONTRACT NO.: N62472-01-D-1390
DELIVERY ORDER NO.: 0001
TEC PROJECT NO.: P6901
SUBCONTRACTOR: SRS Technologies
PERIOD: Sept 29 – Nov 2, 2002

Task	Title and Deliverable	Complete
1	Develop Workplan	100%
2	Develop RCMP Cherry Point/Lejeune	31%
3	Develop RCMP Template	5%
4	Briefings and Meetings	30%
5	Status Reports	12%
6	IT Compatibility	9%
	Estimated Overall Project Complete	29.6%

Work Performed During This Period:

- Submitted revised final Workplan
- Submitted NAVFAC Environmental Data Workshop Minutes
- Continued data collection activities

Actions or Issues Requiring Special Attention:

- A need for enhanced coordination with and between various Marine Corps commands was identified.

Significant Events Scheduled for the Following Period

- Continue data collection activities
- Distribute additional copies of Workplan

Budget: TEC has invoiced for 29.6% of the delivery order budget.

Delivery Order Budget:	$745,000.00
Invoiced to Date:	$220,732.00

Progress Report Recipients:

Name/Organization	Internet Address
Virginia McAllister, EFA NE	mcallsitervf@efane.navfac.navy.mil
Bryan Murphy, CINCLANTFLT	bryan.murphy@navy.mil
John Van Name, LANTDIV	vannamejp@efdlant.navfac.navy.mil
R. G. Head, SRS Technologies	rg.head@wg.srs.com

Cherry Point/Camp Lejeune RCMP
Progress Report

Contract: N62472-01-D-1390

Prepared For: The Environmental Company, Inc.

Prepared By: SRS Technologies

Dates Covered: 1 August – 31 October 2002

1. Summary of Work Accomplished During the Period

- Developed and briefed the Kick-Off Briefing for Cherry Point and Camp Lejeune commands.
- Developed and submitted the Draft Workplan that provided a detailed approach for developing RCMP products that included: Range Area and Current Operations Descriptions, Operations Scenario Database/Databook, Future Operations & Vision, Range Requirements Summary, Range/OPAREA/SUA Quick Reference guides, GIS Maps and Charts, Range Management Structure, Range Manager's Exercise Preparation Checklist.
- Attended Workplan Review Meeting in Norfolk.
- Developed and briefed the RCMP Workplan and Strategic Vision Briefings.
- Submitted Final Workplan
- Attended Navy operations Environmental Data Workshop at Pax River
- Continued data collection activities. Conducted three Data Collection/Analysis visits to Cherry Point, Camp Lejeune, and Norfolk, VA.
    - 27 Aug-5 Sept 2002 — FACSFAC, Cherry Point, Camp Lejeune
    - 8-9 October 2002 — Norfolk
    - 15-16 October 2002 — Cherry Point and Camp Lejeune
- Began writing Draft RCMP

2. Status of Tasks

Task	Activity	Estimated Percent Complete of the Amount Funded
1	Develop Workplan	100%
2	Develop RCMP CP/CL	31%
3	Develop RCMP Template	5%
4	Briefings and Meetings	30%
5	Status Reports	12%
6	IT Compatibility	9%

3. Contact Records

1. Maj Will Brown, HQ USMC (PP&O), 9 May 2002
2. Odle Wood, Targets Dept, MCAS CP, 12 Aug 2002
3. Bobbie L. Best, Targets Dept, MCAS CP, 13 Aug 2002

4. John J. Kurek, Targets Dept, MCAS CP, 15 Aug 2002
5. LT Will Harmon, FACSFAC VACAPES, 27 Aug 2002
6. CDR Morrison, CINCLANTFLT N721, 28 Aug 2002
7. J.P. Pifer, MAEWR/TACTS, 3 Sept 2002
8. Mike Dolan, MEAWR/TACTS, 3 Sept 2002
9. Col Jim Schleining, AC/S T&O MCB CLNC, 4 Sept 2002
10. Lynn Phillips, Dep Dir IT Ops, MCB CLNC, 4 Sept 2002
11. SSgt C. W. Zwielhofer, MCB CLNC, Range Scheduling, 4 Sept 2002
12. Peggy Briley, RDD MCB CLNC, 4 Sept 2002
13. Jim Williams, Range Inspector, MCB CLNC, 5 Sept 2002
14. Maj Michael Kaine, II MEF G-3T, 5 Sept 2002
15. Capt T.J. Johns & Capt T. Reese, 22 MEU S-3, 5 Sept 2002
16. Bobbie L. Best, Central Scheduling, MCAS CP, 3 Sept 2002
17. LtCol Fred Leberman, ROD MCB CLNC, 4 Sept 2002
18. CDR Mike Hohl, CPF N73, 8 Oct 2002
    CDR Frank Kara, C2F J72 – T&E
    CAPT Skip Sayers, CNAL N3
    Dave Norris, CNAL
    Kim McConnaughey, CNAL N36
    LCDR Chuck Woodard, FACSFAC
    Bill Barrett, MARFORLANT
    Bryan Murphy, CLF N465
    Hank Eacho, CLF N465
19. Maj Frank Luster, MARFORLANT, 9 Oct 2002
20. Steve Frisk, CNSWG-2, 9 Oct 2002
21. CDR Dean Oyler, CFFC/CLF N8, 9 Oct 2002
22. CDR Fred Sanford, CCG-4 N343, 9 Oct 2002
23. Liz Nashold, CLF N4654A, 9 Oct 2002
24. Ken Cobb, MCAS CP Env. Affairs Dept, 16 Oct 2002
25. Robin Ferguson, MCAS CP Env. Mgmt. Branch, 16 Oct 2002
26. Joe Ramirez, MCB CLNC TRMD, 16 Oct 2002

4. Summary of Issues/Concerns

- **Approval of Marine Corps Operations**
  - Proposed operations with justification have been provided to MARFORLANT for approval.
- **Visit Coordination to USMC Commands**
  - Although direct liaison was agreed to during the Kick-off meetings, MARFORLANT is re-evaluating scheduling and coordination of data collection/analysis visits to USMC commands. A schedule of projected visits to USMC commands and desired points of contact have been provided to TECOM for further coordination with MARFORLANT.

5. Status of Deliverables

a. VACAPES Kickoff Meeting Briefing and Minutes, 17 Jul 2002
b. Cherry Point/Camp Lejeune Kickoff Meeting, Briefing, and Minutes, 23-23 Jul 2002
c. RCMP Draft Workplan, 16 Aug 2002
d. RCMP Workplan Briefing and Minutes, 28 Aug 2002
e. RCMP Strategic Vision Briefing and Minutes, 29 Aug 2002
f. NAVFAC Environmental Data Workshop Minutes, 10-12 Sept 2002
g. RCMP Final Workplan, 20 Sept 2002

6. Summary of Work to be Accomplished in Next Period

- Continue Data Collection/Analysis
  - Nov – Cherry Point/Camp Lejeune
  - Dec – Norfolk, Cherry Point, and Camp Lejeune
  - Jan – Cherry Point/Camp Lejeune
- Incorporate data and analysis into Draft RCMP
- Conduct review meetings and briefings
- Monitor Navy Range Management System and other IT developments

Attch: Contact Reports

As of: 24 Oct 02

INDEX OF RCMP CONTACTS

Contact No.	Name	Organization	Subject
1 5/9/02	Major Will Brown	HQ USMC, Plans, Policy,Ops	Discussion of MEU METLs and MEU Operations to be analyzed in the CP/CL RCMP
2 8/12/02	Odle Wood	Targets Dept, Cherry Point	Discussion of MCAS Cherry Point scheduling and operations
3 8/13/02	Bobbie L. Best	Targets Dept, Cherry Point	Data on Cherry Point scheduling and operations
4 8/15/02	John J. Kurek	Targets Dept, Cherry Point	Discussion of tactical training range operations and Fleet Training Range Directory
5 8/27/02	LT Will Harmon	FACSFAC VACAPES	Data Gathering on air and surface operations in the FACSFAC VACAPES OPAREAs
6 8/28/02	CDR Mark Morrison	CINCLANTFLT N721	Discussion of Navy METLS
7 9/3/02	J.P. Pifer	MAEWR	Extended discussion of MAEWR scheduling, TRIMS, EW operations and range requirements
8 9/3/02	Mike Dolan	MAEWR	Discussion of MAEWR and TACTS operations, requirements and feedback presentation demonstrat'n
9 9/4/02	Col Jim Schleining	Asst C of S, Training & Ops	In-brief and discussion of RCMP goals, objectives and issues of interest
10 9/4/02	Lynn Phillips	Dep Dir IT Ops, Bus & Log Spt	Extensive discussion of MCB CL GIS System and Integrated Geographic Info Repository Data Catalog
11 9/4/02	SSgt Z	CL Range Scheduling	Data gathering on CL scheduling, REFMS, users and range utilization
12 9/4/02	Peggy Briley	CL Range Transformation	Detailed discussion of Peggy's Range requirements, vision, analysis and transformation plans
13 9/5/02	Jim Williams	Range Inspector	Extensive tour of MCB CL ranges with detailed discussion of enforcement and sustainment practices
14 9/5/02	Major Michael Kaine	II MEF	Discussion of II MEF training objectives
15 9/5/02	Capt T.J. Johns Capt T. Reese	22 MEU	Very detailed review of 22 MEU SOCEX and SACEX operations with extensive data presentation

16 9/3/02	Bobbie L. Best	CP Tgts Dpt./ Scheduling	Discussion of Central Scheduling Procedures for Airspace/Ranges at Cherry Point
17 9/4/02	LtCol Leberman	Range Ops. MCB CLNC	Detailed Discussion of Range Instrumentation at Camp Lejeune, NC
18 10/8/02	CDR Mike Hohl CDR Frank Kara CAPT Skip Sayers Dave Norris Kim McConnaughey LCDR Chuck Woodard Bill Barrett Bryan Murphy Hank Eacho	(CPF N73) (C2F J72 – Training and Exercises) (CNAL N3) (CNAL) (CNAL N36) (FACSFAC) (MFL) (CLF N465) (CLF N465)	Data Collection for current and future operations in the CP/CL range complex
19 10/9/02	Maj Frank Luster	MARFORLANT OPS	Data Collection re USMC operations in CP/CL complex
20 10/9/02	Steve Frisk	CNSWG-2	Data Collection re NSW use of CP/CL complex
21 10/9/02	CDR Dean Oyler	CFFC/CLF N8	Discussion re Range Requirements
22 10/9/02	CDR Fred Sanford	CCG-4 N343 (Strike Ops)	Data Collection re Range Requirements
23 10/9/02	Liz Nashold	CLF N4654A (NEPA Lead)	Status of CLF Environmental Planning Docs for CP/CL
24 10/16/02	Ken Cobb	MCAS CP Env. Affairs Department	Initial liaison with Mr. Cobb and the Environmental Affairs Department
25 10/16/02	Robin Ferguson	MCAS CP Env. Mgmt. Branch (NEPA Lead)	NEPA Status at MCAS CP
26 10/16/02	Joe Ramirez	MCB CL Trng Resources Mgmt Div Public Outreach	Initial liaison with Mr. Ramirez and the Training Resources Management Division

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 1

Name/Company: RG Head, Dave Hearding, John Pitcher and Ryan Heitz

Person Contacted: Major Will Brown
Bryan Murphy, N465 CLF

Organization: HQ, USMC, Plans, Policy, and Operations

Telephone Number: 703-614-2116

Date: 9 May 2002

Reason for Contact: Discussion of MEU(SOC) Predeployment Training Program (PTP) at MCB Camp Lejeune MEU Operations

Summary of Discussion:
Maj. Brown was the Fire Support Coordinator on G-10 & other locations.
He provided copies of MCO 3120.9B and discussed the USMC MEU METLs.
Maj. Brown described the following Navy operations that occur on MCB Camp Lejeune:

SEAL use of the MOUT Naval Construction Battalion Training
F-14 FAC-A exercises on G-10

Maj. Brown described some encroachment issues cited at Camp Lejeune include:

ESA: Turtle nesting areas on Onslow Beach
Training Impact: The units are required to used marked lanes during the nesting season, and only 1 company can land at a time.
ESA: Listed plants are found in the Sandy Run area(s)
Urban Growth: Development on the west side of the base is resulting in increased noise complaints.
Training Impact: Firing is restricted to certain atmospheric conditions that result in lower noise propagation.

Other training operations discussed included:

Type Commander Amphibious Training (TCAT)
Beaufort F-18 training
MEBEX – MEB afloat with Marine Air Wing – Can be regimental size ~10,000

Major Brown suggested for operational analysis purposes that we group the individual training areas on Camp Lejeune that have similar operational uses.
It was suggested that we include Bogue Airfield as part of the Camp Lejeune training areas because it is used as an Expeditionary Airfield
Three major exercises that occur at Camp Lejeune include:

SACEX – Supporting Arms Coordination Exercise
SOCEX – Special Operations Capable Exercise
MEUEX – Marine Expeditionary Unit Exercise

The discussion then focused on how to classify the operations at the base for analysis purposes. Dave Hearding proposed that the operations could be divided into Green (USMC Ops), Blue (Navy Ops), and Blue/Green (Navy & USMC Ops). It was agreed upon that a suitable scope of analysis would cover Blue and Blue/Green Operations. Analyzing this set of operations would encompass almost all of the Green Operations occurring on the base since those operations would be a subset of the more extensive Blue/Green Operations that occur during the Predeployment Training Program.
The discussion ended with the development of a draft set of operations that are proposed for analysis in the RCMP. Those operations are listed below and are part of the PTP:

Mission	*No.*	*Operation*
Amphibious Operations	*1*	*Amphibious Assault*
	2	*SACEX*
	3	*SOCEX*
	4	*Airfield Seizure*
	5	*MOUT*
Maritime Special Operations	*6*	*Visit Board Search and Seizure*
	7	*Direct Action*
MOOTW	*8*	*Non-Combatant Evacuation (NEO)*
Supporting Operations	*9*	*TRAP*
	10	*Information Operations*

Actions for SRS:

- Look at Bogue Airfield as a possible training area to include in the RCMP
- Talk with the Special Operations Training Group (SOTG) at Camp Lejeune to learn more about Special Operations training on the base.
- Talk to II MEF Training about training on the base.
- Obtain and review the TRS proposals for CP/CL
- Talk to Jim Omans about the encroachment problems at Camp Lejeune and the initiative to acquire land as buffers for the ranges to reduce encroachment problems.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 2

Name/Company: Charlie Goodwin/SRS

Person Contacted: Odle Wood

Organization: MCAS Cherry Point, Targets Department, Range/Airspace Scheduling

Telephone/Email: 252-466-4041; woodol@cherrypoint.usmc.mil

Date: August 12, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Collection at Cherry Point Targets

Summary of Discussion:

Checked in with the Range Manager, LtCol Deven. Everything okay.

Received two copies of the MCAS Air Station Order 3570.2Q, on CD-ROM, which governs scheduling of R-5306A, R-5306C and operations, to include hours, for BT-9, BT-11 and MCOLF Atlantic.

Received a Targets Department Command Chronology report for CY 01, detailing average monthly personnel strength, equipment, and significant events by month.

Acquired LOA concerning MCASCPT, RATCF, MCBCL Range Control issue; Joint use and real time scheduling of R-5306D/E, R-5303A/B/C and R-5304A/B/C.

Gained TRIMS access for pulling reports. It is http://64.173.241.147/; user name: "targets," password: "piney".

On future operations, Scheduling expects to have more combined exercises, more intense FAC/FAC(A) training, and JTFEXs becoming more complex with target Ids, JSTARS, Predator UAVs (UCAVs), and Time Critical/Sensitive Targeting

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 3

Name/Company: Charlie Goodwin/SRS

Person Contacted: Bobbie L. Best

Organization: MCAS Cherry Point, Targets Department, Range/Airspace Scheduling

Telephone/Email: bestbl@cherrypoint.usmc.mil

Date: August 13, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Collection at Cherry Point Targets

Summary of Discussion:

Charlie Goodwin conducted a general discussion with Bobbie Best on Cherry Point operations, targets, and overall range issues. He set up contacts for future visits by the CP/CL RCMP Team.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 4

Name/Company: Charlie Goodwin/SRS

Person Contacted: John J. Kurek

Organization: MCAS Cherry Point, Targets Department, Range/Airspace Scheduling

Telephone/Email: 252-466-4040; kurekjj@cherrypoint.usmc.mil

Date: August 15, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Collection at Cherry Point Targets

Summary of Discussion:

Met with John Kurek and discussed Cherry Point scheduling. Received a copy of the Fleet Training Range Directory on CD.

Talked with Mr. Best and asked to get copies of all and the ROCC's daily inputs. He will discuss with G-6 and see if he can e-mail attachments to an outside address.

Obtained hard copies of these reports.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 5

Name/Company: Karl Whittenberg, Tammy Mason (SRS)

Person Contacted: LT Harmon, Operations Officer

Organization: FACSFAC VACAPES

Telephone/Email: 757.433.1248 HARMONWL@vacapes.navy.mil

Date: August 27, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Collection at FACSFAC VACAPES

Summary of Discussion:

Karl Whittenberg and Tammy Mason conducted a thorough interview with LT Harmon, Operations Officer FACSFAC VACAPES and gathered the following information:

- Ascertained that only two specific Letters of Agreement are in existence between FACSFAC VACAPES and other organizations within the Cherry Point/Camp Lejeune Range Complex that coordinate the scheduling of Airspace within the complex. The first LOA is for the Camp Lejeune G-10 2d LAAD Stinger Battery firing. The airspace is blocked via NOTAMS to deconflict the hazard/warning areas. The second LOA outlines procedures for scheduling airspace with the Cherry Point Range Complex. The requesting unit submits a standard naval message asking for a specific portion of airspace to be blocked/altitudes for a specific period of time. Described as two separate entities.
- Discussed the proposal for the Corps and Mattamuskeet Military Operations Areas (MOAs): 1994-1995 movement from 3 miles to 12 miles off shore warning areas- W-122 was spared, as it would lose training objectives. Corps MOA: R5306S Airspace doesn't join. Speed restrictions 250 kts and below/MOA 3k-18k. Allow flow from MOA to SUA to SUA below 10A. Mattamuskeet MOA: 18K West of Dare County to Northern tip of USMC airspace there currently doesn't exist special use airspace (SUA) Request for MOA to be 12-18K. **USMC wants to own 18K and below for both Regions. USN will own offshore, USAF owns Dare County, and a refueling track exists within W-122 that the FAA informs FASFAC VACAPES when the track is active. There will be restrictions.
- All exercises, not to include, JTFEX and COMPTUEX, will be scheduled by the parent unit. For the Joint exercises JTFEX and COMPTUEX, a message is disseminated asking to reserve blocks of airspace within the range 2-4 weeks prior to STARTEX of the joint exercise. 2NDFLT reserves airspace for JTFEX. CARGO4 reserves airspace for COMPTUEX. The Overarching Range Cooperative Agreement (ORCA2) or Range Cooperative Investment (RCI) is a vision of the USAF and USN: Organized effort to design the new airspace for COMPTUEX to be held in the Gulf of Mexico vice Puerto Rico and predicted for release December 2002 in writing so can be in use NLT June 2003.

- During Carrier operations within W-122, aircraft are not talking to FASFAC VACAPES as they ferry back and forth.
- Deconfliction issues: Each SOA (special operations area) has a corresponding frequency that will update flights with current range information and traffic.
- Traffic Count has been changing over the years: discrepancies in recording of Annual Report: operations vice specific #s of sorties/aircraft. ATC NATOPS NAVAIR 00-80T-114 guidance.
- Annual Utilization and Justification Report: Fiscal Report of Restricted Areas/MOAs/ATC OPNAVINST 3770.2
- Suggested Cherry Point POCs: Dave Plummer (Airspace MCAB East) 919-466-3466 and Dan Brown (Deputy Director MCAB East)
- Sustainment Issues: There is an issue with the civilian airlines. The Airlines want to schedule flights through the warning area to destination airport. Many calls to FASFAC VACAPES. The civilian carriers want to be scheduled but the FAA is supposed to be the mouthpiece of the civilian carriers, routing around the SUA. Due to push hours being the same, the civilian carriers would like access to the area. (SWAP delineates this). U.S. Navy is the driver though so it is not an encroachment issue. However, the Union is more powerful than the FAA. There is currently friction as the current head are still in favor of DoD yet the new generation perspective is skewed. A smaller portion of the ATC is DoD friendly. Problem as those individuals leave and are replaced by the Union. FASFAC Vacape's current trump card is the Executive Agreement. Airspace/frequency spectrum are not issues currently with the FAA- they are accommodating.
- MTRS and airspace analysis were omitted. Need to add the LATR system and ensure that the MAG-16 low-level routes are incorporated as well.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 6

Name/Company: Dave Hearding/SRS

Person Contacted: CDR Mark Morrison

Organization: CINCLANTFLT/N721

Telephone/Email: mark.morrison@navy.mil

Date: August 28, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Collection on NMETLS

Summary of Discussion:

CDR Morrison has been the Fleet lead on Navy Mission Essential Task List (NMETL) for the past three years. The purpose of the visit was to ascertain the status of NMETL development and their applicability to the RCMP requirements development process. The process has 4 phases:

Phase I: Develop the Mission essential tasks. Input is due from Type Commanders by Dec 2002.
Phase II: Develop Navy Warfare Training Plan. Estimated completion in 2004.

- would provide training objectives for each type of platform
- CO of ship/squadron would log on and get a "shell" of a training plan which would identify resources required including fuel, opposition forces, ranges
- Provide conditions and standards

Phase III: Execution
Phase IV: Assessment. In the 2007 timeframe.

- analyzing collected data against standards

CDR Morrison logged on to NMETL web site for demonstration. Current state and specificity of NMETL conditions and standards would not lead directly to range requirements. The timeline for the NMETL process does not appear to support the RCMP requirements process.

CDE Morrison suggested a review of Navy Tactical Task List, from which NMETLs are derived for a Battle Group or ARG, which are available on the Navy Warfare Development Command web site.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 7

Name/Company: R. G. Head/Mike Wentz/Tammy Mason/SRS

Person Contacted: J. P. Pifer, Manager

Organization: TACTS/MAEWR

Telephone/Email: (252) 466-4295

Date: September 3, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Gathering on Cherry Point MAEWR and TACTS

Summary of Discussion:

Mike Wentz, RG Head, Tammy Mason, and Charlie Goodwin (SRS) met with J.P. Pifer, Manager of TACTS/MAEWR to gather data about MAEWR/TACTS operations within the Cherry Point/Camp Lejeune Complex and ascertained the following information:

- TACTS/EW stood up in 1990 with 34 new radars and threats.
- A host of environmental issues, there are many threats to MAEWRS/TACTS in small areas (BT-11 and airfield).
- 18 mobile sites were added, including Camp Lejeune, NC, to create realism.
- MAEWRS/TACTS is not the sole EW entity within the complex: T&E is also involved. T&E looks at electrical fidelity however, it does not properly associate an actual threat characteristic and lacks fidelity in mechanical aspects of threat. None of the T&E threats act like a threat like Patuxent River and Atlantic Test Range.
- MAEWRS/TACTS has agreements with Coast Guard (no signed LOAs- all e-mail agreements) to move sights/threats but first, they must get environmental and signal approval. A noted deficiency is the lack of a full time civilian frequency manager.
- Formal agreements with Hoboken and Bogue Field do not exist, but they received frequency approval allowing the radar up to 15 frequencies. 15 pre-approved mobile sites at Camp Lejeune but zero utilization.
- MAEWRS/TACTS is expanding their area into ARG supportability. (10-15 missions/exercises supported with last MEU). Surface ships tend not to utilize MAEWR however, with Vieques going away, they will need to consider new avenues for ship training. Currently there are three sites near Lejeune on the water's edge, which are ideal for ship and helicopter training.
- Eastern NC is horrible for EW threat and radar operations- trees, traffic, etc. Terrain masking works/offers realistic training.
- There is a high user demand for Manned Systems, because they provide more realistic, reactive training and can simulate the desert environment. The automated systems lack realistic capabilities to fully train.

- Utilization of the MAEWR/TACTS range by service: 40% USMC 35% USN 25% OTHER. Cherry Point is considered a "Purple" Range as it is utilized most on the East Coast for large force exercises (8-10 major exercises a year). Scheduling priority flow: USMC/USN/USAF/USA/USCG/Civilian.
- TRIMS Report- data collection ability/system for MAEWR/TACTS.
- Issue with Pilots not scheduling the range but piggybacking other operations- Undocumented training (out of the airspace but still utilizing capabilities) account for about 8-10%. Limited ability to track this traffic. N7 interest: SEALS/Special Operations don't account for numbers as they are not an air system, but they still support.
- Sponsor was there two weeks ago (AIRLANT). MIPR funding from USMC units (very small amount of $) Defense Emergency Relief Fund: DERF excess funding money from Congress (TRS association) ½ million this year and an IOU for 3 million. A deficiency exists in upgrading MAEWR through funding means (mainly need/get from other entity). No systems have been fielded since initial fielding- investment is a shortfall. Upgrades are a necessity-double digit cost.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 8

Name/Company: RG Head/Mike Wentz/Tammy Mason/SRS

Person Contacted: Mike Dolan, Mission Coordinator

Organization: MAEWR/TACTS

Telephone/Email: (252) 466-2216

Date: September 3, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Gathering on Cherry Point MAEWR and TACTS

Summary of Discussion:

RG Head, Mike Wentz, and Tammy Mason (SRS) met with Mike Dolan, Mission Coordinator of MAEWR/TACTS to ascertain operations data for the Cherry Point/Camp Lejeune Range Complex. The following information was gathered:

- MAEWRS/TACTS is an air-oriented facility that still is in need of a surface EW expertise on the range side.
- MAEWR/TACTS Navy/Marine Corps exercise involvement:
  ARGEX- Ships detect EW threats based upon how/what ships need and their detection methods. However, ships get less training than air.
  SOCEX- limited EW play due to SOTG guidelines and restrictions.
  JTFEX- doesn't fully utilize capabilities however, this exercise alone accounts for the majority of the USN utilization of the MAEWRS.
  COMPTUEX- supported by MAEWRS on the periphery, not direct support.
- Range Scheduling: Unit schedules range 2-3 weeks in advance by phone call or e-mail.
  (1) BT-9/BT-11-Bombing through the Aerial Surface Targets Division/ a confirmation of the validated training requests is published every two weeks
  (2) MAEWR scheduled daily/ 1500 each day, the schedule is locked hard for the next day in TRIMS.
- The TRIMS Order, 3624.1D, is still a draft and not signed to date. TRIMS is not performance-oriented. It may include a T & R Matrix but only shows hrs used vs. hrs available and doesn't identify the types and quality of the missions. TRIMS lacks EW Emitter usage data.
- The flexibility of TACTS is demonstrated through the flexibility in adding at least 20% of their daily missions. Aircraft scheduling doesn't actually account for actual utilization (# of aircraft/time in space, etc.) Lack feedback from units on what training requirements were accomplished, training use, and range supportability: Cherry Point provides instant feedback- few exercises exist where you can play and train with instant feedback. Usage is mainly on what the Aircrew desires, not on a specific requirements basis.

- The Cherry Point TACTS is all over land with no ocean towers so it is not conducive to air-to-air missions. Future effort: TACTS data to ready rooms to marry up with HUD tapes on the SIPRNET. PODS is an issue with air-to-air missions. 2ndFleet has recognized a lack of EW. SHAW and MCINTYRE come to Cherry Point for EW/Seymour Johnson wants to raise the altitude of the R5306 airspace from 18K to FL230 . Warning areas are the largest portion of the airspace utilized. Facilities are over-utilized by USAF and USA because they can use the range without funding. EW is not seen as a high priority by the USN or USMC. There needs to be an active duty range liaison with the Navy and Marine Corps for continuity and joint planning. Currently, information is pushed to the USMC vice requested.
- Approximate percentage utilization of EW capability at MAEWRS/TACTS: 30 USN/ 30 USMC/ 30 USAF/ 10 USA. Education amongst squadrons is limited (Helo Squadrons need more training than the fixed-wing). No existing LOAs with other ranges outlining airspace deconfliction and routing coordination. Looking to model the USAF: one central range office of 42 people. Looking for entry into a formal training process that includes units, ranges, fleets, requirements, readiness, etc.
- Range Prioritization $ issues: Range Prioritization conferences have limited military representation and they are competing for funding with the Navy Flying hour program. 5 years in a row, only 2 EW aspects were funded/ rest of the funding fulfilled by the SHRAM budget. There is a communications backbone underway from Oceana to MCAS Cherry Point to Camp Lejeune that will pipe boresight video and will be finished in FY-03.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 9

Name/Company: RG Head/SRS

Person Contacted: Colonel Jim Schleining
Renee Hawthorne

Organization: Assistant Chief of Staff/Training & Operations

Telephone/Email: Renee 910.451-7391

Date: 4 Sep 02

Reason for Contact: Staff Orientation and Data Collection

Summary of Discussion:

The SRS Range Management Team met with Colonel Schleining and Renee Hawthorne to in-brief at MCB Camp Lejeune prior to going to the Range Operations Division for detailed data collection. RG provided Col Schleining with an overview briefing of the RCMP project.

Col Schleining responded with his support for the RCMP, and he noted that recently the Commandant had directed all commanders to develop METLs for their units and to assess their training progress frequently. The colonel's only fear was that the Range Management Team might not look at all the range operations being conducted at MCB CL. We responded that we were going to look at more than originally anticipated by adding a "Sustainment Training" category. His guidance was to pay particular attention to improving range instrumentation. He noted that the base had only approximately 8 Red-cockaded woodpecker "violations" [many were administrative] last year, as contracted with as many as 80 in years past.

Renee Hawthorne set up appointments with Range Operations and the MCB Camp Lejeune IT Operations Deputy Director, M. Lynn Phillips.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 10

Name/Company: RG Head/SRS

Person Contacted: Lynn Phillips, Deputy Director

Organization: Business Technology Division
Business and Logistics Support Department
IT Operations, MCB Camp Lejeune

Telephone/Email: 910.451.8909; phillipsml@lejeune.usmc.mil

Date: 4 Sep 02

Reason for Contact: GIS Data Collection

Summary of Discussion:
RG met with Lynn Phillips, who is the enterprise GIS leader for MCB Camp Lejeune's integrated information technology and GIS department. After a short explanation of the RCMP project, she outlined the MCB organizational and functional network for data management, including GIS. In 1992, the Commanding General, MCB Camp Lejeune, directed that the organizational entities under his control integrate their information capabilities under a centralized IT department. The concept of operations is that data should be input and quality controlled at the lowest level in the organization (decentralization), but polity, management and availability should accrue to a base-level organization (centralization).

Thus, MCB Camp Lejeune now has an integrated set of approximately 300 GIS data layers, which archive data in the functional areas of: transportation, utilities, military operations, environmental, and regional (outside the base). She provided a book of metadata with overall GIS instructions and individual sheets on each data layer.

This book, Integrated Geographic Information Repository Data Catalog – July 2001, contained a form to request data layers or maps. We completed the form, had it signed by Bryan Murphy, the Navy NTR, and submitted it to Renee Hawthorn for validation and forwarding to the IT department. Ms. Phillips was glad to provide these data layers to the Range Management Team, and she requested that any value added to these layers be coordinated with the IT Department.

Ms. Phillips will send us the charter of the IT department and the current draft of the base policy instruction.

Renee Hawthorne set up and attended this interview.
Francis Railey is the GIS Manager (910) 451-9016

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 11

Name/Company: RG Head/Mike Wentz//SRS

Person Contacted: Staff Sergeant Curtis Zwiefelhofer

Organization: CL Range Operations Scheduling

Telephone/Email:

Date: September 3, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Gathering on CL training

Summary of Discussion:

RG and Mike met with SSgt Zwiefelhofer (SSgt Z), who is the Scheduling Chief for Range Operations at CLNC. SSgt Z discussed the standard operating procedures involved with scheduling ranges and training areas at CLNC. He also discussed how this information was inputed and stored in RMFSS.

SSgt Z provided us with several reports from RMFSS on the ranges and training areas utilized from October 1, 2001 until September 3, 2002. These reports were categorized by individual units with a concentration on the 3 II MEF MEU(SOC) training programs.

SSgt Z is going to provide the entire year-end report that is published via RMFSS after October 1, 2002.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 12

Name/Company: RG Head/Mike Wentz/Tammy Mason/SRS

Person Contacted: Peggy Briley

Organization: Director, Range Development Division

Telephone/Email: 910.451.4480 **brileymg@lejeune.usmc.mil**

Date: September 3, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Gathering on CL range requirements and transformation plans

Summary of Discussion:

Peggy Briley gave an extremely informative briefing on her new 2020 Range and Training Area Transformation Plan for MCB Camp Lejeune, NC. The purpose of the 2020 vision is "to provide the operational forces with the means to attain and maintain a high state of combat readiness" and introduce MCB Camp Lejeune, home of the East Coast's largest amphibious training complex, as the premier East Coast training facility for the USMC. The transformation efforts will improve the quality of the ranges and the inherent training, while working hand-in-hand with the Environmental Division to preserve and protect archaeological sites and endangered species as well as to incorporate noise management, property and community initiatives in the development of buffer and compatible use zones.

She covered a variety of issues that have affected the Range Complex, to include an evaluation of the deficiencies at the complex and efforts that have been made to improve them. Targeting is in grave need of repair. The targets are either non-existent or inadequately placed at the wrong distance. Ranges are open fields, littered with debris and erosion, while brush overgrowth encroach on boundaries. The Ranges do not meet the established training standard criteria nor recommendations from higher headquarters. Further, access roads are minimal and inadequately maintained.

The new vision calls for an evaluation of each range and redesign to ensure that they meet all individual training standards for the unit that will be utilizing the range and construction of state-of-the art, live-fire operational facilities, with automated computers and target feedback systems, restroom facilities, classrooms, and adequate access roads. The number of ranges and locations will be minimized by orienting the ranges so that their Surface Danger Zones fall within the common impact areas, making more efficient use of the land and significantly reducing environmental impacts on the training complex. Peggy's vision will be accomplished in phases, concentrating on modernizing facilities west of the New River initially, and then moving to the East side and finally, the Greater Sandy Run Area (GSRA).

A variety of environmental, noise, and land use restraints have been inflicted on the Camp Lejeune Range Complex. The inter-coastal waterway was not an issue when the training complex was established in 1944; today, live-fire cannot be conducted across the waterway without closing it to public traffic first. Tanks now fire at SR-10, within the GSRA, creating numerous noise

complaints coupled with inadequate, sponge-like training ground that limits non-dud performance. Signs on the New River establish a no-go zone to the East of the K-2 impact area; however, noone has taken civil police action against the many trespassers who continue to travel up the river to fish. Many of the ranges are being moved to the southern region of the G-10 Impact Area due to environmental restrictions on Red Cockaded Woodpecker settlements. The F-Ranges have been moved away from the perimeter in response to noise concerns.

The funding estimate for maintaining the GSRA was inaccurate and with the inclusion of new ranges, the facilities have been overwhelmed and have had difficulty maintaining adequate upkeep. Peggy has been interviewing UXO companies, with retired EOD personnel for possible contracts to remove range residue. Funding is definitely an issue. Renee Hawthorne is looking into Joint Training Funding for the 2020 vision plan. One short-term solution involves signs that Peggy is placing at each range that provide range information, scenarios, and a list of training standards that can be accomplished at that particular range, while preventing possible mishaps. In The GSRA, they are planning on establishing an embassy at the Airfield Seizure range to ensure that embassy reinforcement can be accomplished. This is one of the greatest USMC deficiencies. Peggy built an emergency Range Shutdown system, a series of sirens, currently placed at SR-6 for evaluation and tracking, however, the range is currently used minimally due to wetland restraints on training.

This summary only touches the surface of Peggy's detailed range and training area transformation, her current progress in accomplishing this vision, and the problems she has encountered along the way. She is a wealth of knowledge and expertise on the Camp Lejeune training complex and there is an abundance of data that she can provide for incorporation in the Range Complex Management Plan (RCMP) effort. The RCMP can provide support for her vision and help promote adequate DoD funding and recognition.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 13

Name/Company: RG Head/Mike Wentz/Tammy Mason/SRS

Person Contacted: Jim Williams

Organization: Range Inspector

Telephone/Email: 910.330.1617; 449-6228

Date: September 4, 2002

Reason for Contact: Tour of CL Ranges and discussion of Range Inspector roles

Summary of Discussion:

Jim Williams, Viper, head of 5 Range Inspectors, works for Jim Helring, Range Control Officer, and is contracted by MANCON until October 1st 2002 and thereafter, by SIMS. The Range Inspector ensures the safe operation of the range by enforcing the standards of range usage. They open the range, check for a safety vehicle, ensure 2 means of established communication (FM), and give the RSO/OIC an orientation of the left and right lateral limits of the range, etc. Jim Williams helped to re-write 90% of the Range Order. Bill Ward, Bldg 1, handles all contracts. Fidelity maintains upkeep of the range and automated targets. There are 2 fidelity crews: operators and technicians who provide 8 hours of maintenance to each range. The Range Control website has digital photos of the ranges.

Guided tour of ranges:

- GSRA: no dud-producing ordnance are permitted in the GSRA: only inert practice bombs. GSRA restrictions include no off-road movement of vehicles due to the wetlands. There is a whole new set of restrictions in the GSRA-no maneuvering areas other than designated ranges. GSRA is mostly fenced while the other ranges are not. GSRA is a tree forestry harvesting area. 40+ noise complaints of 68 from GSRA range.
- SR-10 Tank Firing Range and Pistol Range: consists of 2 moving targets on tracks and RETS and permits the use of lasers. SR-10 is used 2 ½ months, twice a year by Tanks Company (10-12 tanks). Computers in towers register hits and misses on tank and RETS. RETS can be set to retract after 1 or several hits.
- F-Ranges: 5 Ranges with left and right fans and thermal panels indicating safety limits and night firing. F-5 Maneuvering Course: small unit rifle range with automated targets. Targets are 100/400m down range in automatic pits. Training range areas are designed to meet ITS. CBC is considered the best range because it has life fire and maneuver for all organic weapons. Poaching issues with hunters at F-2 Machine gun range.
- G-Ranges: G-10: 12 noise complaints of 68 from NSFS in G-10. G-6: Company Battle Course with Mk-76 close air support shoots.

- MOUT Eastside: Simulations/Paint Ball/31 buildings and shantytown/ 2LZs/ cameras for feedback/ maintained by contract and marines that utilize the town. Maintenance issues: requirements to clean up after each use so utilized minimally/ Marines have to police the brass on all of the ranges, even on the fire and maneuver ranges/ fire danger.
- K-Ranges are the most heavily used.
- Noted public dumping of trash and HAZMAT next to state highway 172.
- Red Cockaded Woodpecker restrictions have relaxed: currently there is a 200 meter buffer around the occupied tree. 3 rings on a tree indicate the colony of woodpeckers and the white rings on the tree show 200 meters out from the colony tree. Now, the rings have been painted black and maneuvering units have been permitted to pass through these previously restricted areas. Initially, Parachute landed in RCW tree and it took 7 people to approve and cut the tree. Endangered species in the Camp Lejeune Range complex include eagles, the lower-leaf stripe plant, venus fly trap, sea turtles, and white dovetail bird.
- The carrier group does utilize the ranges but only for specific missions. There is an LHA deck to practice fleet carrier landings near New River and a loading ramp at Blue Bird, New River, for LCACs.
- The Range Inspectors have good relations with the Game Wardens, local sheriffs, local and state regulatory officials, county commissioners, citizens with complaints, etc. Inspectors help the community whenever possible as they are the first responders. Sustainability is maintained by enforcing a set of procedures, which have been developed by EMB and coordinated with regulators of range control. Inspectors are first to discover and report the violations.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 14

Name/Company: RG Head/Mike Wentz/Tammy Mason/SRS

Person Contacted: Major Michael Kaine
MSgt Daniel Mace

Organization: II MEF

Telephone/Email: 910.451-8415

Date: September 4, 2002

Reason for Contact: Discussion of II MEF training objectives

Summary of Discussion:

The SRS Range Management Team met with Major Michael Kaine and MSgt Daniel Mace of II MEF G-3 Training. After a short explanation of the RCMP project by RG, the gentlemen began to outline II MEF's involvement in the unit training cycles and any subsequent impact at the MEF level. Both the MSgt and Maj also discussed their views of the training areas/ranges and their impact on training.

Each individual unit attached to II MEF is responsible for its own training syllabus. II MEF supervises training via the II MEF TEEP. Training issues and problems involving training areas and ranges are handled at the unit or immediate higher headquarters level. II MEF involvement in these issues are limited to MEB and higher level training operations and exercises (i.e. MEBEX, Millennium Challenge, etc.)

Both men agreed that a majority of the issues being discussed at subordinate level commands are: 1) the overall area is adequate for training, yet limited when it comes to the explosion and detonation of ordnance; 2) Current range capabilities are lacking in realism; 3) Most units utilize "canned scenarios" while training on the CLNC ranges and maneuver area (to include the MOUT facility); 4) Unit training is dictated by encroachment issues thus making it too difficult to support training operations (i.e. land development in Sneads Ferry, Bn maneuvers restricted due to woodpecker areas, wetlands restrictions, etc.); 5) G-10 Impact Area is not fully utilized due to overgrowth of vegetation and limited observation facilities.

When asked if there were other Service ranges that provide the needed training capabilities, both men stated that "No," however a majority of the Army ranges were more capable of supporting larger sized training and live-fire operations (example: Rolling Thunder at Fort Bragg with 10th Marines – artillery).

Maj Kaine will send us the II MEF TEEP that tracks each units training/deployment evolutions.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 15

Name/Company: RG Head/Mike Wentz/Tammy Mason/SRS

Person Contacted: Captain T. J. Johns, Targets Information Officer
Captain Travis Reese, Fire Support Officer

Organization: 22 MEU

Telephone/Email: Johns: 910.451-5941
Reese: 910.451-0407

Date: September 4, 2002

Reason for Contact: Extended discussion and data gathering on SOCEX and SACEX

Summary of Discussion:

The SRS Range Management Team met with Captain Johns and Captain Reese, who are the Targets Information Officer and Fire Support Officer for 22nd MEU Command Element (S-3). After a brief explanation of the RCMP project, both gentlemen outlined the flow of MEU operations during SACEX and SOCEX, as well as the differences in both operations.

Both gentlemen discussed that SOCEX, being the MEU's final evaluation for SOC designation, was multi-dimensional and scenario driven by the evaluating agency (SOTG). Live fire operations had minimal impact on the entire evolution as its intent was to test and evaluate the MEU's ability to plan and execute multiple tasks. SOCEX impact on the training areas is limited to the maneuver areas and structures (MOUT facility, GSRA Airfield, etc.). Normal SOCEX missions included Humanitarian Assistance, TRAP, Embassy Reinforcement, and VBSS (Direct Action).

SACEX, on the other hand, consisted mainly of supporting arms live fire coordination and execution. The scenarios are MEU written and controlled (S-2/N-2) with minimal maneuver elements. The intent behind SACEX is for the MEU to test its ability to coordinate and transfer fires from ship to ground control and then back again. Both gentlemen stated that there were many limitations to the training area and overall support for this evolution: 1) SACEX is apart of JTFEX and is not an integral part of the evolution (often times considered an expanded Tactical Air Control Party (TACP) exercise with Artillery support); 2) SACEX scenarios may encompass all of the CLNC area, however targets are limited to G-10 Impact Area (fire support personnel concentrated on G-10 Ops vice with maneuver elements); 3) SACEX units simulate NGF support with a non-MEU artillery battery; 4) Realism of training is dependent upon scenario, Navy support (NGF and ARG on station), and availability of aircraft (normal ops have 4-6 AH-1s, 6 AV-8Bs, and 4-6 F-18/14s); 5) Most comprehensive training occurs when CCG sends "over-flow" aircraft to training area. Normal ammunition utilization for SACEX: 400 artillery rounds for simulated ship fires (300 HE, 50 smoke, 50 illum), 700 rounds for the MEU artillery battery

(500 HE, 100 smk, 100 illum), 800 81mm mortars (700,50,50), inert bombs for air assets (2-4 per aircraft), and 2.75mm for AH-1s.

Both gentlemen described the flow of personnel, fires, ordnance utilized, and vehicle movements for 1 task element of SOCEX, and a possible scenario for SACEX. Both agreed that the ARGEX tested the full capabilities of the MEU as both the ARG and MEU commander had the freedom to exercise the units to their full extent. They also expressed the need for EW training into both scenarios so there would be more realism involved in both operations.

22 MEU is going to provide basic T/O&E's for each operation the RCMP studies, a copy of a PTP training schedule, and operation orders. 22 MEU is also going to provide a copy of their after action report, "Re-shaping the Spear" from their action in Afghanistan and includes their recommendations for current and future training evolutions at CLNC and surrounding areas.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 16

Name/Company: Tammy Mason/SRS

Person Contacted: **Bobbie L. Best**

Organization: MCAS Cherry Point, Targets Department, Range/Airspace Scheduling

Telephone/Email: bestbl@cherrypoint.usmc.mil

Date: September 3, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Collection at Cherry Point Targets

Summary of Discussion:

- The Cherry Point Targets Department has 3 full-time schedulers and one data analyst.
- Daily Status reports break-down range utilization by unit/target/date/time.
- The requesting process is simple: request range two weeks in advance/ CP Scheduling calls and confirms day prior with each unit/TRIMS data is complete day of/ unit must cancel prior to day of requested use of airspace. No shows are reflected in TRIMS data
- Given electronic copy of Range Order and hard copy of LOA with ATC Seymour Johnson and Camp Lejeune.
- Three issues with the airspace:
  (1) Biggest issue: conflict between Kiwi Track and Neuse ADCA Kiwi: 18-23K/ Neuse ADCA: 18-22K. Currently the two tracks overlap. Anytime the Air Force Kiwi track is active (scheduled and controlled by Seymour Johnson), the NEUSE ADCA is not utilized north of the Delta (scheduled and controlled by Cherry Point).
  (2) R5306A broken down further into 3B(north) and 3A(south): currently the procedure is first come/first serve. If a crop duster, etc. is there first then military ops cease until the aircraft leaves the airspace. Range control will not mix helos and civilian aircraft. Cherry Point ATC-FAC gives heads up to schedule military and hold civilians out through ATC.
  (3) H-58s flying in support of the civil-military ops (the law enforcement aircraft)700 ft or so….1 or 2 helos at field/TROJAN(ATC det) wouldn't clear the aircraft to fly. Not clear on this. Depends who is on duty.
- TRIMS data: Put in sorties/branch/flight data. Broken down by sortie/total amount
- **ammo/acft/ship type(RAICUZ data).** No type of targets category nor type of ordnance expended. Need for a TAC(A) or strike frequency during joint exercises. Too many agencies/frequencies currently must be preset. Cherry Point is the frequency manager.
- The Scheduling authority is the CG, MCAS Cherry Point, NC, who delegates scheduling authority to the Central Scheduling Center.

- Scheduling of the R5306A and R5306C for exclusive use requires approval of the Commanding General, Second Marine Aircraft Wing and the Commanding General, MCAS Cherry Point (Figure 2-1)
- Aircrews entering the SUA must have scheduled the airspace prior to arrival and be in receipt of a mission number corresponding to information available to Trojan and be able to confirm.
- Scheduling of the R5306A is inclusive, automatic when aircrews are scheduled for BT-9 or BT-11.
- The scheduling activity for R5304A, B, C (Gizra), R5306D, R5306E, BT-3 and G-10 is the CG MCB Camp Lejeune, NC.
- The warning area 122 and Pamlico B are scheduled and controlled by FACSFAC Vacapes, VA.
- First pass hot operations must be coordinated in advance with Central Scheduling at Cherry Point, NC. Cherry targets will only clear first pass hot as per request. Flight lead is responsible for ensuring the target is clear before commencing training. (Ch 5 and 6 details)
- Scheduling procedures for BT-9 and BT-11: range periods divided into 15 minute blocks, back to back periods may be scheduled, schedules are published NLT Wednesday of the week preceding the two week schedule. Request for range time must be submitted no later than 10 days prior to the first day of the schedule. Central scheduling is responsible for promulgating the schedule.
- Central Scheduling disseminates updated copies of the schedule daily via e-mail. A unit can be added to the daily distribution by contacting General Scheduling.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 17

Name/Company: Mike Wentz/SRS

Person Contacted: LtCol Fred Leberman

Organization: Range Operations, MCB CLNC

Telephone/Email: 910-451-3733

Date: September 4, 2002

Reason for Contact: MCB CLNC Range Instrumentation

Summary of Discussion:

Mike met with Lieutenant Colonel Fred Leberman, Range Operations Division, MCB CLNC, concerning current and future instrumentation on the ranges and training areas. He discussed the instrumentation at CLNC and how it is broken into 3 areas: Target, Range, and MOUT Instrumentation.

Targetry and Instrumentation has been the responsibility of the host facility to control – providing targets, maintenance, etc., and implement requirements/needs into the POM cycle based upon the installations priority (i.e. it competed against housing, schools, facilities, etc.) CLNC is currently working on POM 04' with HQMC and TECOM to provide the facility range/MOUT dummies, updated targets, and new data feedback systems.

Current CLNC ranges have instrumented RETS targets, which is considered obsolete with today's technology. The RETS targets provide limited to no feedback for users other than hit or miss. RETS targets capabilities are: pop-up or down, can be hard or soft wired, purely reactionary, and non-R/F wired. The USMC is implementing the Army's Caswell Target System to improve the feedback capabilities (R/F wired, MILES linked, computer solutions, necessary hardware). 29 Palms and Camp Pendleton are to receive this system immediately; however CLNC is to be retrograded with parts to its systems yearly. The greatest needs at CLNC is for the ranges to be equipped with instrumented targets that can provide a "real time" feedback with a recognized solution (either visual or instrumental) that is linked to MILES and capable of supporting all areas of the MAGTF.

CLNC eventual push/strategic vision is for a multi-purpose key-card controlled range. With this concept, the range would be opened, activated, controlled, and closed by the key-card holder (ATM concept). During range operation, the same control system would gather and provide full range feedback based upon those ITS and T&R Standards inputted by the key-card holder (fire, maneuver, etc.)

Another aspect of instrumentation discussed by LtCol Leberman was Range Instrumentation (non-target inclusion). The specific needs here is the ability to track individuals, units, vehicles, etc. on the range and provide the feedback/after action on those entities ability to move and fire in a "real time" environment. CLNC position is to provide a range instrumentation package that provides MILES and associated compatibility, is expandable within the range, transportable to separate ranges, and can provide real-time tracking and reviews for every aspect of the MAGTF (Air, Ground, etc.).

One possible range instrumentation system is the DITS (Deployable Instrumented Training System) by SAAB. This system will provide extensive training and feedback for every aspect of the battlefield. It will enable commanders the ability to create real-time situations that include all aspects of the "fog-of-war" and tie-in directly with targetry, control measures, and heads-up displays/views, as well as tie in directly with MAEWR and other agencies. The only drawbacks are the cost $3+ million cost and possible spectrum problems.

The final aspect discussed was MOUT Instrumentation. CLNC focus is concentrated at the company level as the smallest unit. The measured factors involved in this view are focused upon SOI curriculum and MEU readiness; as each are incorporated into a company's training cycle. The staff develops its criteria by examining the ranges effectiveness when compared to MEU readiness in a MOUT environment.

Current initiatives are focused on the Army's CAMTF Plan that focuses on breaching, urban assault, and shooting within a smaller MOUT complex with extensive instrumentation. The USMC is expanding the Army's view to include a more campaign process that just MOUT centric. USMC MOUT operations would begin at an LZ, move through rural areas, then through the lesser developed region (ghetto), and on to highly urban and developed areas). The difficulties arise in providing instrumentation over a widely diverse area.

A current study at NOCDSD (Orlando) is ongoing to look at what systems and MOUT instrumentation can capture the full extent of the outreach and total provide a true analysis and feedback of the training.

LtCol Leberman's key points were:

1) Current instrumentation does not account for a growth of the battlespace beyond the beach-head and all future and expanding capabilities for OMFTS, STOM, MV-22, AAAV, etc.
2) Instrumentation systems need to be dictated/capable of supporting those key factors or measurements a unit or commander wishes to capture; it should not dictate the range and system capabilities to the units
3) The need should focus on instrumenting the ranges vice people in order to expedite training.
4) T2P2 is a growing concern when discussing ranges; affects readiness, personnel, abilities, and capabilities of each unit across the board.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 18

Name/Company: Dave Hearding (SRS)/ Steve Golle (TEC)

Persons Contacted/Organization:
CDR Mike Hohl (CPF N73)
CDR Frank Kara (C2F J72 – Training and Exercises)
CAPT Skip Sayers (CNAL N3)
Dave Norris (CNAL)
Kim McConnaughey (CNAL N36)
LCDR Chuck Woodard (FACSFAC)
Bill Barrett (MFL)
Bryan Murphy (CLF N465)
Hank Eacho (CLF N465)

Telephone/Email:

Date: October 8, 2002/1300-1530

Reason for Contact: Data Collection for current and future operations in the CP/CL range complex**.**

Summary of Discussion:

Intermediate and advanced training at CP/CL:

Current (prior to May 2003):

- C2X – not done in CP/CL EXCEPT:
    - TSTA III enroute w/3 days for CVW at BT-9/11 and G-10 and MAEWR
- JTFEX – 2-3 x per year
    - Done entirely at CP/CL
    - BT-9/11, MAEWR
    - Long range strikes 3 x/day each day
    - MCM – drop inert shapes for MH-53 sweeping and Q-routes
    - CLF has EAs for
- SACEX – 2/yr @ 2.5 days
    - Formerly at AFWTF, but past 2 years all at CP/CL
    - W-122 (Onslow Bay), BT-9/11, G-10
    - 2 Fire Support boxes to simulate fire into G-10 which is limited in size; w/ arty, CAS, NSFS – so CAS done at BT-11 simulating G-10
    - Amphib landing
    - Integrating ARG w/ BG assets; CVW support (not CV based) plus Cru/Des, plus helos and AV-8's

- SOCEX – 2/yr

    - OMFTS, but not an amphibious landing
    - Revisit SACEX plus SOC missions
    - Helos and AV-8's

Future (post-May 2003):

- C2Xs will leave Vieques and be distributed per the TRS; some events to CP/CL
- JTFEX, SACEX, SOCEX unchanged
- Expeditionary Strike Group (ESG)
    - Tailored Cru/Des, ARG group
- JNTC
    - Spring 04 event in CPOA?
    - Assume 1 Joint exercise every other year

Unit training at CP/CL:

- FAC-A training
- SWATS – SFARP into BT-9/11
- Harriers at CP do unit level at BT-9/11
- 5" NSFS into G-10
    - agreement between community (?) and USMC
    - 30 x per year iso Marine spotter training
    - EA completed
- VAST-DP to be certified in Nov 02; IOC in 1Q CY03
    - 5-7 reusable buoys
    - recovered after event
    - GPS
    - Not anchored
    - Sea state 3 or less
- Current ASW training limited to:
    - JTFEX w/ scripted geography (chokepoint)
    - TSTA 3 enroute to C2X (ASW-PT)

Other Notes:

- JSF IOC for USMC = 2008, Navy=2010
- TCTS – rangeless system
    - Funded program
    - Key West FY05
    - Oceana FY07
    - CP FY09
    - Replaces TACTS/LATR
    - USAF has interim system (P-5)
- No air minelaying at CP (all at PAX)
- Training mine range is an option at SWTR; will be covered in SWTR EIS
- EW @ MAEWR will be upgraded resulting in increase in ops
- A-A missilexs: will be done use mobile sea launch of drones
- S-A same as above
- HARMEXs done in CPOA using barge target
- EOD ops do occur at CP
- Bogue Field handles FCLPs, primarily for AV-8's

- JCIET (Joint Combat Identification and Engaging Targets)
    - Normally in JAX and Eglin
    - Planned in conjunction with JTFEX 04-2 in CP/CL
- Canadian ops – 4 SCs in CP/CL
- New systems to consider:
    - Rail gun (Advanced gun system)
    - RAMEX (MCM)
    - F-22
    - JSF
- MCM – explosive charges
    - MINEWARCOM – UAVs to neutralize mines using explosive charges
        - See Liz Nashold
        - Who owns?
        - Done at CP

Navy/USMC to provide:

1. JTFEX EA(s)
2. VAST EA (draft)
3. MCB CL EA for Marine spotter training at CL.
4. Agreement between USMC and ?? re NSFS at G-10
5. Maritime Integrated Tactical Training (MITT) document
6. MCB CP/North Carolina agreement re ordnance in the water
7. TCTS background info and IOC plans (PMA-248; Mr. Morales/CAPT Graser)
8. TRS plans for C2X events in CP/CL
9. TRS investment plans for POM-04

Actions for SRS/TEC:

1. Meet with CLF N8 (CDR Dan Oyler)
2. Meet with CNO N43 (Austin/Krause) to discuss requirements methodology and POM-04 investment plan for CP/CL, TRS/Training BAM
3. Provide Bryan Murphy preferences for visits with ACC and TRADOC
4. Interview EODMU re ops at CP/CL
5. Mike Wentz to send e-mail to MAJ Luster re Marine Corps ops
6. CNSL POCs:
    a. CAPT Camacho (N6)
    b. LCDR Jeff Clapp (N6)
    c. CDR Eric Tapp (N6)
    d. CAPT Valentine (N7)
    e. LCDR Mike Dewitt (N7)
7. See Ron Carder re EW upgrade plans
8. Details of Expeditionary Strike Groups (ESG) and training requirements (see CAPT Divo Dervay – N3 – (757-836-3793))
9. Is there an agreement between USMC and ?? re NSFS at G-10
10. Request Maritime Integrated Tactical Training (MITT) document

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 19

Name/Company: Dave Hearding (SRS)/ Steve Golle (TEC)

Person Contacted: MAJ Frank Luster

Organization: MARFORLANT

Telephone/Email: lusterf@marforlant.usmc.mil

Date: October 09, 2002/0800-0930

Reason for Contact: Data Collection re USMC operations in CP/CL complex

Summary of Discussion:

GOMEX option for SACEX

- no range on East Coast currently satisfies all training requirements
- have been accepting the risk to date
- MFL is exploring other options to improve the training
- CP/CL are backyards ranges and good for sustainment, but there are conflicts between MEU training and other Marine training

Five types of training:

- Land-based
- Sea-based
- Air-based
- Maneuver
- Integration

CL can do 2 of 5 types well:

- Land and maneuver

GOMEX is equal to CL now, but USMC looking at $$ to improve so that it can support:

- Land-based
- Air-based
- Maneuver (limited)
- Integration (limited)
- Sea-based (none)

Looking for another area where could do all 5 well

Proof of concept in GOMEX scheduled for 2nd half CY03

Can't use G-10 during SACEX for NSFS, only for Marine spotter training

POCs:

- Dave Casey (II MEF) – current ops
- LTC Frank Topley (TECOM)/ 703-784-4772/ Coalition special warfare – tng requirements for MEU
- MAJ Don McGuire (TECOM)/ 703-784-4387/ mcguiredw@tecom.usmc.mil

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 20

Name/Company: Dave Hearding (SRS)/ Steve Golle (TEC)

Person Contacted: Steve Frisk

Organization: CNSWG-2 (range project manager)

Telephone/Email: frisk@grp2.nswlant.navy.mil

Date: October 9, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Collection re NSW use of CP/CL complex

Summary of Discussion:

- NSW conducts some training at CP/CL
- Good POC is LT Jim Smith at TRADET, CNSWG-2
- Underwater demolition is done primarily at Aberdeen, MD in a pond.
- Building a NSW training complex at Ft. Story
- During JTFEX, 4-5 concurrent special ops required at CP/CL

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 21

Name/Company: Dave Hearding (SRS)/ Steve Golle (TEC)

Person Contacted: CDR Dean Oyler

Organization: CFFC/CLF N803

Telephone/Email: (757) 836-6890/dean.oyler@navy.mil

Date: October 9, 2002

Reason for Contact: Discussion re Range Requirements

Summary of Discussion:

- He is the right POC in N8 for range requirements
- He has not been engaged to date on range requirements
- Needs to talk to N8 about the relationship with N8 on this issue
- OK to go to OPNAV N43 on the range requirement issue

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 22

Name/Company: Dave Hearding (SRS)/ Steve Golle (TEC)

Person Contacted: LCDR "Fred" Sanford

Organization: CCG-4 N343 (Strike Ops)

Telephone/Email: (757) 444-7350/ n343@ccg4.navy.mil

Date: October 09, 2002

Reason for Contact: Data Collection re Range Requirements

Summary of Discussion:

Telephone Interview:

- BT-9/11 conops are approved by CCG-4 RADM Rutherford
- Requirements were not constrained by resources
- No live ordnance at BT-9/11; only inert
- Only live training on East coast is at Pinecastle
- Eglin AFB offers several advantages:
    - Live ordnance
    - Unrestricted airspace
- No problem using Conops in discussions with Fleet and/or N43

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. _23_

Name/Company: Dave Hearding (SRS)/ Steve Golle (TEC)

Person Contacted: Liz Nashold

Organization: CLF N4654A (NEPA Lead)

Telephone/Email: elizabeth.nashold@navy.mil

Date: October 9, 2002

Reason for Contact: Status of CLF Environmental Planning Docs for CP/CL

Summary of Discussion:

- Completed JTFEX PEA with signed FONSI in 2002; will provide to SRS
- COMPTUEX
  - Bombs and sonar use are primary concerns
  - TAMS/MAI completed Marine Resources assessment in 2002
  - Looking at at-sea impacts in
    - VACAPES
    - CP/CL
    - CHASN/JAX
    - GOMEX
- Currently doing Key West EA
- Navy will do live-fire EIS for ops at Avon Park AFB
- Want to do PEIS for ops at Eglin AFB

CLF to Provide:

- JTFEX EA (done)
- Shore Fire Control Party EA at CL (done)
- CONOPS for BT-9/11 (done)
- Matrix of events by W-area and description of events
- VAST-DP EA (done)
- Mining exercise EA

Open Issues; how to handle:

- IEER (see Kelly Knight)
- Explosive SUS
- RDT&E events

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 24

Name/Company: David Hearding/ Karl Whittenberg (SRS); Chuck Maquire (TEC)

Person Contacted: Ken Cobb

Organization: Environmental Affairs Department

Telephone/Email: 252.466.5376/cobbkw@cherrypoint.usmc.mil

Date: October 16, 2002

Reason for Contact: Initial liaison w/ Mr. Cobb and the Environmental Affairs Department

Summary of Discussion:
David Hearding, Karl Whittenberg (SRS Technologies), and Chuck Maquire (TEC) met with Ken Cobb from the MCASCP Environmental Affairs Department. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce each other and to establish a coordination relationship between the CP/CL Range Complex Management Plan (RCMP) contractors and Mr. Cobb. The RCMP effort will necessitate frequent and routine coordination between participating parties to conduct research, collect information, conduct reviews, and formulate findings relevant to environmental matters at MCASCP.

Mr. Cobb is in charge of explosive ordnance disposal (EOD), munitions rules, and BT range targets. Discussion centered on five areas of concern to Mr. Cobb:

1. Permitting? Pending formal approval of a State permit, MCASCP has interim approval to conduct range ordnance burns and detonations. Obtaining the formal permit is an ongoing effort. MCASCP is reviewing range expenditures for EOD infrastructure, has constructed monitoring wells, and conducts surface sampling. These provisions suffice for the interim approval.

2. Scrap Metal Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)? MCASCP has a standing MoU with the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Office (DRMO) to remove scrap metal from the CP range complex. The outstanding issue with the MoU is safe scrap certification. Range scrap metal may contain unexploded ordnance that can present a safety hazard to commercial claimants. The safe scrap certification ensures the safety integrity of the scrap and mitigates MCASCP liability to unintentional explosive mishap. Safe scrap certification approval is pending.

3. Executive Order (EO) 1318? EO 1318 provides for toxic releases on ranges. The Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act (EPCRA) requires that organizations must report on their toxic releases. On MCASCP, there are two reporting organizations: Second Marine Air Wing (2d MAW) and the MCASCP Environmental Affairs Department. The two organizations have no centralized reporting procedures for toxic releases; therefore, toxic release reports are not coordinated or standardized. There is an ongoing effort by the

MCASCP Environmental Affairs Department to provide a single, coordinated report that provides combined toxic release data for both the 2d MAW and the MCASCP.

4. BT Range Fires? On occasion, range fires may spill over fire barriers onto private lands. The MCASCP Fire Management Plan seeks to reduce off-range fires by providing alternative solutions to range fire management. At present, there has been no decision on the preferred strategies for range fire management; although, a high-pressure sprinkler system is being considered. The sprinkler system, and other yet-to-be-defined alternatives, will require investment planning and outlays. Such investments are not in place.

5. Ship Targets? The ship targets on BT-9 need replacing. There are no target replacement provisions in-place, however, to accommodate environmental concerns. The MCASCP Environmental Affairs Department proposes that ship targets be replaced under the provisions of the Sink Exercise (SINKEX) Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). The SINKEX SOP provides the necessary guidance and procedure to place new ship targets while ensuring environmental compliance.

At the end of the discussion, the participants exchanged business cards and information to facilitate future liaison and coordination. Mr. Cobb was very cordial throughout and displayed a keen interest in the RCMP effort and a commitment to participate fully.

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 25

Name/Company: Dave Hearding, Karl Whittenberg (SRS)/Chuck Maguire (TEC)

Person Contacted: Robin Ferguson

Organization: MCAS CP Environmental Management Branch (NEPA Lead)

Telephone/Email:

Date: October 16, 2002

Reason for Contact: NEPA Status at MCAS CP

Summary of Discussion:

- Robin is lead for NEPA, Wetlands, Coastal Consistency Review, ESA
- Just received final Biological Opinion (BO) for ordnance delivery at BT-9/11
    - Considered turtles, right whales, manatees
    - Didn't look at noise
    - Terms and conditions are OK but require a "survey" immediately after an event; CP interprets this to be satisfied by the aerial survey the next day; written into SOP for morning sweep to look for dead/injured animals
    - 26 takes/yr of turtles with live fire
    - BO provided to SRS from CD
- MMPA Issues:
    - Dolphins commonly near shore at BT-11
    - Duke U conducting survey to determine density and distro to support modeling
    - To be completed in July 03
- RAICUZ Issue:
    - The big thing hanging over CP's head
    - Dan Brown (G-3 MCAS) is lead
    - Footprints exceed prohibited areas at BT-9/11
    - Going to need more area and NEPA doc
- Atlantic OLF
    - Rare plants there
- Licenses with State of NC

Dan Brown has lead

RCMP CONTACT FORM

No. 26

Name/Company: David Hearding, Karl Whittenberg (SRS)/ Chuck Maquire (TEC)

Person Contacted: Joe Ramirez

Organization: MCB Camp Lejeune Training Resources Management Division
Public Outreach

Telephone/Email:

Date: October 16, 2002

Reason for Contact: Initial liaison with Mr. Ramirez and the Training Resources Management Division

Summary of Discussion:
David Hearding, Karl Whittenberg (SRS Technologies), and Chuck Maquire (TEC) met with Joe Ramirez from the MCBCL Training Resources Management Division and Pubic Outreach. The purpose of the meeting was to introduce each other and to establish a coordination relationship between the CP/CL Range Complex Management Plan (RCMP) contractors and Mr. Ramirez. The RCMP effort will necessitate frequent and routine coordination between participating parties to conduct research, collect information, conduct reviews, and formulate findings relevant to environmental matters at MCBCL.

Mr. Ramirez is responsible for two distinct functional areas at MCBCL; Training Resources Management and Public Outreach.

Training Resources Management. Mr. Ramirez manages training resources. In his role, Mr. Ramirez provides maintenance, construction, and renovation on the Camp Lejeune range complex. He also does the budgeting for the Training and Operations Department. He gets his requirements from Range Operations and Range Development. Both these organizations define the range requirements against which Mr. Ramirez and his staff construct the physical resources to be placed on the ranges.

Public Outreach. Public Outreach involves MCBCL efforts to influence community planning pertinent to current and projected MCBCL mission and range operations. Mr. Ramirez sits on a number of community groups including citizen committees, community planning groups, Joint Land Use (JLUS) committees, and the local housing board. His Camp Lejeune influence on the Citizens' Committee has contributed to a favorable impression of Camp Lejeune as expressed in the Citizens Comprehensive Plan for Onslow County (Draft), September 2002. The Citizens Comprehensive Plan addresses transportation, land use, housing, environment, education, parks and recreation, infrastructure and facilities and other issues relevant to Onslow County. Mr. Ramirez, as a sitting committee member, makes substantial contribution by presenting Camp Lejeune issues and future needs.

Mr. Ramirez is also deeply involved in the JLUS program to establish buffer lands adjacent to the Camp Lejeune range complex boundaries. The Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) and the local community have agreed to share a 50/50 split in funding. Mr. Ramirez will represent Camp Lejeune during public hearings and the development of implementation strategies. The end result of the JLUS effort will be a Memorandum of Agreement that will formally recognize the existence of the allocated lands and the implementation strategy.

Both Camp Lejeune and the local community recognize the environmental problems encroaching on Camp Lejeune. Mr. Ramirez offered to give the Contractors the Camp Lejeune encroachment briefing describing the issue. Encroachment takes the form of endangered species, noise, housing development expansion, and local and State politics. General Mize is very involved with the public outreach efforts and champions the Citizens' Committee planning and JLUS activities. On a separate note, Mr. Ramirez recommended that the JLUS program be linked to Cherry Point, since the Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point range complexes are inextricably linked.

Mr. Ramirez is exceptionally knowledgeable about range resources and public outreach. He very cordial throughout and displayed a keen interest in the RCMP effort and a commitment to participate fully. He is a valuable resource.