

DOCUMENT RESUME

05796 - [B1226177]

Review of the Navy's Site Selection and Appropriation Request for Funds To Construct Support Facilities at Kings Bay, Georgia. LCD-78-327; B-178056. April 27, 1978. 13 pp. + appendix (2 pp.).

Report to Rep. George H. Mahon, Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations; by Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General.

Issue Area: Facilities and Material Management (700).

Contact: Logistics and Communications Div.

Budget Function: National Defense: Defense-related Activities (054).

Organization Concerned: Department of Defense; Department of the Navy.

Congressional Relevance: House Committee on Appropriations; House Committee on Armed Services; Senate Committee on Armed Services. Rep. George H. Mahon.

Authority: National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

The Navy considered several sites on the U.S. east coast for the relocation of the strategic submarine squadron to be withdrawn from Rota, Spain. Because of strategic and diplomatic considerations, the Navy determined that the relocation site should be located on the Atlantic Ocean in U.S. territory. Findings/Conclusions: Navy studies explored four possible conditions for the relocation site: (1) one squadron supported by a tender ship and a floating drydock, called the T-1 concept; (2) two squadrons supported by two tender ships and two drydocks, called the T-2 concept; (3) one squadron of submarines supported by shore-based facilities similar to the Bangor, Washington, base; and (4) two squadrons supported by shore based facilities. The Navy looked to availability of land for expansion and explosive safety distances and also considered cost, impact on the environment, impact on nearby communities, timeliness, and operational considerations such as weather. On January 26, 1978, the Navy announced the selection of Kings Bay, Georgia, as the relocation site and requested 1978 construction funds of \$26.3 million to support the T-1 concept. The facilities planned are in excess of what is required to support the T-1 concept, and the Navy's funding request was overstated by about \$13 million. The Navy's 1979 appropriation request can be reduced by that amount. (RRS)

6177

---

REPORT BY THE

# Comptroller General

OF THE UNITED STATES

---

## Review Of The Navy's Site Selection And Appropriation Request For Funds To Construct Support Facilities At Kings Bay, Georgia

The Navy has selected Kings Bay as the site for basing a squadron of strategic submarines on the east coast. The facilities planned to support this squadron are in excess of essential support. In GAO's opinion, the Navy's fiscal year 1979 appropriation request for construction at Kings Bay can be reduced by \$13 million without materially affecting operations.



LCD-78-327  
APRIL 27, 1978



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-178036

The Honorable George H. Mahon  
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations  
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Chairman:

As requested in your letters of July 13 and July 28, 1977, this report discusses (1) the Navy's approach in selecting Kings Bay, Georgia, as the site for basing the submarine squadron returning from Rota, Spain, and (2) the justification for the appropriation request to construct the required facilities.

At your request, we did not obtain written comments. The matters covered in this report, however, were discussed with Navy officials and their comments are incorporated where appropriate.

This report does not contain recommendations, but it does conclude that the Congress could reduce the Navy's fiscal year 1979 appropriation request to construct facilities at Kings Bay by about \$13 million without materially affecting the squadron's operations.

As arranged with your office, copies of this report are being made available to other interested parties who request them.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thomas A. Altschuler".

Comptroller General  
of the United States

COMPTROLLER GENERAL'S  
REPORT TO THE CHAIRMAN,  
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON  
APPROPRIATIONS

REVIEW OF THE NAVY'S SITE  
SELECTION AND APPROPRIATION  
REQUESTS FOR FUNDS TO  
CONSTRUCT SUPPORT FACILITIES  
AT KINGS BAY, GEORGIA

D I G E S T

The Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with Spain provides for the U.S. strategic submarine squadron at Rota, Spain, to be withdrawn by July 1979. The Navy, because of strategic and diplomatic considerations, determined that the relocation site should be located on the Atlantic and in U.S. territory.

The Navy considered several sites for the squadron on the U.S. east coast. In its considerations, Navy explored four possible conditions:

- One squadron of submarines equipped with the Trident I, C-4 missile supported by a tender ship and a floating drydock, called the T-1 concept.
- Two squadrons equipped with the Trident I, C-4 missile supported by two tender ships and two floating drydocks, called the T-2 concept.
- One squadron of submarines supported by shore-based facilities similar to the Bangor, Washington, base.
- Two squadrons supported by shore-based facilities.

On January 26, 1978, the Navy announced the selection of Kings Bay as the site for relocating the squadron on the east coast. Also in January the Navy requested funding to begin construction of facilities to support the T-1 concept at Kings Bay.

The Navy's request was in two parts: (1) authorization to reprogram fiscal year

1978 construction funds of \$26.3 million to begin construction and (2) a request for fiscal year 1979 funds to continue construction. The House Subcommittee on Military Construction approved the reprogramming request on February 17, 1978.

Upon reviewing the Navy's requests for funding to construct facilities at Kings Bay, GAO believes that the facilities are in excess of what is actually required to support the T-1 concept. As a result, the Navy's funding request was overstated by about \$13 million. In GAO's opinion, the Navy's fiscal year 1979 appropriation request can be reduced by that amount.

At the Committee's request GAO did not take the time to obtain written comments from Defense; however, the report was discussed with Navy officials.

They said that there are no facilities being planned at Kings Bay except to support the T-1 concept; however, those facilities are being located and sized so that, if the decision is made to expand the site, the capital investment will only be made once.

GAO believes that the locating and sizing of facilities for some possible future decision does not justify the additional cost involved.

C o n t e n t s

	<u>Page</u>
DIGEST	i
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION	1
Scope of review	2
2 SITE SELECTION PROCESS	3
Alternative sites considered	3
Factors considered in selecting the site	3
Kings Bay selected as preferred site	4
GAO evaluation of the Navy's selection	5
3 REQUESTS FOR FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT SUPPORT FACILITIES	7
Request for approval to use fiscal year 1978 appropriation	7
Fiscal year 1979 appropriation request	7
Conclusion	13
APPENDIX	
I Sites considered as a possible location for the Trident base	14

ABBREVIATIONS

CONUS	continental United States
GAO	General Accounting Office

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The Navy has three Atlantic-based squadrons of Poseidon submarines fitted with the Poseidon C-3 missile. Two of the squadrons, consisting of 10 submarines each, are located outside the United States--at Holy Loch, Scotland, and at Rota, Spain. The third, located at Charleston, South Carolina, consists of from two to seven submarines and is used mainly to supplement activities of the other two squadrons. Each of these squadrons is supported by a tender and a floating drydock. 1/

The Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation with Spain, dated January 1976, provides for the squadron in Rota to be withdrawn by July 1979. The Navy plans to start relocating the facilities so as to have the tender and drydocks operational in the United States by May 1979. The Navy plans to convert, or backfit, the returning Rota squadron to handle the Trident I, C-4 missile. In the Navy's long-range development plans, the squadron of submarines converted to handle the Trident I, C-4 missile is intended to be replaced by the Trident submarine. The Navy is constructing support facilities for a squadron of Trident submarines to be based on the west coast at Bangor, Washington, and is tentatively planning for another squadron of Trident submarines to be based on the east coast.

The squadron of Poseidon submarines to be converted to handle the Trident I missile is to be supported by a tender and floating drydock. The replacement squadron, possibly Trident submarines, is to be supported by facilities ashore, such as those being constructed at Bangor.

---

1/Tenders and floating drydocks provide repair and maintenance support, supply support, and other refit-related services. Tenders are equipped with industrial shops, maintenance facilities, supply systems, and personnel support accommodations, all providing a wide variety of services. The various shops employ almost all trade skills found in a shipyard. Floating drydocks permit uninterrupted progression of a refit. When a submarine is in drydock for hull maintenance or below-water-line repairs, all work on the submarine by the tender crew continues, with personnel and equipment being shuttled to and from the drydock.

The Navy studied several locations as a possible site for the returning Poseidon squadron and selected Kings Bay, Georgia, as its preferred site. Factors the Navy considered in making that selection are discussed in chapter 2.

By letters dated July 13 and July 28, 1977, the Chairman, House Committee on Appropriations, requested that we review (1) the Navy's site selection processes, including the considerations that led to choosing Kings Bay as the preferred site, and (2) the Navy's requests for funds to construct facilities to support these submarines.

#### SCOPE OF REVIEW

Our review was made primarily at the Office of the Trident Project Manager, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C., and at headquarters, Polaris Missile Facility, Atlantic, Charleston, South Carolina. We examined:

- The draft Environmental Impact Statement which contained the Navy's assessment of the impact of locating the refit site at specific locations.
- The Atlantic Fleet SSBN 1/ Refit Siting Study, which included the Navy's comparison of costs to relocate the refit site at each of the five locations receiving final consideration.
- The final Environmental Impact Statement, filed with the Council on Environmental Quality, which included public comments on the proposed action and the Navy's evaluation of those comments.
- Cost data provided by the Navy as justification for its appropriation request and its request for approval to use reprogramed fiscal year 1978 funds.

---

1/Nuclear Powered Fleet Ballistic Missile Submarine.



## CHAPTER 2

### SITE SELECTION PROCESS

Because of strategic and diplomatic considerations, the Navy determined that the preferred site for the Squadron returning from Rota, Spain, would be on the Atlantic and in U.S. territory. The Chief of Naval Operations established the Strategic Submarine Refit Siting Steering Group to recommend such a site.

### ALTERNATIVE SITES CONSIDERED

In selecting a site for the first squadron of Trident submarines (the base under construction at Bangor, Washington), a Navy study considered many alternatives. In selecting a site for the squadron returning from Rota, the Steering Group used information obtained in the earlier study. The study had identified 88 candidate sites. (See app. I.) Pacific coast sites were automatically eliminated from consideration, and other sites were eliminated because:

- Entire towns would have to be relocated.
- Large population concentrations would be displaced.
- Remote areas had no reasonable access.
- A conflict of missions would arise with an existing military installation.

As a result of evaluations and onsite surveys, the Navy selected the following sites for final consideration:

- Charleston, South Carolina.
- Cheatham Annex/Camp Peary, Virginia.
- Kings Bay, Georgia.
- Mosquito Lagoon, Florida.
- Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island.

### FACTORS CONSIDERED IN SELECTING THE SITE

To support the squadron in the United States, the Navy plans to use one tender ship and one floating drydock with some shore-based support. The site selection process

recognized this plan. The Navy considered that the Poseidon submarines have a limited life and may be replaced by Trident submarines.

The Navy also considered the possibility that another squadron of Poseidon submarines now based at Holy Loch, Scotland, may be returned to the United States. Therefore, in considering a site for the Rota squadron, availability of land for possible expansion beyond one squadron afloat was also a factor.

Navy studies explored four possible conditions:

- One squadron supported by a tender ship and a floating drydock, called the T-1 concept.
- Two squadrons supported by two tender ships and two drydocks, called the T-2 concept.
- One squadron of submarines supported by shore-based facilities similar to the Bangor base.
- Two squadrons supported by shore-based facilities.

The Navy also looked to availability of land for explosive safety distances and considered the following other major factors:

- Cost.
- Impact on the environment.
- Impact on nearby communities.
- Timeliness (availability of site when needed).
- Operational considerations (weather conditions, fog, ice, etc.)

#### KINGS BAY SELECTED AS PREFERRED SITE

The Navy announced its selection of Kings Bay, Georgia, as the site on January 26, 1978.

The Navy noted that its studies were directed toward selecting a site suitable to base the squadron to be back-fitted with the Trident I, C-4 missile. The major considerations that appear to have kept the other four sites from being selected were as follows.

Narragansett Bay--Costs to acquire the public airport that would fall within the explosive safety distance would be sizable, and operational conditions would be less than ideal, since the bay averages about 98 days a year of heavy fog and is occasionally iced in.

Mosquito Lagoon--The environmental impact of providing passage from the ocean through a dike into a freshwater lagoon and exposing freshwater life to saltwater would be too great.

Cheatham Annex--The explosive safety distance would require that the existing Navy installation be moved.

Charleston--Congestion of explosive safety distance areas and existing river traffic, and possible legal action to acquire the necessary land and inhabited buildings would be expensive and time consuming.

#### GAO EVALUATION OF THE NAVY'S SELECTION

In January 1978, the Navy requested funds from the Congress to construct, at Kings Bay, the facilities required to support the returning Poseidon squadron. The Navy's request was in two parts: one was for approval to use some reprogrammed fiscal year 1978 funds, and the other was an appropriation request for fiscal year 1979. The Navy is also considering permanent ashore refit facilities (rather than a tender and floating drydock) to support the submarines expected to replace the Poseidon. However, the Navy has not made a decision to locate the replacement submarines at Kings Bay and cannot do so until it has complied with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. 1/

In February 1978, the Subcommittee on Military Construction of the House Committee on Appropriations approved the Navy's request to use funds reprogrammed from fiscal year 1978. Thus, the Navy had congressional approval to begin construction

---

1/The act requires that a Federal agency prepare an Environmental Impact Statement on any planned major actions that could significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The draft Statement is to be made available for public review, and comments are to be evaluated and the results included in the final Statement, which is to be filed with the Council on Environmental Quality.

at Kings Bay to support the T-1 concept; that is, one squadron of submarines supported by a tender ship and a floating drydock.

Our analysis of the Navy requests, viewed in that light, is discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 3

REQUESTS FOR FUNDS TO

CONSTRUCT SUPPORT FACILITIES

REQUEST OF APPROVAL TO USE  
FISCAL YEAR 1978 APPROPRIATION

In January 1978, the Navy requested congressional approval to use funds reprogramed from the fiscal year 1978 appropriation. The following construction projects were included in that request.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	(000 omitted)
Water Treatment and Distribution Facilities	\$ 1,700
Floating Drydock and Mooring Facility	6,400
Submarine Tender Mooring	1,750
Dredging	8,700
Electrical Distribution System	750
Berthing Wharf Improvements	600
Sewage Treatment and Collection Facilities	1,850
Telephone Facilities	1,100
Steam and Compressed Air Facilities	<u>770</u>
Total	<u>\$23,620</u>

The Subcommittee on Military Construction, of the House Committee on Appropriations, approved the request in February 1978.

FISCAL YEAR 1979 APPROPRIATION REQUEST

The following projects were included in the Navy's request.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Cost</u>
	(000 omitted)
Helicopter Landing Pad	\$ 170
Telephone Facilities	280
Transit Storage Building	790
Dredging	15,600
Waterfront Service Building Rehabilitation	160
Staging Building	510
Equipment Maintenance Buildings	1,550
Public Works Maintenance Building	1,750
General Supply Storage Building	830
Flammable Storage Building	460
Base Fire and Security Facilities	730
Base Administration Building	1,780
Recreation Building	230
Playing Courts and Fields	220
Electrical Distribution System	1,550
Sewage Treatment and Collection Facilities	2,750
Water Treatment and Distribution Facilities	1,800
Roads	3,800
Vehicular Parking	700
Land Acquisition	<u>3,440</u>
Total	<u>\$39,100</u>

Analysis of the individual projects and their associated costs disclosed that the Navy's cost estimates were overstated. Projects that we believe are overstated are shown in the following table and discussed in more detail below.

	<u>Amount overstated</u>
	(000 omitted)
Land Acquisition	\$ 3,246
Floating Drydock and Mooring Facility	4,800
Roads	3,821
Contingencies	<u>1,484</u>
	<u>\$13,351</u>

The overstatement resulted from the Navy planning to purchase land not needed to support the T-1 concept of operation and locating facilities so that the Kings Bay site could be adapted to a permanent ashore facility. ALSO some costs were overstated because the Navy used an erroneous factor to estimate contingency costs.

Should a decision be made to construct permanent ashore facilities at Kings Bay, the Navy's approach may prove to be sound. As previously noted, however, the Navy has not yet selected a site for permanent ashore facilities.

According to the Navy, no facilities other than for the T-1 concept are being planned for Kings Bay construction. It stated that the facilities are being sited and sized so that capital investment will be made only once even if the site is later expanded beyond the T-1 concept.

However, as discussed below, the facilities being planned are more than needed for the T-1 concept. In our opinion, siting and sizing facilities for some possible future decision does not justify the additional costs.

#### Land Acquisition

The fiscal year 1979 appropriation request included \$3.44 million for acquisition of about 3,343 acres of land. Only about 160 acres are needed to meet requirements for the T-1 concept. Navy officials said that the extra 3,183 acres included in the Land Acquisition project are for a refit facility large enough to support two shore-based squadrons. But the Navy has no firm plans to locate two shore-based squadrons there.

The estimated fair market value of the 160 acres is \$194,000, \$3.2 million less than the amount requested by the Navy.

#### Floating Drydock and Mooring Facility

The Navy's fiscal year 1978 reprogramming appropriation request included \$6.4 million to construct a mooring platform for a floating drydock. The planned location for this facility differs from the Navy's original plan, which was to locate the drydock further upstream at an estimated cost of \$1.6 million.

In selecting the original site, the Navy noted in its Environmental Impact Statement that:

"This option was chosen as Site One because it provided the greatest use of existing facilities with the least initial cost while providing for all operational and safety requirements."

There are no existing facilities at the specific location being considered by the Navy, and the request includes funds to construct an access trestle, supporting utilities, a road, and security facilities.

In its justification supporting the request, the Navy stated that the drydock was being relocated

- to avoid throwaway costs and disruption of operation from possible ashore construction upstream of the tender,
- to reduce upstream dredging costs related to rock removal,
- to meet the added requirement of providing berthing for four tugboats, and
- to meet the added requirement of providing a small craft landing float.

The throwaway costs and dredging costs related to rock removal referred to by the Navy are estimated costs for dredging to a depth of 50 feet--required for drydock operation. Relocating the drydock would reduce dredging costs by an estimated \$514,200. In our opinion, this does not justify the additional costs of \$4.8 million to construct the access trestle, a road, and other supporting facilities required at the new location.

The disruption of operation referred to by the Navy is the expected disruption from construction of ashore facilities when and if the decision is made to construct them at Kings Bay. As noted earlier, that decision has not been made. Should it be made, some disruption of operations at the original drydock's location would occur. At that time, the drydock would have to be relocated, but permanent support facilities would not be required to support it. The drydock could be anchored in mid-stream and supplied by boat or other less



expensive methods, as is done at Charleston, South Carolina; Holy Loch, Scotland; and Rota, Spain. At those locations the drydock is anchored rather than permanently moored. We did not determine the differences in the costs of operating from moored and from anchored facilities.

The added requirements to provide berthing for four tugboats and to provide a small craft landing float could, in our opinion, be satisfied either at the floating drydock or at the existing wharf at Kings Bay.

### Roads

Included in the costs for relocating the drydock was an estimated \$924,000 for a new road. The Navy also requested funds for other roads that we believe are not required for the T-1 concept: \$20,790 in the fiscal year 1978 reprogramming request and \$3.8 million in the fiscal year 1979 appropriation request. A Navy official made the following comments about using the existing road at Kings Bay:

- Technically the Navy could "get by" with the existing road.
- The way the road is laid out is not most desirable.
- The most desirable locations of proposed facilities are not possible with the existing roads.

The most desirable locations of proposed facilities are in the Navy's base master plan, designed to accommodate the growth of Kings Bay to a shore refit facility for two shore-based squadrons, should the Navy decide to locate shore facilities there. On the other hand, were the base master plan designed for a submarine tender and floating drydock under the T-1 concept, the most desirable locations of proposed facilities would be along the existing road.

### Contingency Costs

Defense and Navy Department directives on estimating costs allow an amount for contingencies to cover unforeseen construction difficulties and design changes. A 10-percent factor is permitted when estimating costs for some types of projects, such as modifications or repair projects. When estimating costs to construct repetitive-type facilities, however, the regulations specifically instruct estimators to use a contingency factor of 5 percent or less.

Repetitive-type facilities are those, such as barracks and dental clinics, for which standard designs are available for site adaptation. In preparing its funding requests for fiscal years 1978 and 1979, the Navy used a 10-percent contingency factor in estimating many of the Kings Bay facilities. Many of the projects were facilities which are used on most military bases in the United States and which, in our opinion, should be considered repetitive-type facilities. These facilities and the cost difference of using a 5-percent rather than a 10-percent contingency factor are listed below.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Estimated cost using</u>		<u>Differ- ence</u>
	<u>10-Percent</u>	<u>5-Percent</u>	
	—————(millions)—————		
FY 1978 reprogramming:			
Water Treatment and Distribution Facilities	\$ 1.7	\$ 1.644	\$.056
Electrical Distribu- tion System	.750	.710	.040
Sewage Treatment and Collection Facili- ties	.85	1.779	.071
Telephone Facilities	<u>1.1</u>	<u>1.051</u>	<u>.049</u>
	<u>5.4</u>	<u>5.184</u>	<u>.216</u>
FY 1979 request:			
Water Treatment and Distribution Facili- ties	1.8	1.73	.07
Electrical Distribu- tion System	1.55	1.478	.072
Sewage Treatment and Collection Facili- ties	2.75	2.628	.122
Roads	<u>3.80</u>	<u>3.627</u>	<u>.173</u>
	<u>9.9</u>	<u>9.463</u>	<u>.437</u>
Total	<u>\$15.3</u>	<u>\$14.647</u>	<u>\$.653</u>

The facilities listed above are identified in the Navy's "Historical Military Construction Cost Engineering Data" publication dated October 1977 as frequently built military facilities.

The Navy contends that the projects identified above as fiscal year 1979 projects are site unique and therefore qualify for the 10-percent contingency and that the fiscal year 1978 projects were based on preliminary estimates and not firm engineering estimates.

However, since these facilities are identified in a Navy publication as frequently built military facilities, we believe they should be classified as repetitive-type facilities using a 5-percent or lower contingency factor.

In addition, other projects, for which the estimated costs included a 10-percent contingency factor, were facilities that the Navy should be familiar with. The facilities and cost differences are:

Floating Drydock and Mooring Facility	\$ 314,000
Submarine Tender Mooring	71,000
Dredging	<u>1,099,000</u>
Total	<u>\$1,484,000</u>

The Navy also included a 10-percent contingency factor for land acquisition. We believe that land acquisition should not be classified as construction and therefore should not include a contingency factor. By including this factor, the Navy increased its request by \$297,000. If the Navy's request for funds to purchase the 3,343 acres of land is approved, we believe the amount should be reduced by \$297,000. However, as previously discussed, we believe that most of the land which the Navy plans to purchase is not needed to support the T-1 concept of operation. (See p. 9.)

The Navy stated that the cost of land is not determined by the budget request and that the 10-percent contingency factor is to be used for negotiating the selling price of the land. We believe that it would be more appropriate to base requests for land acquisition on the fair market value of that land, which the Navy knew. (See p. 9.)

#### CONCLUSION

The Navy has requested funds to construct facilities at Kings Bay, Georgia, to support the T-1 concept, or one squadron of Poseidon submarines equipped with the Trident I missile. We believe that the Navy's request for required facilities is overstated by about \$13 million and that the Navy's fiscal year 1979 appropriation request could be reduced by this amount.

SITES CONSIDERED AS A POSSIBLE LOCATIONFOR THE TRIDENT BASEAtlantic Region Sites-Continental United States (CONUS)

- |                                 |   |
|---------------------------------|---|
| 1. Cobscook Bay, Maine          | 30. Savannah River, S.C.                  |
| 2. Moose Cove, Maine            | 31. St. Catherine Sound, Ga.              |
| 3. Machias Bay, Maine           | 32. St. Simons Sound, Ga.                 |
| 4. Little Kennebec Bay, Maine   | 33. St. Marys River, Ga.                  |
| 5. Gouldsboro Bay, Maine        | 34. St. Johns River, Fla.                 |
| 6. Kennebec River, Maine        | 35. Mayport, Fla.                         |
| 7. Casco Bay, Maine             | 36. Cape Kennedy (Mosquito Lagoon), Fla.  |
| 8. Portsmouth Harbor, N.H.      | 37. Biscayne Bay, Fla.                    |
| 9. Plum Island South, Maine     | 38. Key West, Fla.                        |
| 10. Salem Harbor, Maine         | 39. Ponce de Leon Bay, Fla.               |
| 11. Boston Harbor, Maine        | 40. Charlotte Harbor, Fla.                |
| 12. Narragansett Bay, R.I.      | 41. Tampa Bay, Fla.                       |
| 13. Thames River, Conn.         | 42. Apalachee Bay, Fla.                   |
| 14. New York Harbor, N.Y.       | 43. St. George Sound, Fla.                |
| 15. Great Bay, N.J.             | 44. Apalachicola Bay, Fla.                |
| 16. Maurice Cover, N.J.         | 45. St. Joseph Bay, Fla.                  |
| 17. Philadelphia, Pa.           | 46. St. Andrews Bay, Fla.                 |
| 18. Breakwater Harbor, Del.     | 47. Choctawatchee Bay, Fla.               |
| 19. Baltimore, Md.              | 48. Pensacola Bay, Fla.                   |
| 20. Potomac River Entrance, Va. | 49. Mobile Bay, Ala.                      |
| 21. Camp Peary, Va.             | 50. Pascagoula, Miss.                     |
| 22. Yorktown, Va.               | 51. NASA Mississippi Test Facility, Miss. |
| 23. Norfolk, Va.                | 52. NASA Michoud, La.                     |
| 24. Jamestown, Va.              | 53. Port Arthur, Tex.                     |
| 25. Beaufort Inlet, N.C.        | 54. Galveston Bay, Tex.                   |
| 26. Cape Fear River, N.C.       | 55. Matagorda Bay, Tex.                   |
| 27. Winyan Bay, S.C.            | 56. Corpus Christi Bay, Tex.              |
| 28. Charleston, S.C.            |   |
| 29. Port Royal Sound, S.C.      |   |

Atlantic Region Sites (Non-CONUS)

- |                                  |                       |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 57 and 58. Puerto Rico (2 sites) | 59. St. Thomas Island |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|

Pacific Region Sites (CONUS)

- |                             |                                 |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 60. Bangor, Wash.           | 72. San Pablo Bay, Calif.       |
| 61. Miller Peninsula, Wash. | 73. San Francisco, Calif.       |
| 62. Pillar Point, Wash.     | 74. Monterey Bay, Calif.        |
| 63. Gray's Harbor, Wash.    | 75. Morro Bay, Calif.           |
| 64. Willapa Bay, Wash.      | 76. Point Arguello, Calif.      |
| 65. Astoria, Oreg.          | 77. Port Hueneme, Calif.        |
| 66. Tillamook Bay, Oreg.    | 78. Point Mugu, Calif.          |
| 67. Winchester Bay, Oreg.   | 79. San Miguel Island, Calif.   |
| 68. Coos Bay, Oreg.         | 80. Los Angeles Harbor, Calif.  |
| 69. Crescent City, Calif.   | 81. Oceanside, Calif.           |
| 70. Humboldt Bay, Calif.    | 82. San Diego, Calif.           |
| 71. Bodega Bay, Calif.      | 83. San Clemente Island, Calif. |

Pacific Region Sites (Non-CONUS)

- |                       |                           |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|
| 84. Ketchikan, Alaska | 86. Kodiak Island, Alaska |
| 85. Anchorage, Alaska | 87. Oahu Island, Hawaii   |
| 88. Guam Island       |                           |