AD-A272 650

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL Monterey, California





THESIS

A FINANCIAL REVIEW AND COST - BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF FUEL STORAGE TANK UPGRADES AT THE NAVY EXCHANGE GAS STATION, NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

by

3-279

90

Daniel F. Geldermann

June, 1993

Thesis Co-Advisors:

William R. Gates Jeffrey M. Nevels

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

Unclassified Security Classification of this page

	REPORT DOCU	UMENTATION PAGE				
la Report Security Classification: Unclassified		1b Restrictive Markings				
2a Security Classification Authority	3 Distribution/Availability o	f Repon				
2b Declassification/Downgrading Schedule		Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited. 5 Monitoring Organization Report Number(s)				
4 Performing Organization Report Number(s)						
ha Name of Performing Organization Naval Postgraduate School	6b Office Symbol (if applicable) 36	7a Name of Monitoring Organization Naval Postgraduate School				
be Address (city, state, and ZIP code) Monterey CA 93943-5000	7b Address (city, state, and ZIP code) Monterey CA 93943-5000					
8a Name of Funding/Sponsoring Organization	6b Office Symbol (if applicable)	9 Procurement Instrument Identification Number				
Address (cirv. state, and ZIP code)	10 Source of Funding Numbers					
Program Element No Project No Task No Work Unit				Work Unit Accession No		

11 Title (include security classification) A FINANCIAL REVIEW AND COST - BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF FUEL STORAGE TANK UPGRADES AT THE NAVY EXCHANGE GAS STATION, NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

13a Type of Report13b Time Covered14 Date of Report (year. month. day)15 Page CountMaster's ThesisFromTo1993 June 14165	12 Personal Author(s) Geldermann, Daniel F.			
	13a Type of Repon	13b Time Covered	14 Date of Report (vear. month. dav)	15 Page Count
	Master's Thesis	From To	1993 June 14	165

16 Supplementary Notation. The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.

17 Cosati Codes			18 Subject Terms (continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)
Field	Group	Subgroup	Financial Review, Cost - Benefit Analysis, Cost Comparisons, Present Value,
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Environmental Regulations.

19 Abstract (continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)

This thesis examines the costing allocations at the Navy Exchange Gas Station. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey California. From this a complete cost picture has been provided from which to improve cost data for future upgrade and maintenance decisions involving the facilities. This is becoming more critical in light of both the funding reductions currently being experienced by the military services, and the growing complexity and expense of complying with increasingly stringent astronomental regulations. Additionally, this study determines if three facilities upgrade options faced by the Navy Exchange are funancially justified and which of them is the most desirable.

This study found that the Navy Exchange costing practices are sound, and with some minor adjustments, an even higher accuracy of record keeping could be attained. To meet environmental compliance concerns. Alternative II, replacing the underground storage tanks with new ones in 1998, is the best of the three options considered. Present value 1993 costs of this alternative is \$214,451 and the estimated payback is 15.5 months.

20 Distribution/Availability of Abstract xx unclassified/unlimitedsame a	s reportDTTC users	21 Abstract Security Classification Unclassified		
22a Name of Responsible Individual William R. Gates		22b Telephone (include Area Code) 408-656-2754	22c Office Symbol AS/GT	
DD FORM 1473,84 MAR	83 APR edition may	be used until exhausted	security classification of this page	
	All other edit	uons are obsolete	Unclassified	

i

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

A Financial Review and Cost - Benefit Analysis of Fuel Storage Tank Upgrades at the Navy Exchange Gas Station, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California

by

Daniel F. Geldermann Lieutenant Commander, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy B.S., Marquette University, 1981

> Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

June 1993

William R. etate

Author:

Daniel F. Geldermann

Approved by:

William R. Gates, Thesis Co-Advisor

vels, Thesis Co-Advisor

David R. Whipple, Cheirman Department of Administrative Science

ü

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the costing allocations at the Navy Exchange Gas Station, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey California. From this a complete cost picture has been provided from which to improve cost data for future upgrade and maintenance decisions involving the facilities. This is becoming more critical in light of both the funding reductions currently being experienced by the military services, and the growing complexity and expense of complying with increasingly stringent environmental regulations. Additionally, this study determines if three facilities upgrade options faced by the Navy Exchange are financially justified and which of them is the most desirable.

This study found that the Navy Exchange costing practices are sound, and with some minor adjustments, an even higher accuracy of record keeping could be attained. To meet environmental compliance concerns, Alternative II, replacing the underground storage tanks with new ones in 1998, is the best of the three options considered. Present value 1993 costs of this alternative is \$214,451 and the estimated payback is 15.5 months.

Accellion For NTIS CRAM A DHC TAP i i Uningantia ٤Ĵ Justinuation. Вy Distribution Availability Duces Aven to the Dist Special

DTH QUALITY INSPECTED S

iii

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INT	RODUCTION
	A.	BACKGROUND
	В.	OBJECTIVES
	c.	RESEARCH QUESTIONS
	D.	SCOPE, LIMITATIONS, AND ASSUMPTIONS 6
		1. Scope 6
		2. Limitations
		3. Assumptions
		4. Study Organization
		· ·
II.	BA	CKGROUND
	A.	THE NPS NAVY EXCHANGE GAS STATION 11
	в.	ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS
111	. м	ETHODOLOGY AND DATA BASE
	A.	BACKGROUND RESEARCH AND INTERVIEWS 19
		1. Background Research
		2. Interviews
	в.	DATA COLLECTION AND SURVEY
		1. Data Collection
		2. Survey
	c.	GAS STATION OPERATING COST SUMMARY 23

ł

۱

ļ

iv

R.,

8)

	D.	GAS STATION REVENUE SUMMARY	23
	E.	ANALYSIS OF DATA	24
IV.	P	RESENTATION OF DATA	25
	A.	BENEFITS/COSTS	25
		1. SC05 Report Categories For Department J-3 .	26
		2. SCO6 Report Categories For Department J-3 .	31
	В.	STATION UPGRADE ALTERNATIVES	35
		1. Alternative I - Retrofit Existing USTs	37
		2. Alternative II - Replace Existing USTs With	
		New	38
		3. Alternative III - Replacement with Aboveground	
		Stor age Tanks	38
		4. Alternative IV - Remove Existing USTs and	
		Close the Gas Station	39
	c.	LOCAL GAS STATION PRICE SURVEYS	40
	D.	CUSTOMER GAS STATION SURVEY	41
	Ε.	COSTS EXEMPTIONS FOR THE NEX GAS STATION	41
		1. NEX Costs Breaks	45
v.	DA	TA ANALYSIS	49
	A.	BENEFITS/COSTS	49
		1. SCO5 Report Adjustments For Department J-3 .	49
		2. SCO6 Report Adjustments For Department J-3 .	57
•	В.	BENEFIT/COST PROJECTIONS	59
		1. Adjusted SCO5 And SCO6 Reports	59

v

-

'*****)

L)

Đ

	2. Net Contribution Projections	59
c.	ANALYSIS OF GAS STATION UPGRADE ALTERNATIVES .	66
	1. Alternative I - Retrofit Existing USTs	67
	2. Alternative II - Replace Existing USTs with	
	New	68
	3. Alternative III - Replacement With Aboveground	•
	Storage Tanks	68
	4. Alternative IV - Remove the USTs and Close The	
	Station	72
	5. Alternative Present Value And Payback	
	Comparisons	72
D.	LOCAL GAS STATION MARKET PRICE SURVEY	75
Ε.	CUSTOMER GAS STATION SURVEY	77
	1. Customer Value of the Gas Station	80
	2. Gas Station Affect on Main NEX Store Sales .	84
	3. Customer Sensitivity to Fuel Prices	92
F.	VALUE OF SAVINGS RECEIVED FROM SOCIETY	95
	1. Consumer Savings	97
	2. Tax Savings	97
CO	NCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	99
A.	COSTING PRACTICES OF THE NEX GAS STATION	99
	1. Internal Costing Practices	99
В.	GAS STATION UPGRADE ALTERNATIVES	100
c.	GAS STATION CUSTOMER SURVEY	101
	1. Customer Value of Gas Station	101
	С.	 Net Contribution Projections

vi

•

19

\$

	2. Gas :	Station Lo	cation Ef	fect on	Main N	NEX Sto	re		
	Sale	s			• • •		•	102	•
	3. Cust	omer Sensi	tivity to	Fuel Pr	ices	• • •	•	102	4
D.	COSTS	OF SAVING	S PROVII	DED TO	THE	NEX G	GAS		
	STATION		• • • •		•••	• • •	•	103	•
Ē.	FURTHER	RECOMMEND	ATIONS .	••••	•••	•••	•	103	
	1. Reco	mmended Ch	anges to	Current	NEX PI	ractice	9	104	
	2. Furt	her Resear	ch Questi	ons	• • •	•••	•	105	•
F.	SUMMARY		• • • •		•••	• • •	•	107	
LIST OF	REFEREN	CES	••••		•••		•	109	•
BIBLIOGF	АРНУ .		••••	••••	•••	•••	•	111	
APPENDIX	(A. E	NVIRONMENT	AL REGULA	TIONS .		•••	•	112	• •
APPENDIX	(B. S	CO5 FINANC	IAL REPOR	XTS	•••	•••	•	130	•
APPENDIX	(C. S	CO6 FINANC	IAL REPOR	TS	•••	•••	•	136	
APPENDIX	KD.R	ADIAN CORP	ORATION U	PGRADE E	STIMA	IES .	•	142	•
APPENDI)	(E. C	USTOMER SU	RVEY COMM	ENTS .			•	148	•
INITIAL	DISTRIB	UTION LIST	••••		• • •		•	156	

vii

#

I. INTRODUCTION

With shrinking defense dollars a reality in the 1990s, appropriated funds for facilities, maintenance, and operations are diminishing. Navy exchanges will need to rely more heavily on self-generated profits to sustain themselves. This paper focuses specifically on the fueling operations at the Navy Exchange Gas Station, Naval Postgraduate School (NPS), Monterey, California. However, the circumstances faced, and the approach used to review this entity, have similarities with many of the 108 other Navy Exchange operated fueling facilities throughout the Continental United States (CONUS).

Additional pressures beyond funding shortfalls are faced by the gas stations as increasingly more stringent environmental regulations take effect. These new laws and regulations require expensive equipment and facility upgrades to avoid costly clean-ups and/or fines. The State of California is well known as having some of the toughest environmental laws in the country. Department of Defense policy is to have bases comply with the relevant state and local environmental laws.

In October 1992, the Federal Facility Compliance Act of 1992 was signed by President Bush. It furthered strengthened DOD environmental policy. This act makes federal facilities subject to administrative orders, fines and penalties from the

Environmental Protection Agency or authorized state/local agencies for non-compliance with solid waste or hazardous waste regulations. The act also removes sovereign immunity, previously afforded to federal activities in environmental matters. Indications are that any fines and penalties will be paid from appropriated funds other than the past "judgement account." This change greatly increases the environmental liability faced by all DOD activities. R.

In July 1992, during annual tank testing, the Navy Exchange at NPS Monterey discovered that a 10,000 gallon underground storage tank was cracked. An undetermined amount of fuel was lost into the soil before the damage was discovered. This requires a follow-on ground study to determine the amount of contamination and the extent of cleanup required.

This study will examine current costing practices of the Navy Exchange Service Station's Fueling Operations, Department J-3. It will also review the costs and benefits of future fueling facility upgrade options available to the Navy Exchange and Postgraduate School. Recommendations will be aimed at improving costing figures and minimizing future environmental liabilities. However, this study will not discuss which funding sources should be used to implement the recommendations, nor which department at the Naval Postgraduate School should be the action code.

A. BACKGROUND

Navy Exchange service stations are big business. Annual worldwide fuel sales were \$134.6 million for NEX fiscal year 1992 which ended in January 1993. These sales have resulted in an average profit of 11.5 percent. [Ref. 1] The evolution of stricter environmental regulations and appropriated funding cuts make it prudent to consider all relevant costs in current and future upgrade decisions.

The operation of modern Navy Exchange stores and outlets can be traced back to 1946. A 1945 Secretary of the Navy study, headed by Captain Wheelock H. Bingham, SC, USNR, recommended consolidating Navy resale activities into a chain of retail stores with centralized direction and guidance [Ref. 2:p. 13]. As early as 1939, the Navy operated service stations through the Ships Stores program, the forerunner of the Navy Exchange system [Ref. 3].

In 1949, the House Armed Services Committee published the Armed Services Exchange Regulations (ASER). These regulations apply to exchanges operated in the continental United States, and provide a list of authorized resale items exchanges can carry. Since being updated and revised in 1956, the list has remained relatively constant. The House Armed Services Committee also impacts exchange policy through statements and decisions reached during committee hearings. The 1949 ASER was accompanied by several committee statements: the committee would continue to be concerned with competition

between the exchanges and local merchants [Ref. 4:p. 3551], exchanges would not be the sole provider of goods and services for the serviceman [Ref: 4:p. 3757], and exchanges would not supply the total funds needed for recreational and welfare activities [Ref. 4:p. 3543].

The Navy Exchange Mission statement is set down in the Navy Exchange Manual as follows:

The mission of an exchange is to provide a convenient and reliable source from which authorized patrons may obtain at the lowest practicable cost, articles and services required for their well-being and contentment; to provide, through profits, a source of funds to be used for the welfare and recreation of Naval personnel; and to promote the morale of the command in which it is established through the operation of a well managed, attractive and serviceable exchange. [Ref. 5:para. 1211]

The Navy Exchange is not a traditional business "profitoriented" operation, but the profit objective is manifested in its overall mission. This mission requires generating revenues above minimum operating costs to sustain operations and provide funding for base morale, welfare and recreation (MWR) programs. In 1991, MWR received 83.3 million dollars from 1990 Navy Exchange sales of two billion dollars. The Navy's net profit in 1990 exceeded 100 million dollars for the first time, though projected defense reductions are expected to reduce future total sales volume by up to 20 percent [Ref. 6].

For Navy exchange service stations in CONUS, the Navy Exchange Manual provides general operating goals for fueling operations, Department J-3 Fuels. Targets to Sales of Gross

Profit 14%, Expenses 7%, and Net Contribution 7% have been established for the service stations. The NPS NEX gas station's past five fiscal year averages are; Gross Profit 14.4%, Expenses 5.6%, and Net Contribution 12.6%.

B. OBJECTIVES

This study will identify how costing allocations are made at the Navy Exchange Gas Station. It will then review these practices to provide a complete cost/benefit picture. This information can be used to improve the cost data for future upgrade and maintenance decisions involving the facilities. This is becoming more critical in light of both the funding reductions currently being experienced by the military services, and the growing complexity and expense of complying with increasingly stringent environmental regulations.

Additionally, this paper will determine if the facilities upgrade options faced by the Navy Exchange are financially justified, and which one of the three possible fuel tank upgrade options is the most desirable. A default option to close the service station has also been kept open in the event data analysis reveals all upgrade options are too costly.

C. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The primary research question is: what are the complete costs of operating and maintaining the Navy Exchange Service Station fueling operations at the Naval Postgraduate School,

Monterey, California? The reported costs will be verified and modified where necessary to capture all costs incurred in Department J-3, Fueling Operations. Secondly, the analysis will consider the impact of mandatory compliance with increasingly stricter environmental regulations and growing environmental liabilities faced by the Navy Exchange Gas Station. Potential facility upgrade options will be reviewed considering these factors.

A third concern is to estimate the value placed on the Navy Exchange gas station by the authorized DOD patrons. This will help determine the demand for continued Navy Exchange fueling operations, considering that several commercial service stations operate nearby. This analysis will consider savings provided to DOD personnel through exchange fuel purchases compared to the civilian market. This depends on the customer's price sensitivity to fluctuating fuel prices and the location of the service station. Located adjacent to the main NEX retail store, the gas station is a potential business draw to the main store.

D. SCOPE, LIMITATIONS, AND ASSUMPTIONS

1. Scope

In this study, data for one individual activity, the Navy Exchange Gas Station, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, was collected and analyzed. Only the Fuels Department, Cost Center J-3, was examined, separating this

portion of the service station from the Automotive Service Department, J-5. Civilian service station cost categories for which the NEX gas station has no equivalent were estimated at the prevailing rates for a similarly sized civilian station. Though not used in the cost analysis, this shows where the Exchange Station has cost advantages compared to civilian stations. These costs include insurance, federal and some state taxes, local business fees, and local sales taxes. The government is exempt from these costs. The study also identifies NPS station funds used by the exchange service station, but not recorded against NEX cost accounts.

In addition to reviewing the NEX gas station, the NPS student population was surveyed to gauge the value placed on the service provided by the Navy Exchange gas station.

The study did not review any future site locations for the NEX gas station that might minimize potential environmental hazards. For example, siting the facility in an area with a lower water table would reduce environmental risks. At the current location, the water table is recorded as 18 feet below the surface, but it has been recorded as high as six feet from the ground surface.

No other departments onboard the Naval Postgraduate School were considered for funding needs. Thus, it is impossible to rank competing requirements for limited appropriated funds.

2. Limitations

One of the study's main limitations was assessing the cost of removing and reclaiming the site of the leaking fiberglass underground storage tank (UST). The tank removal is straightforward, however soil contamination will only become known through physical testing.

Other limitations are the uncertainty of whether military installations will remain in the Monterey area and the requirements of future environmental regulations. The scheduled downsizing of nearby Fort Ord, and the possible closure of the Defense Language Institute (DLI), will have an undetermined impact on the customer base and future sales of the Navy Exchange Service Station. Additional uncertainty arises from environmental regulations. They are continually becoming stricter. This adds costs to compliance efforts. Without knowing future laws, the study focused on meeting current laws. Compliance milestones are already identified for upcoming mandated program changes.

In addition, it is difficult to quantify how much business the gas station draws to the main retail store, and how strongly the gas station is valued by the customers. These questions do not lend themselves to empirical data.

The volume of total fuel sales by year and type of fuel was not available for the financial periods reviewed. This made it impossible to ascertain with certainty if sales

dollar fluctuations resulted from changes in the volume of fuel sold or the price of the fuel sold.

The size of the customer base of the NEX gas station was not available with any level of accuracy due to the lack of consolidated data on the number and location of military retirees and their dependents living in the Monterey Bay area. Similarly, data on the number of active duty service members, and their dependents, who are registered at other area military installation but use the NEX gas station is not available.

Finally, regardless of the study's recommendations, funding will be required for the upgrades. The study's recommendations are made without considering future funding climates. Funding limits may actually lead to implementing a sub-optimal upgrade alternative.

3. Assumptions

Thus study assumes that the Navy Exchange Gas Station will continue to operate in the future. To do so will require facility upgrades to meet scheduled 1998 environmental legislation. It was also assumed that appropriated station funding will continue to decrease as the military services downsize. This requires more accurate and defendable costing figures.

Further more, it is assumed that the amount of annual fuel volumes sold will remain relatively constant, and that

sales dollar values are closely tied to fluctuations in the consumer price index for motor fuels.

4. Study Organization

4

Chapter I is an introduction to the research project.

Chapter II presents a brief history of the Navy Exchange CONUS fueling operations, focusing on the NPS gas station. This is followed by a discussion of the environmental regulatory climate faced by the NPS Navy Exchange service station.

Chapter III discusses the methodology used to collect data and associated problems.

Chapter IV presents the data, including costs, benefits, a gasoline market price survey, a customer survey, and facilities upgrade alternatives to meet scheduled 1998 environmental regulations.

Chapter V analyzes and interprets the data, and reviews the upgrade alternatives.

Chapter VI includes conclusions, recommendations and general comments on the research process, including areas of possible future study.

II. BACKGROUND

A. THE NPS NAVY EXCHANGE GAS STATION

The Navy Exchange gas station is located on the Naval Postgraduate School's western boundary, adjacent to Del Monte Lake. A location map is on the following page, Exhibit 1. The ground water table is approximately 18 feet below the ground surface at this location, but it has been recorded as high as six feet from the ground surface. Regulations are more stringent for sites having ground water levels less than 20 feet below the ground surface, and proximity to Del Monte lake raises concerns about potential fuel spills.

The exact date of the gas station's initial operation is not documented by base records at the Public Works Department or the Public Affairs Office. However, a Navy Exchange Service Station employee, who began working for the Exchange in 1965, indicated that the service station was originally located near the present site of the NPS Fire Station. He believed the Navy gas station began operating at that original location sometime in the 1940s. [Ref. 7]

A review of NPS Plant Property Records indicates that the present service station was built in 1970 at a cost of \$233,033. Operations began in 1971 or 1972. The current plant value of the facility is carried at \$753,000.[Ref. 8]



*



12

•

The NPS Exchange gas station is typical of most Navy Exchange service stations. The service station has three underground gasoline storage tanks. Three underground tanks is the average number found at Navy exchange stations. The average age of the tanks at NPS is 22.7 years. This compares closely with the Navy exchange wide average tank age of 21.9 years for the exchange's 369 total tanks. [Ref. 3] The underground storage tanks (UST) service three fuel islands through piping that links with sixteen fuel nozzles. Gasoline sales are collected by a clerk. The clerk also runs a small automotive parts store and collects payments for work completed by exchange mechanics in the adjacent automotive shop, Department J-5.

The three tanks at the Navy Exchange service station include Tank # 348-1, a 10,000 gallon single-walled fiberglass tank constructed in 1973; Tank # 348-2, a 15,000 gallon single-walled steel tank constructed in 1969; and Tank # 438-3, a 20,000 gallon single-walled steel tank also constructed in 1969. Existing records do not indicate the exact dates the tanks were installed and placed in service, so manufactured dates are used for this study (the earliest the two steel tanks could have been installed was 1970 when construction began on Building 348).

The fiberglass tank, # 348-1, was emptied and taken out of service in July 1992. A leak was discovered at the base of the filler neck during an annual tank pressure test. A

contract is being processed to remove the damaged tank and remediate any soil contamination. One of the station's three service islands was taken out of operation when the tank was closed because of piping configurations. X,

With the two remaining serviceable steel tanks, the Navy Exchange sells regular unleaded and super unleaded gasoline. This gasoline is received through a regional NEX contract that services twelve other Navy/USMC facilities in central California. The contract is administered by the Navy Exchange Center (NEXCEN) in San Diego, California. The current vendor is Exxon, but the gasoline brand can change depending on the supply contract in place.

The station has a new vapor recovery system. New fuel lines were installed from the tanks to the pumps in 1991 [Ref. 9]. In addition, the tanks have an automatic inventory control monitoring system. However, the inventory control system is not sensitive enough to meet leak detection requirements under the existing environmental laws. It needs to be replaced, or supplemented, with a more accurate leak detection and alarm system.

Gasoline sales for the NPS Navy Exchange have been very profitable. Gross Profits to Sales have averaged 15.6%, and Net Contribution to Sales 10.4% during FY 1982 through FY 1992. (The Navy Exchange Fiscal Year begins and ends after the third week of January.)

B. ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS

station falls The Navv Exchange gas under the environmental purview of the state of California Water Resources Control Board. This agency has incorporated much of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) for Underground Storage Tanks (40 CFR 280) into the California Code of Regulations (CCR). The Federal Regulations were developed under the 1984 Hazardous Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA) to the Resource and Recovery Act (RCRA). The Federal regulations allow the State of California to regulate underground Storage tanks (USTs) under state law. Locally, the Monterey County Board of Health administers the UST program and conducts periodic enforcement inspections of the Naval Postgraduate School.

The liability of Federal facilities greatly increased after the Federal Facility Compliance Act of 1992 was enacted. Signed by President Bush in October 1992, the act subjects federal facilities to administrative orders, fines and penalties from either the Environmental Protection Agency or authorized state and local agencies if they do not comply with solid or hazardous waste regulations. The act also removes sovereign immunity, previously afforded to federal activities in environmental matters. It appears that any future fines and penalties will have to be paid from appropriated funds, rather than from central "judgement accounts." The current legal climate is intended to increase incentives for all federal activities to comply with environmental regulations.

The Radian Corporation completed a retrofit study of USTs at the Naval Postgraduate School in July 1992. They noted several areas in the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Title 23 (Waters) with which NPS must comply: 4

- New underground storage tank construction and monitoring standards;
- Existing underground storage tank monitoring standards;
- Release reporting and initial abatement requirements;
- Repair and upgrade requirements;
- Closure requirements;
- Categorical and site-specific variance procedures; and
- Permit application, quarterly reports, and trade secret requirements.

Specific applicable environmental regulations are summarized in Appendix A.

The Navy Exchange must take action to fully comply with environmental regulations. The 10,000 gallon cracked fiberglass tank must be removed and any contaminated soil remediated. Initial attempts have been made to solicit small purchase bids to remove the tank [Ref. 10] No bids had been received as of March 1993. Small purchase regulations prohibit awards above \$25,000. The most recent estimates place the tank removal costs at around \$50,000 [Ref. 11].

The current fuel inventory monitoring system is not sensitive enough to qualify as an approved leak detection system. Leak detection equipment will be required on all

existing tanks by 22 December 1998, per CCR 23, Article 4, Section 2641. The system in place is designed to detect leaks of 10.0 gallons per hour. Current environmental regulations require a system capable of detecting leaks of 0.1 gallons per hour. As an alternative to tank level monitors, vadose zone or groundwater monitoring equipment may be installed below the The vadose zone is the ground layer above the tanks. permanent ground water level. This zone is monitored because it can occasionally contain rain water that could be contaminated from fuel spills. In the absence of such systems, the regulations allow continued operations of service stations with the use of monthly statistical analysis called Statistical Inventory Reconciliation (SIR). The Navy Exchange is using this procedure to comply with the regulations. Daily inventory changes are determined from UST stick readings. They are reviewed under SIR and compared to gasoline sales volumes over a monthly period. Discrepancies in the SIR records are used to pinpoint leaks that may otherwise go undetected. Firms authorized to conduct SIR analyses are identified by the State of California. The cost is borne by the using activity.

Annual tank pressure testing is required for USTs using SIR, according to CCR 23, Article 4, Section 2641. Under current arrangements, NPS funds the tests for all six of the base USTs requiring it. The three other USTs requiring testing belong to the NPS Public Works Department. The cost

to test the three Navy Exchange tanks was 1,540 in 1992, and 1,250 in 1991 [Refs. 12 & 13].



ŧ.

III. METHODOLOGY AND DATA BASE

A five step methodology was used to determine costs and benefits of operating the Navy Exchange gas station:

- 1. Background research and interviews
- 2. Data collection/ customer survey
- 3. Gas station operating cost summary review
- 4. Gas station revenue summary review
- 5. Analysis of data

A. BACKGROUND RESEARCH AND INTERVIEWS

1. Background Research

This study began by reviewing the relevant literature

in several areas, including:

- Existing studies on the Navy Exchange system;
- State and Federal environmental regulations relevant to gasoline service stations;
- The mission and policy statements set forth in the U.S. Navy Resale Manual regulations on Navy Exchange gas stations;
- Two recently completed local contracted studies on Naval Postgraduate School Underground Storage Tanks;
- Articles in petroleum trade journals to learn industry trends in service station operating methods and storage tank configurations;
- Government Accounting Office (GAO) reports on environmental issues and military exchanges;
- Minutes from a House Armed Services Congressional Subcommittee hearing on military exchanges;

- Financial records of past construction and maintenance contracts;
- The five year financial operating records for the NPS Navy Exchange, FY 1988 through FY 1992, and;
- Local taxes and business license fee structures for nearby civilian gas stations.
 - 2. Interviews

Initial and follow-up interviews were conducted with the NEX Services Operations Group headquarters in Staten Island New York, the NPS NEX Officer, the Exchange Services Outlet Manager, the Service Station Manager, the NEX Support Services Supervisor, the NPS Public Works Officer, the NPS Environmental Coordinator and the NPS Resident Officer in Charge of Construction. These interviews recorded background information and identified support inter-relationships between NPS departments and organizations with ties to the NEX service station. The interviews primarily helped identify government costs not recorded in existing Navy Exchange service station financial statements. These costs were absorbed by other NPS departments. The interviews also identified costs that would have occurred if the service station was a civilian entity. Finally, interviews were conducted to determine how personnel costs and expenses for budgeting and reporting are derived.

B. DATA COLLECTION AND SURVEY

1. Data Collection

The majority of the cost and revenue data was obtained from records maintained by the Navy Exchange on standard NEX cost reports. Five years of data was reviewed, beginning with FY 1988 and ending with FY 1992. (The NEX fiscal year begins and ends in January.) Single event costs, such as construction and maintenance projects, were collected from the NPS Resident Officer in Charge of Construction Office. Future upgrade costs were referenced from Naval Facilities Engineering contract studies concerning NPS Underground Storage Tank Management Plans [Ref. 14]. 1992 fuel price data at NPS, Fort Ord and local service stations was also collected.

Capitalization costs of the service station facilities were not included because the age of the physical plant was beyond the twenty year time frame over which assets are normally fully depreciated. Costs for the vapor recovery system, installed in 1991, were capitalized and tank testing was included as an annual expense.

2. Survey

A customer survey was conducted to determine the value of the Navy Exchange gas station's service to the active duty student population. Six hundred surveys were randomly distributed among the 1,800 students at the Naval Postgraduate

School, excluding foreign exchange officers. Also excluded were approximately 200 active duty NPS staff personnel, and an undetermined number of military retirees and their dependents who use the NEX gas station. Initially, attempts were made to obtain access to retired personnel through the NPS vehicle registration records. However, these records were not available due to Privacy Act concerns. An estimated 7,000 retired personnel with 17,000 dependents reside in the Monterey Bay area, according to the Fort Ord Re-use Task Force, a civilian organization chartered to study conversion uses for Fort Ord after it downsizes [Ref. 15].

The sample population of active duty students was considered sufficient to gauge the feelings of exchange patrons. The Navy Exchange charter is directed at providing active duty service members with products at discounts. Retirees in an area are able to capitalize on services if available. While Navy Exchange financial personnel estimate that retirees comprise approximately 60% of the exchange's business, the exchange would not be able to operate a service station without the active duty student population. The survey also provided some feedback on whether the gas station draws patrons to the adjacent main exchange store. Finally, the survey indicated whether patrons are aware of prices charged in the nearby civilian market.

Assuming a normal population of 1,800, 600 surveys were randomly distributed. A total of 189 surveys were

returned, providing a 95% confidence level, with a plus or minus 6.8% margin of error.

C. GAS STATION OPERATING COST SUMMARY

Operating costs were collected from existing NEX financial reports for the NPS Exchange outlets, specifically the SCO5 and SCO6 reports for the period FY 1988 through FY 1992. Using a five year period smooths the costs and shows how they are related. Budget plans were compared to actual performance to determine whether year to year budgeting has been accurate.

Additional government costs were collected from sources outside of the Navy Exchange for improvements and maintenance not funded by the exchange, and for cost breaks enjoyed by the exchange on federal taxes, property taxes, business license taxes, and insurance.

Future tank and facility upgrades to comply with environmental regulations were obtained from a study completed in July 1992. These were done for the Naval Facilities Engineering Command by Radian Corporation. Adjustments were made to Radian Corporation's estimates for improved accuracy due to situations that have changed since then.

D. GAS STATION REVENUE SUMMARY

Navy Exchange gas station revenues were taken from the NEX SCO5 financial reports for the years FY 1982 through FY 1992. An 11 year performance period was used to review sales, gross

profit and net contribution. The data were used to determine conservative future net contribution values. President Clinton's proposed BTU energy tax will raise expenses at competing commercial gas stations but will not affect the NEX service station's costs. The NEX service station is exempt from federal fuel taxes. Any increased price differential should increase gasoline sales and revenues at the NPS station, assuming other costs remain constant compared to civilian stations.

E. ANALYSIS OF DATA

Chapter V analyzes the data collected and applies cost/benefit methodology to determine if costing methods in use are accurate, and which of three upgrade alternatives to meet 1998 environmental regulations is best justified.

The analysis includes operating costs not currently applied to the NPS gas station, but absorbed by other departments or agencies of the Federal government. The analysis also considers the tangible and intangible benefits service members receive from the exchange gas station, whether the gas station draws business to the main exchange, and if customers are price sensitive to fuel costs.

IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA

Chapter IV presents financial and survey data collected during the course of this study. Fueling operations at the gas station have been very profitable for the Navy Exchange. Gross profits averaged 15.6% of sales, and net contributions 10.4% of sales, over the past eleven fiscal years (FY 1982 through FY 1992).

A. BENEFITS/COSTS

(

The Navy Exchange collects costs using standard cost reports established by the Navy Exchange system. The primary references used in this review were the SCO5 and SCO6 reports for Department J-3, Fuels. Reports for the five year period FY 1988 through FY 1992 were collected to review accounting practices. In addition, eleven years of data, FY 1982 through FY 1992, was reviewed for performance of sales, gross profits and net contributions. These fiscal year periods provide a reference for trend identification. They are the most recent complete fiscal year data currently available. The five year period is presented in comparative financial statements. These include budgeted sales and budgeted gross profits compared to actual sales and gross profits. The station has been in continuous operation during the time periods reviewed,

with the exception of disruptions in June and September of 1991 to install a fuel line vapor recovery system.

The additional six years of sales, gross profit and net contribution data was collected to improve future performance predictions. Future net contribution predictions are needed because one of the potential upgrade options has a different impact on revenue in-flows than the others. A summary of historical data is presented in Table 1.

For the review of the five year financial data, each report is discussed in the order categories appear on the SCO5 and SCO6 reports for Department J-3, Fuels. Financial categories are placed together on tables to show the five year trends.

1. SCO5 Report Categories For Department J-3

The SCO5 Report provides an overall department cost/performance summary. The SCO5 reports for FY 1988 through FY 1992 are contained in Appendix B. Table 2 provides a comparative five year statement with selected categories. A discussion of each category follows.

a. Budgeted Sales

The NEX Service Outlets Manager estimates the annual budgeted sales category by 1 December of the year

TABLE 1

*

æ

SUMMARY OF SALES, GROSS PROFIT, AND NET CONTRIBUTION FY 1982 - 1992

DEPARTMENT J-3, FUELS, NEX, NPS, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

FISCAL YEAR	SALES	GROSS PROFIT	NET CONTRIBUTION
1982	1,635,684	167,358	72,433
1983	1,685,413	201,765	124,184
1984	1,665,592	218,257	146,500
1985	1,637,458	207,867	136,024
1986	1,092,263	200,213	138,265
1987	1,271,453	208,371	140,037
1988	1,370,367	260,509	182,256
1989	1,569,788	285,290	186,952
1990	1,863,381	323,800	230,619
1991	1,285,657	218,810	147,803
1992	1,799,020	336, 459	248,120
AVERAGE	1,534,189	238,973	159, 381

(DOLLARS)

TABLE 2SC05 REPORT SUMMARYDEPARTMENT J-3, FUELSFIVE YEAR PERIOD

(DOLLARS)	

	FY 88	F Y 89	FY 90	FY 91 **	FY 92
Budgeted Sales	1,254,600	1,333,949	1,541,238	1,553,000	1,497,500
SALES	1,370,367	1,569,788	1,863,381	1,285,657	1,799,020
COGS	1,109,858	1,284,498	1,539,581	1,066,847	1,462,561
Budgeted Gross Profit	183,120	194,402	231,186	248,480	163,228
GROSS PROFIT	260,509	285,290	323,800	218,810	336,459
PAYROLL	51,466	55,471	55,008	43, 382	57,950
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS	12,276	12,816	13,056	8,986	11,459
other Direct Expenses	13,443	29,582	24,829	18,393	17,304
EQUIP.> DEPREC.	1,065	466	287	245	1,625
total Expenses	78,250	98,315	106,236	71,006	88,338
NET DEPT. Contrib.	182,256	186,952	230,619	147,803	248,120

** Gas station was closed for two non-consecutive months during FY 91
preceding the performance period. The new fiscal year period begins with the start of the fourth week in January.

The budgeted sales figure is based on subjective estimates of individual monthly performance. These figures are combined to arrive at a yearly figure. The manager uses personal assessments, market trends, and previous departmental performance to determine a value. The budgeted sales number is important because it forms the basis for determining a local exchange's overhead charges. This is used to set the Navy wide NEX contribution to MWR programs and the total overhead charges paid to NEX headquarters for support functions.

b. Sales

Total actual sales are recorded from daily fueling sales receipts.

c. Budgeted Gross Profit

The budgeted gross profit is estimated by the Services Manager in concert with the budgeted sales figures. This is also based on subjective judgements and historical trends.

d. Gross Profit

The gross profit is calculated by subtracting the cost of goods sold (fuel) from actual sales.

e. Payroll

At the NEX NPS gas station, the payroll figures include two full time and three part time employees. One of the full time employees is the on-site supervisor for the service station. This supervisor's time is totally allocated to Department J-3, even though the position oversees three Departments: J-3, Fuels; J-5, the Automotive Shop; and H-9, the Automotive Parts Store.

f. Employee Benefits

Recorded employee benefits are compiled from breakdowns provided by the SCO6 Report. These breakdowns include several categories from the Navy Chart of Accounts in the Navy Exchange Manual, including: Provisions for Annual Leave, Account 312; Taxes and FICA, Account 316; and Retirement Annuity contributions, Account 318.

g. Other Direct Expenses

Like employee benefits, other direct expenses include breakdowns from the SCO6 Report. They are: Stationary and Supplies, Account 313; Repairs and Minor Replacement, Account 315; Utility Expense, Account 317; and Miscellaneous Expenses made up of two sub-accounts -Telephone, Account 303, and Miscellaneous Direct Expenses, Account 319.

h. Equipment Depreciation

The equipment depreciation category includes any fixed asset over \$1,000 in value at the time of purchase. A master account is kept at NEX headquarters in New York. They track equipment on a depreciation schedule for each individual exchange. Depreciation is charged to the local exchange during the fiscal year. The depreciation schedule varies from item to item, depending on whether it is building improvements, computer equipment, or other types of equipment. For the NEX gas station, this category contains a \$3,540 cash register system purchased in 1991 and a \$3,743 service island kiosk purchased in March 1992.

X.

2. SCO6 Report Categories For Department J-3

The SCO6 Report contains a more detailed cost breakdown than the SCO5 Report. The SCO6 reports for FY 1988 through FY 1992 are contained in Appendix C. The SCO6 totals build some of the category totals in the SCO5 Report. Table 3 provides a comparative five year statement with selected categories. A discussion of each category follows.

a. Provision for Annual Leave, Account 312

The length of employment service determines the amount of annual pre-established leave benefits for each employee. The total of all calculated leave benefits for the five employees in Department J-3 is charged to this account.

TABLE 3SCO6 REPORT SUMMARYDEPARTMENT J-3FIVE YEAR PERIOD

×,

\$

X.

4

0

•

(DOLLARS)					
	FY 88	FY 89	F Y 90	FY 91 **	F Y 92
ANNUAL LEAVE PROVISION	5,624	6,076	6,657	4,805	6,551
TAXES- Fica	4,332	4,580	4,679	3,486	4,485
RETIREMNT ANNUITY	2,319	2,160	1,178	694	422
TOTAL Employee Benefits	12,276	12,816	13,056	8,986	11,459
STATION- ARY £ Supplies	102	799	1,459	1,105	1,006
REPAIRS & NINOR REPL.MNTS	4,282	3,461	5,799	8,250	8,051
UTILITY Expense	5,347	5,178	9,375	6,280	7,099
MISC. Expense	3,710	20,144	8,195	2,757	1,147
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT EXPENSES	13, 443	29,582	24,829	18,393	17,304
TOTAL Expenses	25,719	42,398	37,885	27, 379	28,763
		<u></u>		** Gas sta	tion was

non-consecutive months during FY 91

•

closed for two

۲

•

32

.

.

b. Taxes - FICA, Account 316

The taxes for FICA (Federal Insurance Compensation Act) are computed for all Department J-3 employees at a rate of 7.59% of wages earned.

c. Retirement Annuity Contribution, Account 318

The costs allocated to the Retirement Annuity Contribution are matching contributions for employees who choose to voluntarily participate in the program.

d. Total Employee Benefits

This grouping includes the sum of the three previously discussed accounts: Provision for Annual Leave, Taxes - FICA and Retirement Annuity Contribution. It is included on the SCO5 Report.

e. Stationary and Supplies, Account 313

Charges to stationary and supplies include costs of cash register tapes and sales receipts, courtesy paper towels and window washing supplies for gas station patrons. Also included are small quantities of absorbent material kept onhand for minor oil and fuel spill clean-ups.

f. Repairs and Minor Replacements, Account 315

Repairs to pumps and associated equipment for individual occurrences under \$1,000 are captured in Repairs and Minor Replacements. This includes replacement of hoses and nozzles damaged in the normal course of business. The

majority of the recorded charges have been for service calls by a local company to repair gasoline pumps and dispensers.

g. Utility Expense, Account 317

Total utility expenses include charges for electricity, water and sewage, and natural gas. Building 348 houses the automotive mechanics, Department J-5, the automotive parts store, Department H-9, and the cashier and supervisor for the fueling operations, Department J-3. The building is metered for electrical usage. The total usage is allocated to the different departments based on Public Works Department engineering estimates. These cost figures also include the electricity used by a base pump to aerate the adjacent Del Monte Lake. The electric use breakdown is 40% for Departments J-3 and J-5, and 20% for Department H-9.

Department J-3 also receives a 10% allocation of Building 348's water and sewage usage, and a 1% allocation of the natural gas usage.

h. Miscellaneous Expenses

Although the miscellaneous expense category includes five accounts under the SRO6 Report, Department J-3 uses only two of these accounts: Telephone, Account 303; and Miscellaneous Direct Expense, Account 319. Building 348 Cleaning and Maintenance Service and Supplies, Account 304, is

fully allocated to the Automotive Shop, Department J-5. Under Miscellaneous Direct Expense the following types of costs have 1

been recorded:

- Waste oil disposal. This charge has been shifting between Departments J-3 and J-5 on an alternating basis.
- NEX vehicle repairs. Includes repairs and upkeep on a government owned pick-up truck used by the NEX for official business.
- Film purchase and processing. Used to record facility conditions and for advertising purposes.
- Refunds for downward fuel price adjustments. Sometimes new advertised lower fuel prices are not immediately reset at the pumps to reflect the latest price. Refunds to customers who paid the higher previous price are charged to this account.
- Customer claim payments for substantiated damages. Occasionally the NEX receives payment requests for automotive repairs from water in the fuel or low quality gasoline products. If supported, the claims are paid.
- Fuel testing by an independent source to verify customer claims.
- Contractor construction claim payments for alterations and repairs that exceeded an original contract price.
- Low cost infrequent items that occur in the course of business. These items do not fit into any other established category and are hard to predict.

B. STATION UPGRADE ALTERNATIVES

Existing environmental laws require the owners of single walled steel underground storage tanks (USTs) to replace or upgrade their tanks by December 22, 1998. This is when new environmental regulations are scheduled to take effect. The NEX service station has two single walled steel tanks.

The NPS is beginning to remove and backfill the NEX service station's 10,000 gallon fiberglass UST which was taken out of service in July 1992. The tank will not be replaced at the time of removal.

Costs have been estimated for three options in a contracted engineering retrofit study of USTs at NPS. The study was conducted by Radian Corporation in July 1992 for the Western Division Naval Facilities Engineering Command. This was used in developing an overall NPS Underground Storage Tank Management Plan. This plan was completed in October 1992. A fourth option, to close the station, was considered appropriate if the alternatives did not produce a positive rate of return and/or the customer base did not support continued operations. The four alternatives identified in this study are:

- Alternative I Retrofit the existing USTs in 1993 and replace them in 1998;
- Alternative II Replace existing USTs in 1998 with new double walled fiberglass USTs;
- Alternative III Replace existing USTs in 1998 with aboveground storage tanks (ASTs), and;
- Alternative IV Remove the existing USTs in 1998 and close the gas station.

Radian Corporation's cost analysis considered initial and long term costs. They presented costs in 1992 present values. Radian assumed a 9% interest rate and ignored inflation.

Radian Corporation provided the following additional information on their cost analysis:

The initial costs for each alternative were based on existing regulatory requirements and unit costs for implementing them. Long-term costs for alternative I consisted of monitoring costs and retrofit costs associated with compliance with the 22 December 1998 secondary containment requirements. Long-term costs associated with Alternatives II and III consisted of monitoring and permitting costs. Long-term costs were based on 15 years of tank operation. [Ref. 14:p. 5-1]

Radian also obtained cost information from several tank contractors located in Northern California. Finally, they based their estimates on as-built plans supplied by NPS personnel, considering the shallow groundwater conditions at the NEX gas station (around 18 feet) and current Federal and State of California environmental regulations applying to storage tanks. The Radian report refers to the NEX service station USTs under Group 3 Tanks, 348-1 through 3. Their estimates for each alternative are contained in Appendix D.

1. Alternative I - Retrofit Existing USTs

Retrofitting the existing USTs involves upgrading the three USTs at the service station in 1993 to meet applicable federal and state UST regulations through 1998. In 1998, double-walled tanks will be required. At that time, equipment that can be re-used from the retrofit will be retained for use on the new tanks. This would include reinstalling the Automatic Tank Gauging System (ATGS) and vadose zone monitoring and groundwater monitoring systems for the tanks.

Total costs for this option in present value 1992 costs is \$130,862. When this estimate was completed, the fiberglass tank (# 348-1) was still in service.

2. Alternative II - Replace Existing USTs With New

This alternative replaces the existing USTs with new double walled fiberglass USTs in 1998. Replacement costs computed by Radian Corporation include equipment, labor, anticipated costs for replacing existing tanks and piping with double walled fiberglass tanks and piping, soil sampling and analysis, leak detection equipment, overfill/spill protection/ATGS equipment, tie downs, concrete removal and replacement, and backfill placement and compaction. Radian Corporation selected double walled fiberglass tanks to provide a mid-range conservative choice. Lower cost jacketed steel tanks represent the low cost end , and double wall steel tanks represent the high cost end. The 1992 present value of Radian Corporation's cost estimate for Alternative II is \$172,040.

Alternative III - Replacement with Aboveground Storage Tanks

This alternative involves removing the existing USTs and replacing them with aboveground storage tanks (ASTs) in 1998. The Uniform Fire Code (UFC) restricts the size of ASTs for motor vehicle fuel to 6,000 gallon capacities. Radian Corporation summarizes the rationale for the tank size limitation as:

(1) Provide containment in the event of an accidental spill, (2) provide a design which can be inspected and maintained, and (3) provide a design which meets current Federal and State regulations.... [Ref. 14:p. 5-13]

The size limitation on ASTs means NEX would need to install eight 6,000 gallon ASTs to meet the station's current 45,000 gallon fuel storage design capacity. Six ASTs of that size would be needed to exceed the current 35,000 gallon operating capacity provided by tanks 348-2 and 348-3.

Cost estimates provided by Radian Corporation are based on single wall steel tanks supported on concrete saddles within secondary spill containment structures. Radian Corporation's approach replaces each existing NEX gas station tank with only one new 6,000 gallon AST. Total planned station fuel storage capacity would drop from 45,000 gallons to only 18,000 gallons. The estimated present value costs as of July 1992 for Alternative III are \$157,185. This estimate includes three new ASTs. In the analysis of the data in Chapter V, this upgrade is expanded to include eight ASTs needed to match the current design fuel storage capacity.

4. Alternative IV - Remove Existing USTs and Close the Gas Station

This alternative is appropriate if the value patrons receive from the NEX gas station is less than the cost of alternatives I-III. Costs to close and remediate the station site in 1998 are based on tank removals, soil testing and clean-up, back-filling and pavement repairs. The estimated

cost for this alternative is \$112,000. Most costs in this estimate are common to the other Alternatives.

C. LOCAL GAS STATION PRICE SURVEYS

As required by the Navy Exchange Manual, surveys of local civilian service stations are performed monthly, and more often if the market becomes volatile. This ensures the NEX provides service members with quality products at comparable or lower prices than otherwise available. The NPS gas station's normal practice is to follow the fuel prices set by the Army's larger Fort Ord gas station eleven miles away.

The local civilian stations surveyed have been the ones most competitive with the NEX station in the past. These do not include several of the civilian gas stations located closest to NPS, which normally have fuel prices 8 - 10¢ per gallon higher than the exchange's.

The results from surveys conducted in FY 1992 for the two types of fuel sold by the NEX gas station, super unleaded and regular unleaded, are presented in Tables 4 and 5. Prices shown are per gallon, and the brand of gasoline sold is noted. The NEX NPS station sells gasoline procured from Exxon under a current regional NEX contract. The Army at Fort Ord also sells Exxon gasoline [Ref. 16]. Results of surveys conducted prior to FY 1992 were not available.

D. CUSTOMER GAS STATION SURVEY

Six hundred surveys were randomly distributed to a NPS student population of 1,800 assumed to be normally distributed. A total of 189 surveys were returned (31.7% of the total distributed).

The survey had three purposes: 1) Determine a qualitative value for the exchange service station by active duty patrons; 2) review whether the station's location, adjacent to the main exchange retail store, is a draw for retail business, and; 3) ascertain if service station customers are sensitive to fuel prices.

A survey questionnaire form is shown in Exhibit 2. Comments received on surveys are compiled in Appendix E.

E. COSTS EXEMPTIONS FOR THE NEX GAS STATION

The NEX gas station enjoys several cost breaks by virtue of its status as a Federal Government facility. These include exemptions on State and Federal income taxes, Federal fuel excise taxes (14¢ per gallon), local city business taxes, building permit fees and insurance premiums for environmental clean-up liability and workman's compensation. State excise and sales taxes are not paid directly by exchange patrons, but some State of California fuel taxes are paid by NEX as part of the total bulk fuel bill. This cost is passed along to patrons without adding the additional tax tier paid by civilian station customers. The State of California excise

SERVICE STATION PRICE SURVEYS

REGULAR UNLEADED, PRICE PER GALLON

(DOLLARS)		All Ci listed	vilian Se are in M	rvice Stat onterey, C	ions alifornia	
D ATE 1992	NEX NPS (Exxon)	Ft. Ord (Exxon)	Mineas (Arco)	Webster (Exxon)	Light- house (Beacon)	Del Monte (Exxon)
03 FEB	0.989	0.99	1.03	1.03	1.03	0.99
21 FEB	1.02	1.03	1.03	1.05	1.05	1.03
01 APR	1.019	1.019	1.029	1.059	1.059	1.059
01 MAY	1.099	1.09	1.12	1.11	1.11	1.15
01 JUN	1.199	1.19	1.229	1.249	1.249	1.259
30 JUN	1.199	1.199	1.229	1.249	1.249	1.259
31 JUL	1.229	1.229	1.249	1.249	1.249	1.259
31 AUG	1.239	1.239	1.229	1.249	1.249	1.259
30 SEP	1.239	1.239	1.229	1.249	1.259	1.259
31 OCT	1.239	1.239	1.249	1.269	1.269	1.249
08 DEC	1.239	1.239	1.247	1.279	1.259	1.299
31 DEC	1.199	1.199	1.249	1.279	1.239	1.279

Source: NEX, NPS, Monterey, California

*)

SERVICE STATION PRICE SURVEYS

SUPER UNLEADED, PRICE PER GALLON

	(DOLLARS)	listed	i are in M	onterey, C	alifornia
D ATE 1992	NEX NPS (Exxon)	Ft. Ord (Exxon)	Mineas (Arco)	Webster (Exxon)	Light- house (Beacon)	Del Monte (Exxon)
03 FEB	1.209	1.17	1.16	1.21	1.17	1.21
21 FEB	1.19	1.19	1.17	1.21	1.19	1.25
01 APR	1.199	1.199	1.169	1.21	1.199	1.23
01 MAY	1.249	1.24	1.25	1.27	1.27	1.31
01 JUN	1.359	1.35	1.35	1.39	1.37	1.41
30 JUN	1.349	1.349	1.389	1.419	1.389	1.439
31 JUL	1.349	1.369	1.399	1.399	1.399	1.439
31 AUG	1.389	1.389	1.389	1.399	1.399	1.449
30 SEP	1.389	1.389	1.389	1.399	1.389	1.429
31 OCT	1.389	1.389	1.419	1.419	1.419	1.429
08 DEC	1.389	1.389	1.419	1.449	1.427	1.469
31 DEC	1.379	1.379	1.419	1.449	1.419	1.469
					and a state of the	

Source: NEX, NPS, Monterey, California

All Civilian Service Stations

×

EXHIBIT 2 NEX GAS STATION SURVEY FORM

Ar,

4

We want your opinion. This survey is to support thesis research on the Navy Exchange Gas Station. Your inputs will help determine the value placed on the availability of gasoline on base. Thank you for your time.

Please return completed surveys to NPS SMC 1903.

Check the blocks that most apply to you.
1. I am: Active Duty, NPS Student, Navy, Army,
USAF, USCG, Other ().
2. I am: male, female
3. Which type of fuel do you normally buy for your vehicle(s)? super unleaded regular leaded
 Are you aware of gasoline prices in town compared to exchange prices? Yes, No, Sometimes
5. How often do you (or your spouse) use the Navy Exchange gas station? Almost everytime I fill-up, Sometimes (every few months), Seldom (1 or 2 times per year), Never
<pre>If you answered "Never" to question # 5, skip to question # 10. 6. How do you feel about the gasoline quality at the Navy Exchange? Good, O.K, Wary, Poor, Don't know</pre>
7. When you purchase gas on base, how often do you (or your spouse) also shop at the main exchange or outlet stores? Always, Usually, Sometimes, Seldom, Never
8. The exchange gas station benefit is a right: Agree, Disagree, Don't care
9. If the exchange no longer had a gas station, would you (or your spouse) change how frequently you used the main exchange and outlets? No change, Would shop less often
10. If the exchange gas station were closed to provide more on base parking (leaving only the mechanics operating) would you 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Strongly Approve Neutral Disapprove Strongly Approve Disapprove?
11. How strong are your feelings towards keeping the exchange gas station open?
1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Strongly Approve Neutral Disapprove Strongly Approve Disapprove
12. Optional Comments

tax at the pump is 17¢ per gallon and state sales tax is 7.25% of the sale price.

X,

These cost breaks are presented to provide a clearer picture of the differences between the NEX gas station and the civilian service station business environment. A detailed analysis of these tax and fee exemptions are beyond the scope of this study. They are not used in calculating the cost of NEX operations to NPS. However, the data are used to determine estimated consumer and producer surpluses received by the NEX gas station from subsidies in the form of taxes and insurance breaks.

The Navy Exchange also receives benefits from the Naval station in the form of base support. This support includes fire and security services, environmental guidance and oversight benefits, and certain facility upgrades. The NPS station support is considered in determining NEX gas station operating costs. All these areas are discussed below.

1. NEX Costs Breaks

a. Federal Fuel Excise Tax

If the NEX gas station were required to pay this tax of 14¢ per gallon, they would have to decrease profit margin in order to remain competitive. For an approximate FY 1992 sales volume of 1,432,000 total gallons sold, this exemption represents a \$200,480 annual cost that would be added to a civilian station's cost of goods sold.

b. State Taxes

The State of California fuel excise tax of 17¢ per gallon would cost the NEX gas station \$243,440 for the 1,432,000 gallons sold from July 1991 to July 1992.

State sales tax of 7.25% times the \$1,631,833 in NEX fuel sales for the one year period would have cost the NEX \$118,308.

c. City Business Tax

The Naval Postgraduate School is located within the city limits of Monterey, California. The City of Monterey taxes local businesses based on their annual gross sales receipts. Tax formulas exist for three size categories. The NEX gas station would fall into the largest category. This group is defined as businesses with annual sales over \$37,500. Based on the city's formula, the NEX gas station would have paid city tax of \$2,245 in FY 1992. (An \$86 flat annual fee, plus \$3 tax per each \$2,500 in gross receipts. NEX gas station sales in FY 92 were \$1,799,020.)

d. Building Permit and Fees

The City of Monterey charges new businesses building permit and plan inspection fees based on square footage and estimated construction costs of a project. The station upgrade options under consideration would cost a civilian station \$1,800 to \$2,100 in permits and fees.

e. Environmental Lizbility Insurance

Civilian gas stations are required by environmental law to carry liability insurance for clean-up requirements in the event their fueling operations cause pollution. The NEX gas station is exempt from purchasing coverage because the Federal Government is self-insured. The insurance premiums vary with the size, location, and age of USTs. If a civilian entity, the NEX gas station could expect to pay about \$5,000 in annual premiums for the required one million dollars of coverage.

f. Workman's Compensation Insurance

Any civilian business is required to provide workman's compensation insurance for its employees. Local civilian service stations pay annual premiums of \$8,000 to \$15,000 for their fueling operations. Additional premiums between \$3,000 and \$5,000 are paid for stations with automotive mechanics.

g. MPS Station Support

The NEX gas station receives several no cost services from NPS through an existing base host-tenant agreement. For example, NPS provides security and fire protection. Civilian stations would pay for these services through business taxes. This cost is not included in this study because the base would provide these services even without the NEX service station.

The Public Works Department provides environmental oversight for the NEX, and includes NEX USTs in the NPS Underground Storage Tank Management Plan without cost to NEX. Benefits from this action include annual tank testing costs (around \$500 per tank) and the 1991 installation of a \$105,100 vapor recovery project. This replaced the gas station's fuel line piping. These costs are not tracked by NEX financial reports, but they have been included in this study.

The existing host-tenant agreement also stipulates that the upgrade or replacement of existing USTs will be financed with appropriated station funds at no cost to the NEX. This support arrangement between the Navy Exchange and host station is typical on Naval bases and has been formalized in naval instructions. Bases provide support at no direct cost to exchanges because NEX services are considered an asset. The asset includes both services provided to military service members, and funds generated for Morale, Welfare and Recreation (MWR) programs. However, this item is under review at NPS and throughout the Navy due to the dollar magnitude of environmental upgrades under consideration.

V. DATA AMALYSIS

Collected data was reviewed for reasonableness, accuracy and completeness. Cost trends were analyzed for the past five fiscal years. Eleven years of sales, gross profits and net contributions data were collected and nine years of net contribution data was analyzed to project future values using least squares regression. Finally, FY 1992 statements were investigated to determine inputs to cost accounts. The results of this analysis are discussed in this chapter.

A DEDIEFITS/COSTS

1 SCO5 Report Adjustments For Department J-3

Cost categories presented on the SCO5 Report are appropriate but several items required further examination. In addition to a discussion on budgeted sales and gross profits, four FY 1992 SCO5 Report categories required adjustments to more accurately reflect costs: 1) Payroll; 2) Employee Benefits; 3) Other Direct Expenses; and, 4) Equipment Depreciation.

a. Budgeted Sales and Gross Profits

Budgeted sales and gross profit have been compared with actual sales and gross profits in each of the five fiscal years reviewed, FY 1988 through FY 1992.

Budgeted sales have ranged from 8.4% to 17.3% below actual sales. The one exception was FY 1991 when sales predictions were 20.8% above actual sales. This resulted from an unanticipated non-consecutive two month shutdown of the gas station during 1991. The shutdowns, in June and September of that year, were necessary to install a \$105,100 fuel vapor An artificial, proportional increase was recovery system. added to those two months, inflating FY 1991 sales to determine a sales trend from FY 1982 through FY 1992. This trend was then compared to the consumer price index for motor fuels for the same period to back out inflationary effects. It was determined that sales were lost in a greater proportion than what could be accounted for by the sales adjustment. A plausible explanation is that additional time was required after reopening to re-establish the customer base lost during the shut-down. This was considered in estimating the payback periods of each upgrade alternative.

A similar percentage shift occurred when comparing budgeted to actual gross profit. Again, with the exception of FY 1991, all budgeted gross profit figures were lower than the actual figures by between 28.6% and 51.5%. For FY 1991 the budgeted gross profit was 13.6% above the actual gross profit.

The under-estimation of sales and gross profit represents a conservative budgeting approach by local NEX management. An explanation for the consistent under-budgeting is the procedure used to determine overhead payments owed to

NEX headquarters. Budgeted figures are developed and submitted to NEX headquarters. From Navy wide submissions, NEX headquarters develops overhead amounts each exchange will pay. For the NPS NEX, an overhead charge of around 1.8% of forecasted sales is used, but the rate can be as high as 2.8% depending on the activity. The total of all exchange inputs provides headquarters with their anticipated budget. The NEX system then makes a commitment to the MWR Program for the coming year, which develops its own future plans. The amount individual exchanges will pay during the year becomes fixed. This occurs regardless of actual sales and gross profit figures. Under-estimating of budgeted sales and gross profit This is because of the financial hardships is prevalent. over-budgeting would impose on exchanges whose sales fell short of targets. Adjustments to budgeted amounts are not forced on an exchange by headquarters unless projections are extremely inaccurate from year to year.

b. Actual Sales, Gross Profits, and Net Contribution

Eleven fiscal years (FY 1982 through FY 1992) of historical data for sales, gross profit and net contributions were collected, and net contributions were analyzed using least squares regression. Their performance was presented in Table 1, Chapter IV. It is graphed here in Figure 1.

Sales figures for FY 1982 through FY 1992 fluctuate, giving the impression of a dynamic market.

FIGURE 1

HISTORICAL PERFORMANCE DEPARTMENT J-3, FUELS, NEX, NPS, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA



However, a review of the consumer price indexes for motor fuels over this period reveals movements that strongly coincide with the movement of NEX fuel sales (see Table 6). The sales figures and index movements, in conjunction with the stable gross profits and net contributions during this time frame, indicate that the quantity of gasoline sold by the NEX is fairly stable from year to year.

A stable sales volume implies a stable customer base. To investigate this idea, student population levels were obtained from the NPS Registrar's Office. Student populations were available only for FY 1987 through FY 1992. The figures ranged from a low of 1,623 students in FY 1988 to a high of 1,992 students in FY 1990. Since then, the student population has slowly declined to 1,809 in FY 1992. In addition, area retirees make up an estimated 60% of the NEX's customers. This supports the idea of a relatively stable customer base, contributing to stable annual fuel sales volumes.

Figure 2 shows consumer price indexes plotted against sales figures from FY 1982 through FY 1992. The index has roughly paralleled sales magnitudes. However, FY 1991 shows a large disparity between the movement in sales and the price index due to the station shut-down previously mentioned.

×;

COMPARISON OF SALES TO THE CPI FOR MOTOR FUELS FY 1982 - 1992

DEPARTMENT J-3, FUELS, NEX, NPS, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

FISCAL YEAR	Sales (\$)	CPI, MOTOR FUELS
1982	1,635,684	102.8
1983	1,685,413	99.4
1984	1,665,592	97.9
1985	1,637,458	98.7
1986	1,092,263	77.1
1987	1,271,453	80.2
1988	1,370,367	80.9
1989	1,569,788	88.5
1990	1,863,381	101.2
1991	1,285,657	99.4
1992	1,799,020	98.9

Sources: NEX Department J-3 sales are from SCO5 Cost Reports. The Consumer Price Index levels for motor fuel are from the "Economic Report of the President," January 1993, Table B-57.

FIGURE 2

'**x**)





c. Payroll

Salaries and wages for two full time and three part time employees are allocated to Department J-3, Fuels. This includes 100% of the salary for a full time supervisor who also oversees the automotive mechanics working in the colocated Department J-5. Therefore, for the purposes of this study, the supervisor's personnel costs have been reallocated: 50% to Department J-3, and 50% to Department J-5. The FY 1992 payroll account has been reduced by \$7,000 (approximately one half of the supervisor position's payroll) to reflect this change. Efforts of this supervisor to oversee the automotive parts store, Department H-9, are not considered significant.

d. Employee Benefits

The benefits associated with the re-allocation of the supervisory costs reduce this SCO5 account by \$1,264.

e. Other Direct Expenses

Based on the two most recent tank testing contracts funded by NPS, annual tank testing costs of \$1,500 (\$500 per tank) have been added to miscellaneous direct expenses on the SCO6 Report.

f. Equipment Depreciation

Equipment depreciation has been increased to cover the \$105,123 station funded vapor recovery system installed June through September of 1991 [Ref. 9]. Based on a ten year

straight line depreciation, \$5,256 has been allocated to FY 1991 depreciation (half-year convention), and \$10,512 to FY 1992 through FY 2000. The remaining \$5,256 is allocated to FY 2001.

2. SCO6 Report Adjustments For Department J-3

The re-allocation of the Department J-3 supervisor's payroll and related benefits discussed in the SCO5 Report section requires reductions in the Provisions for Annual Leave account of \$728, and the Taxes-FICA account of \$536. No revisions are warranted for Retirement Annuity Contributions. A reduction of \$1,624 is reflected in the Total Employee Benefits account for FY 1992.

a. Utility Expenses

Utility expenses were determined to be reasonable with minor inaccuracies that are not significant; therefore, no statement adjustments were made for this item. Areas subject to interpretation are the cost to operate a Naval station pump from NEX's Building 348, and the engineering estimates which allocate the utility bill to the three departments sharing the building. Also, a station pump aerates the adjacent Del Monte Lake. The engineering estimates allocate 40% of the electric utilities to both Department J-3, Fuels, and Department J-5, Automotive Shop. The remaining 20% is allocated to Department H-9, Automotive parts store. In addition, Department J-3 is charged 10% of

the building's water usage, and 1% of the natural gas usage. The electric bill is by far the largest cost of utilities at between \$750 to \$800 per month. Department J-3's 40% portion amounts to between \$3,600 and \$3,840 per year.

b. Miscellaneous Expense

The NEX gas station is the most profitable service outlet run by the exchange with an average eleven year gross profit of 15.6% of sales (FY 1982-1992). As a result of operational realities, it often absorbs miscellaneous expenses that straddle less profitable departments. Examples are: (1) one half of waste oil disposal costs that had been divided between the automotive shop and the gas station on an alternating basis, (2) expenses for maintenance of an NEX government owned pick-up truck, and (3) the cost of film and processing for service station advertising and facility condition documentation. For the future, the NEX plans to fully allocate future waste oil disposal costs of approximately \$800 per year to the Automotive Shop, Department J-5. This is more reasonable since these costs result from the operation of the automotive shop. Therefore, for the purpose of this analysis, \$400 has been deducted from Department J-3, Fuels.

B. BENEFIT/COST PROJECTIONS

1. Adjusted SCO5 And SCO6 Reports

Using the revisions and adjustments previously identified for the SCO5 and SCO6 Reports, modifications have been made to the FY 1992 statement values presented earlier in Tables 2 and 3. The revised data is shown in Tables 7 and 8. Absolute value adjustments totalled \$20,276. These values increase FY 1992 expenses by 4.2% (\$3,748) and decrease total net contribution by 1.5%. Because of the small change, historical data was used without adjustments for projecting future net contribution values. 4

2. Net Contribution Projections

Net contribution data for fiscal years 1982 through 1992 was collected to project future net contributions. These projections are used to calculate the payback of the proposed Future values were estimated using least upgrades. squares regression analysis to reflect a best fit approximation to past performance. Data from FY 1983 to FY 1990 was used for this projection. FY 1982 data was disregarded because of its lower than expected net contribution in comparison to the 1982 motor fuel CPI, and FY 1991 data was disregarded due to the two month shutdown of the gas station that year. Net contributions were not revised for the previously described adjustments to the SCO5 and SCO6 Reports. Data are presented in Table 9 and Figure 3.

×,

ADJUSTED SCO5 REPORT FOR FY 1992

DEPARTMENT J-3, FUELS, NEX, NPS, NONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

()	DO	LL	AR.	5)
_				
			_	

	FY 92 RECORDED	FY 92 ADJUSTED	\$ CHANGE
Sales	1,799,020	-	0
COGS	1,462,561	~	0
GP	336, 459	-	0
Payroll	57,950	50,950	- 7,000
Employee Benefits	11,459	10,195	- 1,264
Other Dir. Expenses	17,304	18,804	+ 1,500
Equip. Deprec.	1,625	12,137	+10,512
total Expenses	88,338	92,086	+3,748
NET DEPT. CONTRIBUTION	248,120	244, 373	-3,748

Note. Total additional cost adjustments of \$3,748 represents a change of 1.5% from recorded NEX cost figures.

ADJUSTED SCO6 REPORT FOR FY 1992

DEPARTMENT J-3, FUELS, NEX, NPS, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

-	FY 92 RECORDED	FY 92 ADJUSTED	\$ CHANGE	
ANNUAL LEAVE PROVISION	6,551	5,823	-728	
TAXES-FICA	4,485	3,949	-536	
retir eme nt Annuity	422	422	0	
Total Employee Benefits	1i, 459	10,195	-1,264	
STATIONARY & SUPPLIES	1,006	1,006	0	
REPAIRS & MINOR REPLACEMENTS	8,051	8,051	0	
utility Expense	7,099	7,099	0	
MISC. Expense	1,147	747	-400	
TOTAL OTHER DIRECT EXP.	17,304	16,904	-400	
TOTAL EXPENSES	28,763	27,099	-1,664	

(DOLLARS)

NET CONTRIBUTION PROJECTIONS

DEPARTMENT J-3, FUELS, NEX, NPS, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

FISCAL YEAR	ACTUAL VALUE (\$)	PROJECTED VALUE (\$)
1982	72,433	95,607
1983	124,184	107,059
1984	146,500	118,511
1985	136,024	129,963
1986	138,265	141,415
1987	140,037	152,867
1988	182,256	164,319
1989	186,952	175,711
1990	230,619	187,223
1991	147,803	198,675
1992	248,120	210,127
1993	-	221,579
1994	_	233,031
1995	-	244,483
1996	-	255,935
1997	-	267, 387
1998	-	278,839

NOTE. Regression Line Equation for Net Contribution: Y(n) = \$95,607 + \$11,452(n); n = year, with 1982 = 0.

FIGURE 3

DEPARTMENT J-3, FUELS NEX, NPS, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA





The future NEX customer base was examined to consider the impact of anticipated decreases in NPS student populations and Fort Ord downsizing plans. Student population is expected to draw down slowly from 1,800 students to 1,700 over the next two years. Fort Ord's downsizing is not expected to significantly affect the NEX customer base. The Fort Ord gas station is being retained as part of a core group of services that will remain after the Seventh Light Infantry Division is disbanded in FY 1993. [Ref. 16] As a result, the customer base for the NEX should remain relatively constant for the foreseeable future. In the event plans change and the Fort Ord gas station does close, NEX's customer base may actually increase as retirees have fewer retail gasoline options.

Attempts were made to collect fuel sales volumes over the eleven year period reviewed to determine if changes in revenues resulted from sales volume changes or fuel price changes. However, the NEX does not maintain consolidated fuel volume records, and data is not available for more than one to two years in the past. The trucking firm that makes bulk fuel deliveries to the NPS NEX was contacted: however, they were not able to provide information on past deliveries. In July 1992, an unknown NPS student compiled records going back to 1991. Total sales volume for this one year period was 1,431,568 gallons. These values have been rounded to the nearest thousand for this study.
Despite the shortage of comprehensive sales volume data, the NEX gas station is assumed to have a fairly steady annual business volume. This is considered reasonable because of the consistent relationship between the consumer price index for motor fuels and NEX fuel revenues. It is also supported by the steady values for gross profit and net contribution. Finally, the authorized customer base, estimated at 40% active duty and 60% retired personnel, is not subject to drastic shifts from one year to the next.

As the final element in developing forecasts, net contribution projections have been reduced to reflect interrupted revenues during the actual upgrade. Based on the additional losses of \$52,000 experienced while the station was closed for two non-consecutive months in FY 1991, additional net contribution losses of \$26,000 per closed period have been added for when the station is undergoing upgrading. То determine this amount, the average of FY 1990 and FY 1992 sales (\$1,831,200) was used. This corresponds to the behavior of the CPI in FY 1991, which was approximately the average of the CPIs for FY 1990 and FY 1992. For the same two years, an average percent net contribution to sales figure of 13.1% can be calculated. Applying this to the average sales figure results in an estimated FY 1991 net contribution of \$239,890. This is the expected amount if station operations had not been interrupted. After adjusting \$239,890 proportionately downward to \$199,908 to account for two non-consecutive months

of closure, the actual net contribution for FY 1991 of \$147,803 was subtracted from it. The resulting value of \$52,105 is considered the additional loss encountered to later re-establish the customer base. One half of this value was used to arrive at the \$26,000 loss per closure figure.

C. AMALYSIS OF GAS STATION UPGRADE ALTERMATIVES

The four alternatives previously introduced will now be reviewed in detail. Radian Corporation's estimates have been adjusted for inaccuracies and/or changes in circumstances. The largest line item revised in all the alternatives was Radian Corporation's assigned value for tank removals. This line item was increased from \$10,200 for the two steel tanks to \$82,000. This was based on actual Naval station costs experienced to remove the leaking fiberglass tank [Ref. 17].

Radian Corporation's original present value calculations used a 9% discount interest rate and are shown in Appendix D. A 10% discount rate was used in this study which is required by Department Of Defense (DOD) and Navy cost analysis planning instructions [Refs. 18 & 19]. Costs were discounted to determine their present value for FY 1993. This discount rate is close to current local business conditions. Business equipment loan rates are 8.25 to 8.55% with 1 to 2% loan fees. Inflation effects were ignored in this study.

A payback period has also been calculated for each alternative using the estimated 1993 present value costs and

projected net contributions. Net present value (NPV) over the expected life of the tanks could be calculated using net contribution estimates. However, since revenues are the same for all upgrade alternatives NPV has the same ranking as present value (PV) of costs. The full cost of each alternative is presented for budgeting purposes.

1 Alternative I - Retrofit Existing USTs

This alternative upgrades the USTs in 1993 to comply with environmental regulations until they are replaced in 1998. When Radian Corporation completed their study in July 1992, all three of the NEX gas station's USTs were in operation. Very shortly after that, annual tank testing revealed that tank # 348-1 (the 10,000 gallon fiberglass tank) was leaking. The tank was promptly taken out of service; therefore, tanks 348-2 and 3 are the remaining steel tanks to which this alternative has been applied.

A review of Radian Corporation's Alternative I estimate appears to indicate that 1992 costs to complete the work were over discounted. This provided a lower total cost for this alternative than seemed reasonable. This study uses Radian Corporation's tank replacement costs for Alternative II as the basis for Alternative I because of similar work completion timeframes. Additional costs to retrofit the storage tanks in 1993 have been added. The cost for the tank removal and disposal of the remaining two tanks in 1998 has

been revised upward based on actual costs incurred to remove the fiberglass tank in 1993. Total FY 1993 costs for this option following the elimination of the upgrade and removal cost of tank # 348-1 is \$221,251. Exhibit 3 summarizes the cost estimates for this alternative.

2 Alternative II - Replace Existing USTs with New

Alternative II replaces the existing tanks with three new double walled fiberglass USTs in 1998. The Radian Corporation cost estimate for this alternative has been revised to account for the earlier removal of the leaking 10,000 gallon fiberglass tank, and the replacement of the tanks in 1998 vice 1992. The FY 1993 present value cost estimate is \$214,451. Exhibit 4 summarizes the cost estimates for this alternative.

Alternative III - Replacement With Aboveground Storage Tanks

This alternative replaces the three NEX gas station USTs in 1998 with eight aboveground storage tanks (ASTs). The ASTs have advantages of easy access for inspection, but they also have several drawbacks. Federal Uniform Fire Codes (UFC) limit the size of ASTs used for motor vehicle fuels to a maximum of 6,000 gallons per tank. This is because ASTs present additional fire safety hazards not encountered with USTs. Compared to USTs, ASTS also have greater upkeep and maintenance requirements, require more physical space, and

EXHIBIT 3

4

ALTERNATIVE I - RETROPIT EXISTING USTS IN 1993, REPLACE USTS IN 1993

REVISED COST ESTIMATE

Unadjusted Radian Corp. Estimate for Alternative II.		
1992 Present Value (PV)	\$172,042 *	Tanks 1-3.
Less: Tank 1 removal	\$ (4,800)	
Tank 2 & 3 removal/clean-up	\$(10,200)	
Revised PV 1992 Adjusted to 1993 PV @ 10% X	\$157,042 (1.09) ⁶ /(1.10) ⁵	
_	\$163,535	
Add ins:		

Tanks 2 & 3 removal costs, value in 1993, (remove 1998)	\$50,916 **
Cathodic Tank Protection (1993)	\$6,800
TOTAL ADD INS, PV 1993	\$57,716

ALTERNATIVE I, PV 1993

Adjusted Radian Estimate	\$163,535
Add ins	\$ 57,716
TOTAL ALTERNATIVE I	\$221,251

* Radian Corporation's Alternative II estimate was used as the basis for this revised estimate. Retrofit costs of a cathodic tank protection system have been added into estimate.

** The value for tank removal was derived from costs of \$51,000 in May 1993 to remove tank number 1. This amount was increased 1.6 times to cover the simultaneous removal of two tanks based on conversations with the construction contracts office at NPS. \$82,000 was then adjusted to PV 1993 costs.

EXHIBIT 4

ALTERNATIVE II - REPLACE EXISTING USTs IN 1998

8

REVISED COST ESTIMATE

Unadjusted Radian Corp. Estimate, 1992 Present Value (PV) \$172,042 Tanks 1-3. Less: Tank 1 removal \$ (4,800) Tank 2 & 3 removal/clean-up \$(10,200) Revised PV 1992 Adjusted to 1993 PV @ 10% \$157,042 X (1.09)⁶/(1.10)⁵ \$163,535

Add in:

Tanks 2 & 3 removal costs, value in 1993, (remove 1998)	\$50,916 *
TOTAL ADD INS, PV 1993	\$50,916
ALTERNATIVE II, PV 1993	
Adjusted Radian Estimate	\$163,535
Add ins	\$ 50,916
TOTAL ALTERNATIVE II	\$214,451

* The value for tank removal was derived from costs of \$51,000 in May 1993 to remove tank number 1. This amount was increased 1.6 times to cover the simultaneous removal of two tanks based on conversations with the construction contracts office at NPS. \$82,000 was then adjusted to PV 1993 costs.

pose a greater air pollution hazard. The air pollution hazard is due to ASTs needing a more complicated vapor recovery system than the gravity recovery systems on USTs. Fuel vapors must be pulled back into the tank through a vacuum pump which is subject to mechanical failure.

The AST's 6,000 gallon size limitation also decreases the option's desirability. Eight tanks would be required to match the original station storage capacity of 45,000 gallons. The Radian Corporation estimate is based on replacing the existing three USTs with three smaller ASTs. This would result in a new station storage capacity of 18,000 gallons. For this study, eight ASTs have been included so that all the alternatives have approximately the same storage capacity.

An AST is better suited for rural rather than urban locations. In rural locations, potential damage from an accidental explosion would not threaten as much life and property as an AST in an urban setting. A common cause of accidents with ASTs results from the requirement to use pumps to deliver bulk fuel loads. This is more dangerous than the gravity flow delivery system used to unload transport tankers into USTs. Explosion proof pumps are required to perform AST deliveries; however, pumps that do not comply with the Uniform Fire Codes are often involved in AST fuel delivery accidents. The NEX gas station is located near the main exchange and in

close proximity to Del Monte Avenue. These are serious causes for concern when considering ASTs.

The Radian Corporation's cost estimate for three ASTs was adjusted by deleting the tank removal costs for Tank # 348-1, increasing the removal costs for the remaining two tanks, and adding five additional ASTs. The 1993 present value cost estimate for this alternative is \$350,544. A breakdown is provided in Exhibit 5.

4. Alternative IV - Remove the USTs and Close The Station

This alternative was provided in case the net present value calculations were negative or the customer survey responses had been strongly against continued operations. The FY 1993 present value estimate to remove the tanks and associated equipment and close the station in 1998 is \$80,916, (see Exhibit 6). Of this amount, \$50,916, for tank removals, disposal and soil remediation costs, is common to Alternatives I-III.

5. Alternative Present Value And Payback Comparisons

As previously mentioned, least squares regression analysis was performed to project net contributions. These projections were used for the payback analysis. Net present value (NPV) over the expected life of the tanks could also be calculated using net contribution estimates from the regression. However, this is not necessary because revenues are the same for all upgrade alternatives so NPV has the same



×,

ALTERNATIVE III, PV 1993

Adjusted Radian Estimate	\$145,096
Add ins	\$205,448
TOTAL ALTERNATIVE III	\$350,544

* The value for tank removal was derived from costs of \$51,000 in May 1993 to remove tank number 1. This amount was increased 1.6 times to cover the simultaneous removal of two tanks - based on conversations with the construction contracts office at NPS. \$82,000 was then adjusted to PV 1993 costs.

****** Five ASTs were added to bring the planned total to eight ASTs. At 6,000 gallons per AST this will match the current design storage capacity of the NEX gas station (45,000 gallons for three USTs).

EXHIBIT 6

ALTERNATIVE IV - REMOVE THE USTS AND CLOSE THE GAS STATION

COST ESTIMATE

Tank Removal Costs

Tanks 2 & 3 removal costs, Present Value in 1993 (remove in 1998) \$50,916 *

Shutdown Costs

Remove and salvage pumps,		
hoses & nozzles. Remove		
piping and island awnings		
Present Value in 1993		
(remove in 1998)	\$30,000	**

TOTAL ALTERNATIVE IV CLOSING COSTS (Present Value 1993)

\$80,916

* The value for tank removal was derived from costs of \$51,000 in May 1993 to remove tank number 1. This amount was increased 1.6 times to cover the simultaneous removal of two tanks based on conversations with the construction contracts office at NPS. \$82,000 was then adjusted to PV 1993 costs.

** Amount includes consideration of some salvage value and sale of useable equipment by the contractor. This reduces total costs to the Government. ranking as present value (PV) of costs. Also, the short payback periods indicate that NPV is greater than zero over the life of the tanks. Reviews of the work involved shows that all the alternatives would require about the same two month shutdown in 1998. Thus, sales revenues will be the same for Alternatives I-III.

Alternative II - Replace the USTs in 1998, has the lowest 1993 PV (\$214,451), with a payback period of 15.5 months. A 1993 Present Value and payback period comparison is provided in Table 10.

D. LOCAL GAS STATION MARKET PRICE SURVEY

The NEX gasoline pricing surveys conducted through FY 1992 reveal that the NEX maintained competitive prices with area civilian service stations. The survey shows that the NEX gas station matched or beat civilian gas station prices on regular unleaded gasoline by 0.1¢ to 9¢ per gallon. The NEX gas station also consistently matched or beat the competition (by up to 9¢ per gallon) on super unleaded gas prices during the same period. Complete market survey information was not maintained and, therefore, not available for the years prior to FY 1992. Market survey data was presented earlier in this study (Tables 4 and 5 in Chapter IV).

FY 1993 PRESENT VALUES AND PAYBACK OF ALTERNATIVES

DEPARTMENT J-3, FUELS, NEX, NPS, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

(DOLLARS)

	ALT. I	ALT. II	ALT. III	ALT. IV
PV 1993	221,251	214,451	350,544	80,916
PAY BACK IN MONTHS	16.0	15.5	24.2	NA

- Alternative I - Upgrade existing USTs in 1993 and replace them in 1998 with new USTs.

- Alternative II - Replace USTs with new USTs in 1998.

- Alternative III - Replace existing USTs with ASTs in 1998.

- Alternative IV - Remove USTs and close gas station in 1998.

- Uses 1998 alternative costs, four months of projected net contribution in 1998 (after upgrades are completed in mid year), with \$26,000 deducted in losses for re-establishing the customer base after re-opening, and net contribution projections increasing at \$11,452 per year from a net contribution in FY 1998 of \$278,839.

E. CUSTOMER GAS STATION SURVEY

5

The customer survey was conducted to answer three questions; 1) How much do customers value the NEX gas station; 2) Is the gas station a business draw for the main NEX retail store; and 3) Are customers aware of and sensitive to fuel prices? Qualitative rather than quantitative answers were sought.

In March 1993, 600 surveys were randomly distributed through the NPS Student Mail Center to a population of 1,800. By the end of April 1993, 189 surveys had been returned (31.7%). The return rate was lower than expected and this may be a source of bias if neutral or apathetic students did not respond. As a result, fewer students may actually favor keeping the station open than indicated by the surveys.

Using the central limit theorem, an assumed normal population of 1,800 students sampled without replacement, and a finite population correction factor, a 95% confidence level was achieved with plus or minus margins of error from 5.4% to 6.3%. The margin of error depended on the number of possible responses per question, which ranged from two to five. A survey form with the number of responses received (frequency) and percentages for each response block is provided in Exhibit 7. All returned questionnaires were fully answered with no missing cases. Survey comments are compiled in Appendix E. Contingency tables have been developed for

EXHIBIT 7

GAS STATION CUSTOMER SURVEY RESULTS

NEX, NPS, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

MARCH - APRIL 1993

Numbers in blocks are response frequencies received. Percentages are provided for selected questions.

189 Surveys returned out of 600, (31.5%)

1. I am: Active Duty 165, NPS Student 154, Navy 129, Army 11, USAF 0, USCG 3, Other 6 (USMC 4, Dependents 2).

2. I am: male<u>167</u>, female<u>22</u>. 88.4% 11.6%

35.8%

3. Which type of fuel do you normally buy for your vehicle(s)? super unleaded 73 unleaded 120 regular leaded 11

58.8%

5.4%

4. Are you aware of gasoline prices in town compared to exchange prices? Yes 140, No 19, Sometimes 30. 74.1% 10.0% 15.9%

5. How often do you (or your spouse) use the Navy Exchange gas station? Almost everytime I fill-up 145, (76.7%) Sometimes (every few months) 26, Seldom (1 or 2 times per year) 6, Never 12. 13.8% 3.2% 6.3%

If respondent answered "Never" to question # 5, they were dimected to skip to question # 10.

6. How do you feel about the gasoline quality at the Navy Exchange? Good <u>87</u>, O.K. <u>58</u>, Wary <u>10</u>, Poor <u>1</u>, Don't know <u>21</u>. <u>49.2</u>% <u>32.8</u>% <u>5.6</u>% <u>0.6</u>% <u>11.8</u>%

EXHIBIT 7 (CONTINUED)

GAS STATION SURVEY RESULTS

7. When you purchase gas on base, how often do spouse) also shop at the main exchange or outle Always 0, Usually 23, Sometimes 99 Never 3. 0% 13.0% 55.9 1.7%	you (or your st stores? , Seldom 52, 29.4%
8. The exchange gas station benefit is a right Agree 71, Disagree 85, Don't care 2 40.1% 48.0% 11	2 <u>1</u> . .9%
9. If the exchange no longer had a gas station, your spouse) change how frequently you used the and outlets? No change 112, Would shop les 63.3%	would you (or main exchange is often <u>65</u> . 37.7%
10. If the exchange gas station were closed to on base parking (leaving only the mechanics ope you	provide more erating) would
1 <u>3</u> , 2 <u>7</u> , 3 <u>23</u> , 4 <u>44</u> , 5 Strongly Approve Neutral Disapprove Stro Approve Disa	<u>112</u> ongly opprove?
1.6% 3.7% 12.1% 23.3% 59	0.3%
11. How strong are your feelings towards keeping gas station open?	g the exchange
1 113, 2 48, 3 24, 4 2, 5	2
Strongly Approve Neutral Disapprove Stro	ongly
Approve Disa	pprove
59.8% 25.3% 12.7% 1.1% 1.	18
12. Optional Comments84	
44.4%	

79

selected data to investigate relationships of responses. The main research questions addressed by the survey are discussed in the following paragraphs.

1. Customer Value of the Gas Station

Two questions, # 10 and # 11, were directly related to how much customers valued the gas station. Question # 6 was indirectly related to value by asking about the perceived quality of the gasoline. Respondents could conceivably value the service but hold a poor opinion of quality. 145 (76.7%) of the respondents claimed to be frequent users of the station, using it almost everytime they fill-up. The fact that these people are frequent users infers that they value both the product and the service. To investigate this assertion, a contingency table was developed to compare the responses of question # 5 (frequency of station use) to question # 6 (perceived gasoline quality).

Table 11 shows that 125 (86.2%) of the frequent users consider the gasoline quality "good" or "O.K.", and 18 (69.3%) of the respondents who use the gas station "sometimes" felt the gasoline quality was "good" or "O.K.". These survey question results, taken in conjunction with ongoing profitable sales, indicate the gas station is considered a valuable service by the majority of the active duty customer base.

Question # 8 (The exchange gas station benefit is a right) was originally intended to supplement the value issue

CONTINGENCY TABLE

COMPARISON OF NEX GAS STATION CUSTOMER SURVEY QUESTIONS # 5 TO # 6

Question # 6	Almost everytime I fill-up		Sometimes (every few months)		Seldo or 2 per y	om (1 times year)	То	tals
	f	ક	f	ę	f	ક	f	S
Good	80	55.2	7	26.9	0	0	87	49.2
О.К.	45	31.0	11	42.4	2	33.3	58	32.8
Wary	5	3.5	3	11.5	2	33.3	10	5.6
Poor	0	0	1	3.8	0	0	1	0.5
Don't Know	15	10.3	4	15.4	2	33.3	21	11.9
Totals	145	100.0	26	100.0	6	100.0	177	100.0

5. How often do you (or spouse) use the Navy Exchange gas station?

6. How do you feel about the gasoline quality at the Navy Exchange?

Note: Question # 5 also has a response category for "never" using the NEX gas station. These 12 responses were not included in this table because they do not apply to question # 6. by measuring how strongly the customers held their views. Based on comments received, the question cannot be used to draw any conclusions. 21 out of 84 total written comments concerned the use of the word "right" versus what most respondents considered the correct term of "privilege." Many who answered "disagree" did so based on the wording of the question rather than on how strongly they valued the gas station.

a. Close the Gas Station for more Parking

Question \ddagger 10 asked how respondents would feel "If the exchange gas station were closed to provide more on base parking (leaving only the mechanics operating)...." This question was designed to make the respondents consider opportunity costs. The parking lot was used as an example of an alternative use, but this may have misled some of the respondents. 22 of the 84 written comments concerned parking problems on base. Most were strongly opposed to intentionally replacing the gas station with a parking lot. The comments indicated that these respondents may have believed that parking problems were the central point of the survey. Fortunately, question \ddagger 10 was the second to last question in the survey, so previous answers should not have been affected by any shifts in focus that took place.

Summarizing the 189 responses to question # 10, 112 (59.3%) "strongly disapproved," and 44 (23.3%) "disapproved"

of closing the gas station to provide more on base parking. This provides a total approval rating for continued operations of 82.6%. Only ten respondents were negative toward keeping the station open instead of a parking lot; three "strongly approved" and seven "approved" for a total of 5.3%. The remaining 23 respondents were neutral (12.1%).

b. Keep the Gas Station Open

Of the 189 responses to question # 11, "How strong are your feelings towards keeping the exchange gas station open?", 113 (59.8%) "strongly approved," and 48 (25.3%) "approved" of keeping the station open. This provides a total approval rating for continued operations of 85.1%. In contrast, only four respondents were negative about keeping the station open, two "strongly disapproved" and two "disapproved," for a total of 2.2%. The remaining 24 respondents were neutral (12.7%).

c. Gasoline Quality at the NEX

Question # 6, "How do you feel about the gasoline quality at the Navy Exchange?" ties into the value question for the reasons previously stated. Respondents who said they never used the exchange gas station were asked to skip question # 6. Of the 177 responses to this question, 87 (49.2%) said they felt the quality of the gasoline was "good," 58 (32.8%) answered "O.K.," and only 11 (6.2%) felt "wary" or that the gasoline was "poor." The remaining 21 respondents

(11.8%) stated they did not know. A weakness of this question is the assumption that each of the responses provided is on a Likert Scale, equally spaced on the spectrum of choices. This may not be true given the subjective values people place on terms like "good, O.K., wary, and poor."

Overall, the perceived quality of the gasoline is positive. Table 11 shows that 125 (86.2%) of the frequent users consider the gasoline quality "good" or "O.K.", and 18 (69.3%) of the respondents who "sometimes" use the gas station felt the gasoline quality was "good" or "O.K.".

2. Gas Station Affect on Main NEX Store Sales

Two questions were designed to provide insight into how often customers who purchased fuel at the NEX also used the main retail store. The store and the service station are co-located on the base. The questions are: \ddagger 7, "When you purchase gas on base, how often do you (or your spouse) also shop at the main exchange or outlet stores?," and \ddagger 9, "If the exchange no longer had a gas station, would you (or your spouse) change how frequently you used the main exchange and outlets?"

In conjunction with questions # 7 and # 9, question # 5, which considers the frequency of purchases, was reviewed to determine if any one type of customer used the retail store more often than another when purchasing gasoline. If the most frequent gas customers were also the ones who shopped at the

main exchange each time, this would have a greater impact than if those who purchased fuel less often were the ones who usually used the main exchange when purchasing gasoline. Contingency tables were developed to compare responses for relationships.

a. Shopping the Main NEX Store When Purchasing Gasoline

Question \ddagger 7 asked "When you purchase gas on base, how often do you (or your spouse) also shop at the main exchange or outlet stores?" A total of 177 responses were received with no answers in the "always" category, 23 (13%) responded "usually," and 99 (55.9%) indicated "sometimes". Table 12 compares these responses to the frequency of gas station usage in question \ddagger 5. This reveals that 105 (72.4%) of the 145 respondents who said they "usually" and "sometimes" shopped the main exchange when purchasing gas use the gas station "almost everytime." This provides evidence of a link between the gas station and the main exchange. Because people usually purchase gas more often than they go retail shopping, the gas station may be a draw for the retail store. However, the reverse is also possible.

b. Main NEX Store Shopping Without a Gas Station

Question # 9 also intended to provide feedback on the business draw of the NEX gas station for the main exchange. Question # 9 asked, "If the exchange no longer had

a gas station, would you (or your spouse) change how frequently you used the main exchange and outlets?" This question had two possible responses, "no change" and "would shop less often." The majority stated that closing the NEX gas station would not affect how frequently they used the main store, 112 (63.3%). The remaining respondents, 65 (36.7%), claimed they would shop less often. Question five was again used in conjunction with question # 9 to determine which category of customer responded to each choice (see Table 13). 55 (37.9%) respondents who use the gas station "almost everytime" they fill up indicated they would shop the main store less often. Adding in those who claim to use the station "sometimes" indicates that a total of 64 (37.4%) respondents claim they would use the store less often if the station closed.

Finally, questions \ddagger 7 and \ddagger 9 are compared in Table 14. This shows how respondents say their shopping patterns would change if the station no longer had a gas station, in comparison to how often they now shop the main store when purchasing gasoline. Results show that the 122 respondents who "usually" and "sometimes" use the main store when purchasing gasoline are almost evenly split on how a closure of the gas station would affect their shopping. 67 (54.9%) respondents of these two groups would not change their shopping pattern, and 55 (45.1%) would shop the retail store less often.

CONTINGENCY TABLE

COMPARISON OF NEX GAS STATION CUSTOMER SURVEY QUESTIONS # 5 TO # 7

Question # 7	Almost everytime I fill-up		Some (eve: mont)	times ry few hs)	Seld or 2 per	om (1 times year)	То	tals
	f	ૠ	f	₽	f	€	f	÷
Always	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Usually	21	14.5	2	7.7	0	0	23	13.0
Sometimes	84	57.9	13	50.0	1	16.7	98	55.4
Seldom	39	26.9	10	38.5	4	66.6	53	29.9
Never	1	0.7	1	3.8	1	16.7	3	1.7
Totals	145	100.0	26	100.0	6	100.0	177	100.0

5. How often do you (or spouse) use the Navy Exchange gas station?

7. When you purchase gas on base, how often do you (or your spouse) also shop at the main exchange or outlet stores?

Note: Question # 5 also has a response category for "never" using the NEX gas station. These 12 responses were not included in this table because they do not apply to question # 7.

CONTINGENCY TABLE

COMPARISON OF NEX GAS STATION CUSTOMER SURVEY QUESTIONS # 5 TO # 9

Question # 9	Almost everytime I fill-up		AlmostSometimestioneverytime I(every fewfill-upmonths)		Seldo or 2 per y	om (1 times year)	Totals	
	f	8	f	8	f	8	f	8
No change	90	62.1	17	65.4	5	83.3	112	63.3
Would shop less often	55	37.9	9	34.6	1	16.7	65	36.7
Tctals	145	100.0	26	100.0	6	100.0	177	100.0

5. How often do you (or spouse) use the Navy Exchange gas station?

9. If the exchange no longer had a gas station, would you (or your spouse) change how frequently you used the main exchange and outlets?

Note: Question # 5 also has a response category for "never" using the NEX gas station. These 12 responses were not included in this table because they do not apply to question # 9.

CONTINGENCY TABLE

COMPARISON OF NEX GAS STATION CUSTOMER SURVEY QUESTIONS # 9 TO # 7

9. If the exchange no longer had a gas station, would you (or your spouse) change how frequently you used the main exchange and outlets? 2

20

Question # 7	No Change		No Change Would shop less often			Totals		
	f	8	f	f %		8		
Always	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Usually	10	8.9	13	20.0	23	13.0		
Sometimes	57	50.9	42	64.6	99	55.9		
Seldom	42	37.5	10	15.4	52	29.4		
Never	3	2.7	0	0	3	1.7		
Totals	112	100.0	65	100.0	177	100.0		

1

t

f

7. When you purchase gas on base, how often do you (or your spouse) also shop at the main exchange or outlet stores?

These results indicate that the location of the gas station does increase main exchange shopping sales. This further confirms the apparent link noticed while analyzing question # 7. A closure of the gas station could reduce purchases in the retail store by some of the gas station's steady customers. The potential impact of this has not been quantified for two reasons: (1) the total number of customers using the NEX gas station was not reviewed, and (2) the average dollar purchases at the main exchange by gas station patrons is unknown.

c. Effect of a Temporary Gas Station Closure On Overall NEX Sales

In an effort to further investigate the apparent location relationship revealed in the survey analysis, sales figures for the entire NPS Navy Exchange were reviewed from April 1991 through October 1991. \mathcal{F}_{3} previously discussed, the NEX gas station was partially closed during the months of July and September. The figures were reviewed to determine if sales for the Navy Exchange had decreased more than the amount of lost NEX gas station sales. The same months were also reviewed in 1990 to see if sales relationships between the entire NEX and Department J-3, Fuels, were significantly different than in 1991. This data is presented graphically in Figure 4. Department J-5, Automotive Shop, sales during the same periods in 1990 and 1991 were also reviewed to see if the



gas station closures adversely impacted automotive shop sales. This data is presented in Figure 5.

Comparisons of the data do not reveal any connection between sales changes in total NEX sales, Department J-5 and Department J-3. The automotive shop had steady sales and does not appear to have been affected by the shut-downs of the gas station in 1991. Information was not available to determine causes of main NEX sales fluctuations.

Taken in the context of the survey, the gas station may provide some business draw to the main store but the relationship is not strong enough to quantify.

3. Customer Sensitivity to Fuel Prices

In question \ddagger 4, a total of 140 (74.1%) respondents indicated that they were aware of fuel prices in town compared to the exchange. Of the remaining, 19 (10%) answered "no" and 30 (15.9%) said "sometimes." A weakness of the survey was not including a follow-on question to ask if prices govern their decision on where to purchase fuel. Table 15 was developed to compare responses of question \ddagger 5 on the frequency of gas station use to question \ddagger 4 on whether customers are aware of comparative prices. Of those who use the gas station "almost everytime" they fill-up, 109 (75.2%) are aware of comparative prices in town and on base. Combining this category with those who sometimes use the station, 130 (92.9%) are aware of prices in town.



CONTINGENCY TABLE

COMPARISON OF NEX GAS STATION CUSTOMER SURVEY QUESTIONS # 5 TO # 4

Ques. #4	Almost everytime I fill-up		Sometimes (every few months)		Seldom (1 or 2 times per year		Never		Totals	
	f	÷	f	8	f	8	f	8	f	÷
Yes	109	75.2	21	80.8	5	83.3	5	41.7	140	74.1
No	12	8.2	1	3.8	1	16.7	5	41.7	19	10.0
Some- times	24	16.6	4	15.4	0	0	2	16.6	30	15.9
Totals	145	100	26	100	6	100	12	100	189	100

5. How often do you (or spouse) use the Navy Exchange gas station? 2

4. Are you aware of gasoline prices in town compared to exchange prices?

F. VALUE OF SAVINGS RECEIVED FROM SOCIETY

In addition to the main research questions regarding costing practices and upgrade alternatives, rough estimates of consumer savings and tax savings enjoyed by military patrons and the NEX were used to further clarify the value of the fuel service and the cost of providing it. The consumer savings and fuel net contributions measure the total net value of the fuel service. The tax savings measure society's cost to provide this benefit. The intention is to evaluate the cost to society of savings provided to the NEX which are then partially passed along to NEX gas station customers.

The cost exemptions discussed in Chapter IV, Section E, were used as the basis for the tax savings. Actual FY 1992 NEX gas station sales of \$1,799,020 were used to determine sales tax breaks. The following assumptions have been made: Consumer demand for fuel is inelastic over the price per gallon ranges involved; the quantity of fuel sold annually has been held constant at 1,066,000 gallons for regular unleaded, and 365,000 gallons for super unleaded (from a July 1991 through July 1992 NPS student study of fuel volume sold); and cost breaks can be allocated as 75% to regular unleaded fuel, and 25% to premium unleaded based on the distribution of quantities sold.

A summary of consumer and tax savings is presented in Exhibit 8.

EXHIBIT 8

X;

4

NEX GAS STATION CONSUMER AND PRODUCER SURPLUSES PROVIDED BY SOCIETY

ANNUAL ESTIMATED DOLLAR VALUES FY 1992

	CONSUMER	SAVINGS		TAX SUBSIDIES				
	Low	High		Low	High			
Regular Unleaded	10,660	95,940	Regular Unleaded	435,745	440,995			
Premium Unleaded	0	32,850	Premium Unleaded	145,248	146,998			
TOTAL	10,660	128,790		580,993	587,993			

TOTAL NET SOCIAL VALUE OF NEX FUEL SERVICE

CONSUMER SAVINGS + NET CONTRIBUTION - TAX SUBSIDIES

Low Range \$10,660 + \$248,120 - \$580,993 = - \$322,213 High Range \$128,790 + \$248,120 - \$587,993 = - \$211,083

Rounded estimate range: - \$322,000 to - \$211,000 total cost.

NOTES .

- Consumer savings is the total savings provided to NEX gas station customers through lower fuel prices than charged in the civilian market.

- Tax subsidies are the total amount of estimated Federal, state and local taxes and annual fees, insurance premiums, and NPS provided support that the NEX gas station does not pay.

- Cost breaks for tax subsidies have been allocated 75% to regular unleaded and 25% to premium unleaded based on volume. Quantity assumed fixed at 1,066,000 gallons regular and 365,000 gallons of premium unleaded sold from July 1991-1992.

1. Consumer Savings

The consumer savings is provided to NEX gas station patrons from the difference between the average civilian fuel prices and the NEX gas station's prices. The price difference per gallon times the number of gallons sold by the NEX gas station equals the total consumer savings.

The market surveys of gasoline prices in the local area were used for estimated price differentials per gallon. For regular unleaded, savings ranged from 0.1¢ to 9.0¢ per gallon. For premium unleaded, savings ranged from 0¢ to 9.0¢ per gallon. These values times the assumed fuel volumes result in a total consumer surplus of from \$10,660 to \$128,790.

2. Tax Savings

The tax savings are the value of the NEX gas station's tax breaks and subsidies that a comparable civilian service station pays to operate. Included in this analysis are: Federal fuel excise tax of 14¢ per gallon; State fuel excise tax of 17¢ per gallon; State sales tax of 7.25%; Annual environmental liability insurance premiums of \$5,000; Annual workman's compensation insurance premiums of from \$8,000 to \$15,000; and NPS base support of \$1,000 annually for tank testing and \$10,512 of annual depreciation costs for the 1991 vapor recovery upgrade. One time costs for building permits

and the cost of base security and fire protection were not included.

X,

47

According to Exhibit 8, the NEX fuel service has a negative net social value. While this service is profitable to the NEX, contributes funds to MWR and provides consumer savings, these benefits are outweighed by the tax and other subsidies that the NEX receives. While upgrading the fuel tanks is profitable to the NEX, it does not make sense from society's financial viewpoint.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions and recommendations will now be discussed based on the data analyzed, observations made and knowledge gained during the course of the study. Areas are discussed in the same order as addressed in previous chapters.

A. COSTING PRACTICES OF THE NEX GAS STATION

The costing practices and procedures of the Navy Exchange Gas Station are generally sound. Total revisions of \$20,276 were made to the SCO5 Cost Report in this study. Cancelling amounts though resulted in only a 4.2% (\$3,748) increase to total expenses for FY 1992. This represents a 1.5% decrease in total net contribution. These revisions are not material; however, areas of cost accounting that can be adjusted to provide a more accurate and complete cost picture are discussed in follow-on paragraphs.

1. Internal Costing Practices

Accounting can be made more accurate by including traceable costs of support provided by the Naval Postgraduate School. This includes the annual tank testing costs and the capitalization of projects funded by the Naval station.

NEX gas station managers need to be aware of the tendency to over allocate shared NEX costs to Department J-3 because of its relative profitability. Over allocating costs

to Department J-3 may result in poor future business decisions for either the gas station, or other NEX service outlets.

The payroll costs of the service station supervisor should be redistributed to reflect actual effort expended between the gas station, auto mechanics and the automotive parts store. Miscellaneous expenses, such as waste oil disposal costs incurred by the auto mechanic operations, Department J-5, need to be separated from gas station operations.

B. GAS STATION UPGRADE ALTERNATIVES

Alternative II, Replace the USTs in 1998, is the most cost effective alternative. Its 1993 present value of costs is \$245,535. Payback for this alternative is estimated at 17.5 months. This also considers the impact of the time required to rebuild sales volume after re-opening.

Replacing the three USTs in 1993 was dismissed because of the satisfactory operating condition of the station and the realistic time frames needed to plan, develop, and arrange funding for Navy projects. The current gas station arrangement will also allow the NEX to get the maximum use out of their existing assets before the environmental laws require the 1998 tank upgrade.

Alternative III, replace the USTs with ASTs in 1998, was cost prohibitive with 1993 present value costs of \$475,971. Even if the aboveground storage tank option had the lowest
present value cost of the alternatives, it would not be recommended. This alternative is considered too risky to implement onboard NPS. The location and concentration of personnel in the area around the NEX gas station are not compatible with the fire and explosion risks associated with ASTS. In addition to air pollution from gasoline vapors and fire safety concerns, physical space constraints would also make this option difficult to implement.

C. GAS STATION CUSTOMER SURVEY

The survey provided answers to the three questions investigated: 1) How much do customers value the availability of fuel on base; 2) Is the current location of the gas station a business draw for the main NEX retail store; and 3) Are customers aware of and sensitive to fuel prices?

A 95% confidence level with margins of error plus or minus 6.8% was determined for the survey results. Conclusions for each main survey question follow.

1. Customer Value of Gas Station

Respondents were overwhelmingly in favor of keeping the service station in operation. Over 80% of the responses were in favor of continued availability of fuel on base. The NEX gas station's positive net contributions are another indication that customers value the service or they would not be patronizing the station.

2. Gas Station Location Effect on Main NEX Store Sales

According to respondents, the co-location of the main exchange and the gas station appears to increase main exchange shopping sales (and conversely gas station sales). However, this relationship could not be confirmed through a review of NEX sales, gas station sales and automotive shop sales during 1991 shut downs of the gas station. A quantitative value could not be assigned from the results of this study. The total number of customers using the NEX gas station was not collected from gasoline sales receipts, and the average main exchange purchase amount by gas station patrons is unknown.

Qualitative results indicate 72% of the customers who use the gas station almost everytime they fill-up use the main exchange store at the same time either "usually" or "sometimes." Approximately one half of the steady users of the NEX gas station said they would shop in the main exchange less if the station was closed.

3. Customer Sensitivity to Fuel Prices

Survey responses, in conjunction with the results of the local market surveys of gasoline prices at civilian service stations, indicate that NEX gas station customers are aware of price savings afforded by the NEX. They most likely are behaving in a price sensitive manner. Of those who use the NEX gas station "almost everytime" they fill-up, over 70% are aware of comparative prices in the local area.

D. COSTS OF SAVINGS PROVIDED TO THE NEX GAS STATION

The cursory analysis done in this study seems to indicate that the cost to society of savings provided to the NEX gas station outweigh the benefit provided by the NEX gas station. From a purely financial viewpoint, it does not make sense for society to provide these savings through tax and insurance breaks. Rough estimates of the annual net social value of the NEX fuel service are from a negative \$211,000 to a negative \$322,000.

These results may indicate that the NEX gas station is not run as cost efficiently as a comparably sized civilian gas station. The NEX station may be profitable only because of the large profit margins resulting from the subsidies. This is not a surprising conclusion for a subsidized operation. It is also not at odds with the intent of Congress when it authorized the establishment of the NEX system in 1946. The NEX gas station does meet their charter by providing service members with a product of comparable value to what is available in the civilian sector, and it does so without excessively competing with the civilian market.

E. FURTHER RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations in this section are based on problems encountered and observations made in the course of this study.

1. Recommended Changes to Current NEX Practices

a. NEX Record Keeping

The NEX office does not maintain comprehensive sales volume records on gasoline sold beyond what is needed to maintain current inventory records. Handwritten records exist for the current fiscal year, but no distinction is made between regular unleaded and premium unleaded gasoline volumes.

There is currently not a way to determine the actual relationship of past sales dollar amounts to past sales volumes. Attempts to obtain delivery records from the fuel delivery trucking firm were unsuccessful for past year sales volumes. This limits the ability to determine if changes in total sales dollars result from changes in volume sold or from price adjustments. The consumer price index for motor fuels had to be used to analyze past sales dollar levels.

The NEX should begin collecting and compiling monthly sales quantities of each fuel grade sold and their average price per gallon on one consolidated monthly report. Over time, these figures would aid NEX managers in budgeting more accurate sales and gross profit figures. In addition, a history of volume figures would aid in planning future fuel storage upgrades coinciding with the size of the operation.

b. Gasoline Market Surveys

Monthly gasoline market surveys are kept on hand for the current fiscal year, and then the records are moved into storage. However, when an attempt was made to find prior fiscal year's records, only partial records could be found. The surveys are the only known historical source of the sales price per gallon charged for regular unleaded and premium unleaded gasoline. Financial reports do not distinguish between types of fuel in total sales and cost of goods sold. As a result, no analyses of past price changes and their effect on sales volumes can be made at the local level.

The NEX should maintain on hand at least the past four fiscal year's monthly gasoline price data from their market survey forms. This data would be most useful if consolidated with the sales volume figures discussed on the preceding page.

2. Further Research Questions

a. Society's Cost of Subsidizing NEX Gas Stations

The previous section on the loss to society from subsidies provided to the NEX gas station could easily be expanded into thesis level research through a detailed analysis. The dead weight loss to society for the subsidies could be determined by constructing a demand curve that is elastic, instead of the inelastic one assumed in this study. Subsidy values could be further refined and expanded to

include all NEX gas stations. The main research question would be to determine the total dead weight loss to society of subsidizing exchange service stations.

b. Upgrade Funding Source

The question of which Naval activity should fund NEX gas station upgrades was beyond the scope of this study. However, this issue is a point of contention between many Navy Exchanges and station Public Works Departments. The exchanges believe that it is in the base's best interest to provide capital improvement support at no cost to the NEX system. This increases the NEX's ability to contribute MWR funds. Most Public Works Departments are opposed to using limited station funding, sized for existing base facilities, for NEX facilities. NEX facilities are normally not part of station owned property. The arguments presented by both sides could be collected and reviewed for validity. Based on this research, a resulting recommendation could be issued.

c. Siting of the NEX Gas Station

The current location of the NPS NEX gas station is poor from an environmental standpoint. The close proximity to the shores of Del Monte Lake and the high groundwater in the area (six to eight feet below the ground surface) provides strong potential for groundwater pollution and a quick migration of any potential fuel spill into the lake.

In light of the upcoming requirement to replace all NEX gas Station USTs, a study could be conducted to review possible new locations for the gas station. The study should include a market study of customers, site environmental and access studies, construction estimates, etc.

d. Gasoline Product Lines

The NPS NEX gas station does not carry a mid-grade unleaded fuel. Almost all comparable civilian service stations offer three grades of gasoline products: regular unleaded, mid-grade unleaded and super unleaded. A study could be conducted to determine if the addition of this product line would increase the existing customer base enough to make the action profitable.

F. SUMMARY

This study has answered the research questions initially presented. Navy Exchange costing practices at NPS are sound, and with some minor adjustments, an even higher accuracy of record keeping could be attained.

In light of environmental compliance concerns, Alternative II, replacing the underground storage tanks with new ones in 1998, is the best of the three options considered. Present value 1993 costs of this alternative is \$214,451 and the estimated payback is 15.5 months.

The NPS NEX gas station provides a service valued by enough of its potential customer base to make it profitable.

However, a cursory look at the tax subsidies provided to the NEX gas station, by virtue of its status as a federal facility, indicate that cost savings measures should be reviewed in an attempt to cut operating costs and further capitalize on the benefits provided. While no one area has been singled out, total expenses appear higher than what a comparable civilian gas station forced to exist in the market would experience.

The NEX gas station meets the mandates of the Congress and conforms to the policies and procedures of the Navy Exchange system. Continued operations and pursuit of the required 1998 facility upgrade are justified based on the criteria used to evaluate the operation.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- 1. Telephone conversation between Mr. L. Boone, Automotive Business Services manager, Navy Exchange Service Command, and the author, 13 May 1993.
- "History and Development of the Navy Resale System," Navy Supply Newsletter, April 1976.
- 3. Telephone conversation between Mr. L. Boone, Automotive Business Services manager, Navy Exchange Service Command, and the author, of 18 February 1993.
- 4. U.S. Congress, House Committee on Armed Services, Hearings on Sundry Legislation Affecting the Naval and Military Establishments, 81st Congress, 1st Session, 1949.
- 5. U.S. Department of the Navy, Navy Supply Systems Command, Navy Exchange Manual.
- Hearings before the Morale, Welfare and Recreation Panel of the Committee on the Armed Services, House of Representatives, 102nd Congress, held November 6 & 7, 1991, HASC No. 102-24.
- 7. Interview between Mr. George Hunter, NPS NEX Mechanic, and the author, 19 April 1993.
- U.S. Naval Facilities Engineering Command, NAVFAC P-68 Manual, Naval Postgraduate School, Nonterey, CA, Record # 203626.
- Contract N62474-90-C-4906, Install Vapor Recovery System at the Navy Exchange Service Station, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, awarded to Groundwater Resources, Inc. for \$105,123.00 on 6 June 1991.
- Invitation For Bid (IFB) N62474-93-M-2138, Remove Damaged Fiberglass Storage Tank, Navy Exchange Service Station, Nonterey, CA, March 1993.
- 11. Interview between LT R. Carr, Resident Officer in Charge of Construction, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, and the author, 24 March 1993.

12. Contract N62474-91-M-0654, Underground Tank Testing at the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, awarded to Associates Environmental Systems, Inc. for \$2,500.00, 19 February 1991. X,

- 13. Contract N62474-92-M-2969, Underground Tank Testing at the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, awarded to Associates Environmental Systems, Inc. for \$3,080.00, May 1992.
- 14. Draft Retrofit Study of Underground Storage Tanks at the Naval Postgraduate School, Nonterey, CA, Radian Corporation, Irvine CA, July 1992.
- 15. Telephone Conversation between Mrs. Anne Malokas, Fort Ord Use Task Group, and the author, 25 May 1993.
- 16. Telephone Conversation between Mr. Minton, Assistant Service Station Manager, Fort Ord, CA, and the author, 25 May 1993.
- 17. Telephone Conversation between LT R. Carr, Resident Officer in Charge of Construction, NPS Monterey, and the author, 20 May 1993.
- 18. Economic Analysis and Program Evaluation for Resource Management, Department of Defense Instruction 7041.3.
- 19. Department of the Navy (DON) Cost Analysis Program, Secretary of the Navy Instruction 7000.19 series.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Lee G. and Settle, Russel F., Benefit Cost Analysis: A Practical Guide, D.C. Heath and Co., 1977.

Converse, Jean M. and Presser, Stanley, Survey Questions: Handcrafting the Standardized Questionnaire, Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, Sage University Papers, 1986.

Mishan, E. J., Cost - Benefit Analysis, Unwin Hyman Ltd., 1988.

Radian Corporation Report for the Western Division, Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Underground Storage Tank Management Plan for the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, October 1992.

Rea, Louis M. and Parker, Richard A., Designing and Conducting Survey Research, Jossey Bass Inc., 1992.

Schmid, Allan A., **Benefit - Cost Analysis**, Westview Press Inc., 1989.

Schneider, Jeffrey W., A Financial Review of the Navy Exchange Program: 1973 to 1978, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, California, March 1980.

U.S. Department of Commerce, National Technical Information Service, Special Investigation Report: An Overview of a Bulk Gasoline Delivery Fire and Explosion, National Transportation Safety Board, NTSB-HZM-78-1, PB 283 769, Washington DC, February 1978.

U.S. General Accounting Office Report to the Chairman Subcommittee on Environment, Energy, and Natural Resources, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, Hezardous Naste: The Cost and Availability of Pollution Insurance, GAO/PMED 89-6, Washington DC, October 1988.

U.S. General Accounting Office Report to Congress, Superfund: Insuring Underground Petroleum Tanks, GAO/RCED 88-39, Washington DC, January 1988.

U.S. General Accounting Office Fact Sheet for the Honorable Bill Green, House of Representatives, Military Exchanges: Management of Navy Exchanges and Related Issues, GAO/NSIAD 87-25FS, Washington DC, October 1986.

APPENDIX A. ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS

'**X**;

Ŀ.

t

t

(

(

1

4

ŧ

ŧ

COMPILED FROM RADIAN CORPORATION RETROFIT STUDY OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS AT THE NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

JULY 1992

112

•

.

.

.

•

•

•

Summary of Relevant Federal and California New Underground Storage Tank Construction and Monitoring Standards

Regulatory Clathes	Regulatory Standards	Compliance Requirements	Reporting/Record Keeping
40 CFR 280/Ca	liforaia Undergreund	l Storage Taak Regulatious (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280.20(a)	All new tanks and piping shall be	Effective July 1, 1991 for tanks and January 1, 1992 for piping.	UST notification form to local agency (within 30
CCR Article 3 Section 2631	required to have primary and secondary levels	Exterior of tank shall be marked, code stamped, or labeled with system specifications.	Certificate of Compliance for cathodic
	of containment	A primary containment system shall have wear plates below all accessible openings.	protection; cathodic protection analysis required if cathodic
		Secondary containment for multiple primary containers shall be large enough to contain 150% of the volume of the largest primary container.	protection not used.
		If secondary containment is open to rainfall, it shall accommo- date volume of precipitation during a 24-hour, 25-year storm.	
		Secondary containment systems utilizing membrane liners shall be certified by an independent testing organization and be installed under the direct supervision of a representative of the fabricator or certified contractor.	
		All tanks shall provide 100% secondary containment unless equipped with the overfill protection system.	

ł,

*

4

ł

ŧ

ł

ŧ

l

4

RAPIAN

113

•

4-2

•

•

.

•

(Continued)

Regulatery Citation	Regulatory Standards	Compliance Requirements	Reporting/Record Keeping
40 CFR 280/Ca	liferala Underground	Storage Tank Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280.43(g) and 280.44 (a & c)	Monitoring requirements, initial responses,	Exterior surfaces of the underground storage tanks and directly beneath the tank shall be capable of being monitored by direct viewing or by a continuous monitoring system.	
Article 3 Section 2632		Visual inspections shall be performed daily, except on weekends and holidays. Liquid level shall be recorded at each inspection.	
		If liquid is observed during inspection, liquid shall be tested, conduct appropriate integrity test. If leak is confirmed, empty tank and secondary containment.	
		Interstitial space of the tank and the secondary containment system shall be monitored continuously, with a monitoring system connected to an audible and visual alarm system.	
		Automatic line leak detectors shall be installed on underground pressurized piping and capable of detecting a 3-gallon/hour leak at 10 psi.	
		A written routiae monitoring program shall establish the frequency of monitoring, methods and equipment used, location, name and title of personnel, reporting format, preventive maintenance schedule, and training program description.	•

*

X,

4

RADIAN

4-3

114

•

•

(Continued)

Regulatory Cliniton	Regulatory Standards	Compliance Requirements	Reporting/Record Keeping
40 CFR 280/Ca	liferaia Underground	Storage Tank Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280.43(g) and 280.44 (a & c) CCR Article 3 Section 2632 (Continued)		Response plan shall demonstrate that any unauthorized release will be removed from secondary containment. Response plan shall include description of methods and equipment used for removing and disposing of hazardous substances, location and availability of equipment, equipment maintenance schedule, and name and title of personnel	
40 CFR 280.20 (a) CCR Article 3 Section 2633	Alternate construction requirements for new motor vehicle fuel underground storage tanks	Underground storage tanks shall be composed of fiberglass reinforced plastic, cathodically protected steel, or steel clad with fiberglass reinforced plastic. Owner of tank shall demonstrate leak interception and detection system can detect a release before it can escape from containment. Floor of any leak interception and detection system shall be constructed on a firm base sloped to a collection sump of any secondary containment system with backfill in the interstitial space. Leak interception and detection system shall prevent the contact of any leaked hazardous substance with groundwater.	UST notification to local agency (within 30 days). Certificate of Compliance for cathodic protection, cathodic protection analysis required if cathodic protection not used.

4-4

115

RADIAN

•

•

Table 4-1 (Continued)

Reporting/Record Keeping					·		•		
Compliance Requirements	Storage Tank Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	After January 1, 1993, inventory reconciliation and other leak detection method that utilizes manual stick readings shall not be used where groundwater is less than 20 feet below the bottom of the tank.	Manual stick readings shall not be used after December 22, 1998.	Meters used for inputs and withdrawals shall comply with CCR, Title 4, Chapter 9, Subchapter 1.	Quantity measurements shall be based on liquid level measuremeats which are performed during periods of no additions or withdrawals, performed by trained personnel, determined by equipment capable of measuring to the full range of taak's height and to the mearest one-eighth of an inch, measured at the center of the longitudiaal axis of the taak, and volume measurements on a calibration chart.	Monthly variations exceeding 1% of the monthly tank delivery plue 130 gallons must be investigated.	The owner shall, on an anguel basis, submit a statement to the local agency which states all investory reconciliation data. The owner shall notify local agency of a suppected unauthorized release within 24 hours.	A written routine procedure shall be prepared and specify methods for determinaing possible unsuthorized releases.	A response plan for an unauthorized release shall be developed prior to the task system being put into service.
Regulatory Standards	liferaia Underground	Monitoring and response plan standards for new motor vehicle fuel	storage tanks						
Regulatary Citation	40 CFR 280/Ca	40 CFR 280.41 CCR Articles 3 & 4	and 2646						

4-5

Ī

116

RAPIAN

(Continued)

Regulatory Clastery	Regulatery Standards	Compliance Requirements	Reporting/Record Keeping
40 CFR 280/Ca	aliferala Underground	Sterage Tank Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280.20 (d), 280.30	Installation and testing requirements for	All tanks shall be tested at the factory before being transported.	Maintain cathodic protection test results of last 3 inspections.
280.31, and 280.41 (b) CCR	new underground storage tanks and piping	Outer surface of tanks and piping constructed of steel shall be protected from corrosion by cathodic protection or a protective coating or clading.	Certification of Compliance for
Section 2635		Before and after installation, all tanks and piping shall be tested for tightness. All secondary containment systems shall pass a post-installation test.	
		All tanks subject to flotation shall be anchored.	
		A secondary containment system is not required for vapor recovery piping, vent piping, or tank riser piping provided the primary containment system is equipped with an overfill prevention system. Secondary containment is not required for suction piping if it operates at less than atmospheric pressure, is sloped toward tank, or no valves or pumps are installed in the line.	
		All underground storage tanks shall be equipped with a spill coataiser and an overfill prevention system.	
		Secondary containment system shall include leak interception and detection systems.	
		Owners shall certify that the installer has been trained and certified by the state licease board and tank and piping manufacturers.	

4-6

117

RAPIAN



*

x,

4

*

118

ŧ

Summary of Relevant Federal and California Existing Underground Storage Tank Monitoring Standards

Regulatery Citation	Regulatory Standards	Compliance Requirements	Reporting/Record Keeping
40 CFR 280/Call	fornia Underground Sta	rage Tank Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280.41 (a)	Monitoring program requirements	Owners of existing tanks shall implement a monthly monitoring program which is capable of detecting any unauthorized release.	Submit monitoring program plan to local
Article 4 Section 2641		Underground piping shall be exempt from the monitoring program if the local agency determines that the piping operates at less than atmospheric pressure, is sloped toward the tank, and no valves or pumps are installed in the piping.	
		Tank systems shall be exempt from visual monitoring if a portion of the tank is not accessible for direct viewing, visual inspection would be hazardous, or the tank is at a facility not staffed on a daily basis. All tank systems exempt from visual monitoring shall include non-visual monitoring.	
		The monitoring program must be approved by the local ageacy.	
		Equipment and devices used in the monitoring program shall be installed, calibrated, operated, and maintained in accordance with manufacturer's instructions.	
		When an unauthorized release is indicated during the installation of a release detection system, the installation operation shall cease.	•
		When an unauthorized release may have occurred, the owner shall replace, repair, or close the tank.	-

*

H,

4

4-8

8

•

119

0

RAPIAN



*

120

Table 4-2 (Continued)

Regulatory	Regulatory		Reporting/Record
40 CFR 280/Call	iferaia Underground Sto	rage Tank Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280.40, 280.41 (a),	Non-visual monitoring/ quantiative release	Tank monitoring shall be conducted monthly and be capable of detecting a release of 0.2 gallon per hour; or annually and be capable of detecting a release of 0.1 gallon per hour.	Hard copy record generated and kept for one year.
200-53 (c & d), and 200-44 (n) CCR Article 4 Section 2643	detection methods	Piping monitoring shall be conducted hourly and be capable of detecting a release of three gallons per hour; and monthly and capable of detecting a release of 0.2 gallon per hour; or anaually and capable of detecting a release of 0.1 gallon per hour.	Submit performance claims and how determined; maintain records for 5 years.
		Any piping systems operating at less than atmospheric pressure shall be monitored every three years and be capable of detecting a release of 0.1 gallon per hour.	Maintain documentation of servicing for 1 year.
		Each quantitative release detection method, with the exception of inventory reconciliation and manual tank gauging, shall have a performance standard certification.	Maintain manufac- turers schodules of required servicing for 5 vents
		The task owner shall notify the local agency 48 hours prior to conducting any task integrity test.	Maintain results for t war
		If an automatic tank gauge is used as a method of release detection, the automatic tank gauge shall generate a hard copy of all data.	Report to local agency.

×,

R,

4

121

4-10

RAPIAN

RAPIAN

Table 4-2 (Continued)

Remistery	Regulatery		Reporting/Record
Clatics	Standards	Compliance Requirements	Keeping
CFR 280/Cali	ferala Underground Ste	rage Taak Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
CFR M and	Non-visual monitorine/	Vadose zone monitoring. See Section 2647.	Submit performance claims and how
	qualitative release detection methods	Groundwater monitoring. See Section 2648.	determined; maintain records for 5 years.
tion 2644			Maintain documentation of servicing for 1 year.
			Maintain maaufacturers schedules of required servicing for 5 years.
			Maintain results for 1 year.
			Report to local agency.
CFR 0.41 (a) and	Manual tank gauging and testing	Used as part of non-visual monitoring for tanks with capacities less than 2,000 gallons.	
		Shall not be used on tanks with secondary containment.	
tion 2645	-	Owners who utilize manual tank gauging shall conduct weekly gauging for 36 continuous hours.	

4-i1

122

*

\$

H)

Table 4-2 (Continued)

Regulatory Citation	Regulatory Standards	Compliance Requirements	Reporting/Record Keeping
40 CFR 280/Cali	ifernia Underground Ste	rage Taak Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280.41 (a) CCR Article 4 Serricle 4	Inventory Reconciliation	After January 1, 1993, inventory reconciliation and other leak detection methods that utilize manual stick readings shall not be used where groundwater is less than 20 feet below the bottom of the tank.	Written routine procedures shall be prepared.
		Manual stick readings shall not be used after December 22, 1998.	
		Tanks shall be monitored individually using an inventory reconciliation system that takes into account separate daily measurements for hazardous substance and water layer, daily input and withdrawal readings, and checking of product inputs indicated by delivery receipt by measurement of the tank inventory volume before and after delivery.	
		Meters used for inputs and withdrawals shall comply with CCR, Title 4, Chapter 9, Subchapter 1.	
		Quantity measurements shall be based on liquid level measurements which are performed during periods of no additions or withdrawals, performed by trained personnel, determined by equipment capable of measuring to the full range of tank's height and to the nearest one-eighth of an inch, measured at the center of the longitudinal axis of the tank, and volume measurements based on a calibration chart.	•
		Monthly variations exceeding 1% of the monthly tank delivery plus 130 gallons must be investigated.	
		The owner shall, on an annual basis, submit a statement to the local agency which states all inventory reconciliation data. The owner shall notify local agency of a suspected unauthorized release within 24 hours. A written routine procedure shall be prepared and specify methods for determining possible unauthorized releases.	

*

\$

IJ,

z

RAPIAN

123

4-ì2

	_
Ņ	2
Ą.	Ž
<u>e</u>	
ā	Ē
Ē	2
-	۳

Regulatery Citation	Regulatery Standards	Compliance Requirements	Reporting/Record Keeping
40 CFR 280/Call	ferala Underground Ste	rage Taak Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280.43 (e) and	Vadose zone monitoring	Vapor monitoring, soil-pore liquid monitoring, or a combination may be used.	Locations approved by local agency.
CCR Article 4 Service 7447	ieduit entento	Vadose zone monitoring shall not be the sole release detection method.	
		Vadose zone vapor monitoring shall be conducted continuously.	
		Monitoring points shall be located within the excavation backfill and locations will be approved by the local agency.	
40 CFR 280.43 (f) and 280.44 (c) 2CR Article 4 Section 2648	Groundwater monitoring requirements	Groundwater monitoring may be used with other release detection methods or as the sole release detection method where subtance stored is immiscible with water, has a specific gravity of less than one, at least one-eighth of an inch of free product can be detected with monitoring devices, groundwater level is less than 20 feet deep, hydraulic conductivity of soil is at least 0.01 cm/sec, groundwater has no beneficial use, and wells are located within the tank ercevation zone.	
		Minimum well requirements include 2 wells for single tank, 3 wells for 2 or 3 tanks, and 4 wells (2 downgradient) for 4 or more tanks. Wells for pipelines will be determined by the local agency.	
		Groundwater monitoring shall be conducted continuously or at least monthly.	•

4-13

124

RAPIAN

*

Table 4-2 (Continued)

•

•

•

Regulatery Citaties	Regulatory Standards	Compliance Requirements	Reporting/Record Keeping
40 CFR 280/Call	iferaia Underground Sto	rage Taak Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280.43	Well construction and sampling	All wells and borings shall be logged for soil type according to the USCS with all wet zones logged.	Records of qualitative release
CCK Article 4 Section 2649	requirements	Soil samples shall be collected from all borings unless the local agency waives this requirement.	detection methous are included in permit records.
		All tools and equipment shall be steam cleaned and samples of well supplies retained for 90 days.	
		If evidence of contamination is detected, drilling shall be halted.	
		The highest anticipated water levels shall be determined by existing data or one downgradient boring.	
		All wells shall extend 20 feet below the water table and 15 feet below the bottom of the tank but shall not penetrate impermeable zones thicker than 5 feet. Screens will extend 5 feet above the water table. All wells will have bottom caps, filter packs, scals, and well head security. Wells will be developed 72 or more hours following construction.	
		Vadose zone wells will follow the same construction standards as a groundwater well, but will be above any free water zones and at least 5 feet below the bottom of the tank.	
		Qualitative release detection methods shall include consistent sampling and analytical procedures and be included in the permit records.	•

4-i4

.

125

•

002 - Cutherin Code of Regulation OTR - Code of Potent Regulation NOTL: Many andreas of the COX, The 23 Under

** 40 CFR 280.

Samp Tak Re

RAPIAN

X)

Summary of Relevant Federal and California Undergound Storage Tank Upgrade Requirements

Regulatery Citation	Regulatory Standards	Compliance Requirements	Reporting/Rocard Keeping
40 CFR 280/Ca	illfornin Underground Si	iorage Taak Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280.21 (b)	Underground Storage Tank	All tanks shall be retrofitted with secondary containment before December 22, 1998.	
Article 6 Section 2662	Constrants Requirements	Owners of steel tanks shall retrofit those tanks with secondary containment or provide interior lining and exterior cathodic protection by December 22, 1998.	
		The interior lining (coating) shall be applied in accordance with nationally recognized engineering practices. The lining shall be inspected by a coatings expert within 10 years of lining and every 5 years thereafter.	
		All cathodic protection wells must be constructed in accordance with applicable state and local well regulations. Field-installed cathodic protection systems shall be designed and cartified as adequate by a corrosion specialist.	
		The cathodic protection systems shall be tested under the direction of a cathodic protection tester within 6 months of installation and at least every 3 years thereafter.	
		Impressed current cathodic protection systems shall also be impected not less than every 60 calendar days by a cathodic protection tester.	
1 (a yh ar -1 ;		Tanks protected with glass fiber reinforced plastic contings, composites, or equivalent non-metallic exterior contings or coverings including conting/secrificial anode systems, shall be terend using an electric resistance holiday detector and shall be checked every 3 years.	

.

*

*

×,

4

4-15

126

•

RADIAN

(Continued)

Regulatery Citation	Regulatory Standarda	Compilance Requirements	Reporting/Record Keeping
CFR 280/Ca	liferala Usderground St	orage Tank Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
0 CFR 10.21 (d)	Spill and Overfill Prevention Fouriement Unerade	All tank systems shall have an overfill prevention system on or before December 22, 1998.	
urticle 6 Action 2663	Requirements	The owner must prevent releases due to spilling or overfilling. The owner must easure that the volume in the tank is greater than the volume of product to be transferred to the tank before the transfer is made.	
) CFR 10.21 (c) CR	Underground Pressurized Piping Upgrade	All underground pressurized piping not containing motor vehicle fuel shall be retrofitted with secondary containment by December 22, 1998.	
stricts o oction 2664		All underground pressurized piping containing motor vehicle fuel installed on or before January 1, 1984 shall be retrofitued with necondary containment unless the piping is constructed of fiberglass reinforced plastic, cathodically protected seeel, or other corrosion resistant materials no later than December 22, 1998.	
		All underground pressurized piping shall be equipped with automatic line leak desectors so later than December 22, 1990.	
		All underground pressurized piping and secondary containment shall be tested for tightness annually.	

4-16

127

III 10 CTR 280. ł 1 ļ 000- Others Cate of Reprints CRB- Cate of Parity Reprints HOTE: Many series of the COL, The 23 Us Ar,

t,

4

ł

ŧ

t

RAPIAN

Summary of Relevant Federal and California Underground Storage Tank Permanent Closure Requirements

•

.

•

Regulatory Citation	Regulatory Standards	Compliance Requirements	Reporting/Record Keeping
40 CFR 280/Ca	liferaia Underground St	orage Tank Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280.71	Permanent Closure Requirements	All residual liquids, solids, or sludges shall be removed and handled as a hazardous waste or recyclable material.	Notify local agency of tank reuse.
Article 7 Section		The tank shall be inerted to levels that shall preclude explosion or lower levels required by local agency.	Closure report to local agency.
(0)7/07		Proper disposal of the tank shall be documented to the local agency.	
		For tanks destined for a specific reuse shall advise the local agency of name of the new owner, location of use, and nature of use.	
40 CFR 280.71	Permanent Closure Requirements (In-	All residual liquids, solids, or sludges shall be removed and handled as a hazardous waste or recyclable material.	
Article 7 Section 2672(c)		All piping associated with the tank shall be removed. For removal which might damage structures or other pipes in a common treach, the piping shall be emptied and capped.	
		The tank shall be filled with an inert solid.	
40 CFR 280.71 CCR	Permanent Closure Requirements (Sampling)	The owner of a tank being closed shall demonstrate to the local agency that no unauthorized release has occurred and shall be based on soil and/or water analysis.	
Article 7 Sectione 2672(d)		Soil samples shall be taken immediately beneath the removal portions of the tank, a minimum of 2 feet into native material at each end of the tank. A separate sample shall be taken for each 20 lineal feet of trench for piping.	

10-51-501-902/mm (van/2061-1-1-10

*

\$

X,

4

ł

4-17

•

128

RADIAN

(Continued)

Regulatory Citation	Regulatory Standards	Compliance Requirements	Reporting/Record Keeping
40 CFR 280/Ca	diforaia Underground St	lorage Taak Regulations (CCR, Title 23)	
40 CFR 280 71	Permanent Closure Requirements	If the tank is not removed, at least one boring shall be drilled as close to the tank midmint as mossible utilizing a slant boring	Notify local agency in 24 hours if release
CCR Article 7	(Sampling) Continued	or vertical borings drilled on each long dimensional side of the tank.	detected.
Section 2672(d) Continued		Samples will be collected a minimum of every 5 feet.	
		If the depth to groundwater is less than 20 feet below ground surface then a well shall be installed adjacent to the tank in the verified downgradient direction.	
		Soil and/or water samples shall be analyzed for all constituents and their breakdown or transformation products previously stored in the tank.	
		If sampling has detected an unauthorized release, the owner `	

4-18

129

RADIAN

APPENDIX B. SCO5 FINANCIAL REPORTS

NAVY EXCHANGE, DEPARTMENT J-3, FUELS, NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL, NONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

FY 1988 - 1992

			-	••	-	•_	•	•		•	ġ	: :	;	:	2	•	:			2	÷	2	23						8.	6.2	. 3			:			•			:			;	:	.;	Ļ		i.	2	:	Á	ř	i)
5		19	ŀ		1323		DAAC	-SX	-			114			20195	40505		1201			ica.		2117		-			101	572				101	100		74.39	-	2820		52.10	1992	-					+	$\left \right $		1		-	F
0		233	ŀ		1		100	20				ľ			ñ	ř							RL.	Ä			T	181	2	Ţ		T	101	a			•				2				1		F				Ť	1	н 11
8 2		2		ŀ	2	2.50	269	29.7	8	뎕	च		ţ	Į		E.	7	Ę		1	Ę	F	۶	7			ţ,	ž	ž	벽	7	ŧ	2	3	1	F	i i	-	ţ	1	Ę	9	1		1	1	Ŧ	Ħ	Ħ		Ŧ	ŧ	Ħ
081021	DEPT LONG	Ĭ			2193	42080	10.79	427.91	050	2397		10201			12.00	27769	117320	052201				2400	I	282			Contract of	1200.1	1511	2027		20425	12940	11111		100	17300			Ĩ	22	1225					ł					+	F
11	î,		ļ	ļ	Ļ			ľ	Ĵ	1					Ŀ			1	1		Ĺ				1	[Ļ	Ľ	Ц]	1	ļ	L	Ц]							1	ļ]		Į	Ц	H		1		
1	CLATION	2.3		ļ	Ļ	\square		-	Ĩ	1	1	1	1	1	Ĺ]	ľ	ľ	Ľ		1]]	1	Ļ	Ļ	Н]	4	ŀ	Ľ	Ц]	ļ]	Ц		Ţ	ļ	Ц]	+	Ŧ	H	Ц	Ц	4	Ŧ	H
	ours of Part	Ì				121	1		011							961	2200					8	1111	â			JCE!			1280	- -	3040					1400				-					- - - -	+					- - - -	
		0	t	ł	r	7	7	1	ក	Ħ	#	칶	ŧ	ł	ŀ	h		đ	1	d:	Įŝ	۶	3	7	׆	ŧ	¢	P	۶	8	4		1	1	Ţ	ķ	F	ą	ŧ		٦	4	ŧ	1	1	Ŧ	Ŧ	F	Ħ	Ħ	Ŧ	Ť	Ħ
	Ma Condici	Ĭ			F	0007	210	2491	900						8	201	6400					8		198	8		100	2002	2930	OFT.				Ę	8	100	000	1001			- 46-	8										-	Ē
w) f o	0 1	9.	+	F	Ļ			G	-	4	4	$\frac{1}{2}$			12		H	-	1			F	2	3		Ę	ŧ	-						k	╈		F	H	4		K	-	╈	╂	H	÷	ŧ	F	\mathbf{H}	Н	+	+	H
LEACT M	10165 101	Ĭ	1.	10201	6061		22079	12242		88	2	1			208	165		5777					1402	15146				1000/	19620	-				Ę				RELLI		1261	134						+					+	+4
-		9.		ļ	}			ľ		-}		1		1	j.	Ľ,	H				t	Ļ	Ļ	1				l,	ļ					ļ	1		Ļ	H	1		H			H	4	-	4	ŧ	Ļ	H	1	╀	
	-	-							d]].			a					ļ	Ļ		1	1	1			-	4				1			1							Н	+	+	ł	╀	Н	H	╉	H
	00144	Ī				12000	10011	1 9242	999	120	9					2	2026	NNE						1.623	2				1221	1				126	2						1.00	1942				-		ł			-		ţ
	t.	2	T.	R	8	ļ	×.	996	ğ	1021	3	3		Ţ	ļ	ξį	Ξ	8	4		ł	18	ľ	9.86	7	3	ŧ	Į	G	R	ষ		ŧ	Зř	ä	\$	R	F	ą	Į	202	Ŗ	ł	Ī	Г	-	7	F	T	T	-	Ŧ	F
r ufrick	CAOSS PROF				1 2010	0057(1	174150	199991-	2700	0622	2005	005001		02100	1 1022	26425	021201	160509	TINOT			000001	11000	70212	1 3200			1.52	16207	0000				20105	1 2600		60000				SC121 -	9024			•	-			Ţ		-	-	F
TILE JULIUM	5445	internet			0001	11-200	170204	10,939.0	9400	2380	513	114600				1100	1255400	1000201				100001	0000	1.55212.1	100201				160134	0000		+ 223+		077701	10200		1501001	17 (103			10124	230900			-	-	-+ 				•	-+	
HAVE EXCHAN	41 4051	107						1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	•••	LOIL	1921				1						+		Carry and the	A DAMAGE AND							212 -	1 202			-1						12002		ļ			-							
A 821	Appinion		ļ	T va v		F	-		-	2210	- SCEL	T	Ţ		1000	197551										1202			1	-	10112	142	The second second						ļ		2000		1,	× x × x ×		•	22.22				•		
:C05		DEPT							j	;								;		i					i	1				Ì	1			1 1 1 1	j			Ķ	:											Į	5		1
	1.	•••	Ţ	~	<u>_</u>	, 	-	_	Ļ	~	~	, -	-	Ť	÷	Ļ	-		1	_		,	_	-	_	_	-		-	Ļ	_	*	_	_	L		-	-	1	_	-	_		1	-	-			Ť	-	-		

		- •	• •	٠	•	•	•	• •			_7		-	Ξ.	<u> </u>			~		÷.,			5				<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		۰ā.	ىھ	نە					_	ق ا	_					ک ا	à.	÷.,	ھے	ă.	ن ھ	
- D5	-	-			2005	2005	-	101	2919				1001	36135		200		7840	2005					191			-	-	-ue				1000			12020	•	-		F					F	F		Ī	-	-	$\left[\right]$
					3	100	-	2	2					ž				2	42					£			-	5	7		ļ	ſ	2		Ī			T		F						F		1-		-	
21		R		1	ž	287	9	2	뷳	퇴		1	43	2	7	2	ł	E	4	ŧ	5	ţ۶		5	ų		12	Ę	1	막	ł	I	2	F	ŝ	1	f	T	╡	F	Ħ	H	Ŧ	1	F	Ħ		1-	F	F	ī
120180	100 DAMA	50.92	1301		46143	40179	719	1446	2237	19261			0150	627	125666	196932		109	-509	6522			- 20	1 2028	92424	28/60		3198	1 22	12151	0700	1 125	1016 1	421				-					-		·					-	
1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2.5		t	t	T	·	7				1	ו	ſ	F		ſ	1		7	7			1	-		1	1	-	- 0		Ī		2	1		1]	-	1					-	Ī	Ī]	Ī		
E ACIN BERGU	autors	م		- 5	-	9	57	90	-	80	407			6.4	3440	466		194	172	3760	2362			-	1200				-	120		600	1 297	322	2002	1948		-	- -				-		•				- -	-	
1	5.5	2	272	1	17	Ĩ	2	2	2	3			1	F	٦	2	뫼	¢۵	۶	-	ង		15	5	9	ਸ :	15			2	7	R	4				ſ	-	-	F	Ē	Γ	-	-	ſ			1	-	-	
REV CA	1 MILLION	522	261		- 896	2670	292	-	116	3496	+			904	7632	29582		. 527	1329	3026	3026			325	BCS)	505		120	990.	1269	2010	321	1 142		1961	15821		-					-	-		ļ					-
NON L	515	•			ħ	129	ŀ	ē	120	1	3	2	. 19	P	Ħ		হ :		Ē		1	-	1	٢	Ħ	4	1	8	٩		Ţ		ĥ	q	Ţ	8	1	-	-	Ŧ	T	11	-	-	Ŧ	t	Π	T	1-	Π	
13V	1 Million		(683)		23605	6/002	-	106	606		10130	12212		288		12816	52221	1004	256	-	16469	COCFI	S.	000		2495			191		2759		. 592	156		14821		•	-					-							F
	¢. *	720	9	1	ģ	ē	3	461	22	663	ខ្ល	Ģ		19		2	1		5	3	779				7	20		Įē		202			2.07		B			[]	-	Ŧ	Ι		-	-	-	T			-	ľ	
1100144	AMONUM 1	242	1000		100500	100215	2412	101	4200	53853	45402	2071		7656	58622	17925 .	3 1 4 6 6		5245	9334	62829	2021	1902	1961	20102	28757	29952	166. 1	101	19295	10680	1996	1276	1912 .	0000	64950		•	-	- -		.		-							
	513	0.6	996		5	16	66	56	1020	879	870	592	1	1	BFI	191			8	10001	8	믥		15	P	1.	Į	1		R	2	12	Ş	S		ទុ		1	-	Ŧ	T	1	F	-	-	T	Π		- -	Ī	ľ
at UPFICE	Incom	11110	1655	ESCHI	606271	174160	7296	5893	7790	. 84647	72176	95609	10262	110.2	194402	285290	200509	212	6178	96932	106242	22000	1975		112-8	68674	1/200	1908	229	37655	22082	110	9344	1 6004	202332	11/1501			-	- -				-	-						
RVICES SUPPO NGE DIVISION ENTAL OPERA	THURSDAY &	1 1454			1 7 7405	179794	6200	6365	7590	96129	99298	10001	107.70	0440	8182EC1	1369788	1950164	400	6170	26932	106242	06599			17 1137	BC65ET	TENED		3682	19626	5327	10725	1 15382	1221	1805091	236146			-					-				-	• •		ŀ
ESALE AND SET NAVY EXCITA VICE DEPARTM	>	-	1.021	9001				2593	COBE				-											10101				5115 1	2112				9506	- 5325	1			•	•					-					-		
NAVY R	3 .	-	1472			-		2706	2210		1		-									•		1011	<u> </u>				2175	Manager and Party			1 2097	1 622				-	-					-	THE LOCAL COLOR						
6	EPT	i	ļ				İ	ļ		:	i i	!	i		;		!		;		ļ				ł		!			I		!	1	i			!	I	**			1	I		:		1				!
8	ð	Ļ		5	-	•	Ĺ		5	-]		2	-		ļ		5	2		ļ					Ι	i	1			ļ	:	1	-		Ļ	1	Ĭ			Ļ				-	Ļ				2

NAV	RESALE AND S	PRVICES SUPPO	AL OFFICE	ŕ							Į į	1	J 1061 0			Γ
8	ERVICE DEPARTI	MENTAL OPERA	LTIONS				ALEACT 1	UNI	REV. CA		Ĭ	1	21.	18 NE	2	05
in Date	041 41 5051	Ĩ	- 4048 8404-		1 NDMAN 4	1			Oligin Danger		LOL WING		MI 0491 CD		1	
3	•	in Charl	Ĩ	°		2.5	in the second		Ĩ	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Ĩ		-	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		1
. .	-	1 7200	10808	Ş	12172	2	-	-	. 160	1	•	ſ	7256	291	-	-
2	979	14525	14482	56	7466	ş	C851	벽	259	٩	-	- 1	5163	Ŗ	2	
5	2	29921	SEOL	텱	1908	3	1983	3	261	1		J	1062			
		00571	197424		20414		1	ţ	6672	1		1				
				1				ł		1		1				
				9				ł		ł		ľ			•	-
						Į		h				ſ				
				i,		ş		S,				Ĩ				
									1	Ŧ		Ì				
ſ				ł				T		ľ		1				
				2	14002		OK STATE	-	120	1		1				
1. S.			BILLEZ	Ę	20141					1		9				
-			0.22			s		ľ		1		ŀ			-	-
122	20429			ļ		R		ľ		ſ		ſ	PE BOZ			
1200	0 1 13346	10269		H	1400	¢,		P	590	4		Ī	05/16			
		1221221		ł				Ť		ľ		I	149223			
			001122	1		ŧ		1		ľ		1				
	A CARAGE STATE		00.241.2			9		1		1		ľ				
-					0725		-	-	221	۲	-	5				-
-		2000	202	g	100	2	5	-	122	5		Ĩ		2		
-	-	-101	12	뎡	1611	5	30	F	827	4		1	8		2	
	and the lite work with a	10(400	104400	g	12100	2			2000	q		9	5500			
12. A. S.	The Real Property lies in	786711	1706711	g	20447	2	. 16623	7	10520	2	2119	1	18176	ž		â
ALC: NOT THE REAL PROPERTY OF	State and the state	106242	106242	1000	65629	3	19462	3	2026	٩	1982	٦	22541 1	P	2	282
-	-	0008	1 4500	8	2642	202	-	-	200	8	-	•	1 1324	5	-	-
1 2741	1 25205	10616	1186	494	2213	201	977	52	1 219	2	-	-	1 7936	117	EL .	5244
1702	1 15039	0512	2642	264	2041	201	905	5	1 312	H	-	-	57	F	14	Dec
and the second	1 J. R. W. W. L. W.	149762	74879	90	36458	241		-	2400	2	-		30479	204		-
1. 1. A.	Contract of the second	156.544	01628	52	30265	ž	1120	9	2034	2	-	Ĺ	43022	27.5	1.81	1946
S. 44	" 2 martin to the second second	100001	62674	9	28767	202	7495	X	3635	X	2		1 28768	200		173
-	-	3000	1221	8	109	į	-	-	1 (100	8		Ē	1 534	102		-
			296	Ş	000	ļ	-	8	1 778	8	-	[1220	S	e	and a
				5	-	Ş	-	ľ	120	ľ	-	F	9816	5	F	
	A NUMBER OF A DESCRIPTION		1 26424	P	-			F	80	۴	 -	F	13564	I	F	ŀ
		55004	21492	E CE	10049	1	2750	2	967)	H		ſ	6052	101	Y	6690
	1	62627	22002	2	106801	2	2759	2	2016	-		ľ	6026	3	5	5.00 C
	-	1	0000	2	3240	22	-	-	440	F	200	ſ	1784	144		-
	7 1 10835	1000		3	1.22	ļ	5594	2	928	ř	228	Ē	5094	292	X	
				Į		Ņ	-	ľ	-	ľ	1901	8	1011		F	
								Ŧ		ľ		ľ		ţ		
		24 7000	140790	f	04000	5		F		Ť		Î				
	States and a second	250910	136708	5	54345	2	15231	9	1221	1	202	1	ZAKE			
1. 1. A. A. E.		231.002	117261	2	54950	R	19851	9	12021	٩		7	36.063	1	2	22
-				1		1		1		1		1		1		
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	2. Bankaratel	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	1			F		F		F		ſ			-	F	F	
			Ī	F		ŧ-		F		ſ						
				ſ		t		ŀ		F		ľ				
				t		t		ľ		ſ		ſ			1	1
				Ţ.		t	-	ſ		ſ	.	1-		+		ŀ
				t	+	t		Ī		ŀ	.	Ī	-		ŀ	
				t		t		Ŧ		F	ŀ	F		F	F	F
•				T		-		ł		F		Ī		ł	Ŧ	
				1		+		1		T		Ī		+	t	T
				1		1		1		1		1		1		1
i		1	-	7		-		1		1		1		+		
	-	-	-	-	•	-	-	•	-	-		-	-	•	-	-
-		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		•	-	-	-	-
┝			-	ŀ	-	F	-	F		F		Ē	-	-		
				ŧ		t	Ī	Ŧ		F	[Ē		ŧ	F	F
			-		-	-	-		-		i					

			IESALE AND SE	RVICES SUPPC	AT OFFICE				(1					1	
	ر د		VICE DEPARTM	ENTAL OPERA	LIONS			ź	ACAL FR	2 73			Ĭ	1			,	500
	μ	and at the	1 41 COST	50465	OBS SOUD	-	PAVBOLI				OTHER DIALC		DUNE DEPHIC	-	MET OFFICE			
8	L.		3	in con	I	2,3	MOUNT	2.3	- MONT	•		•	-	2,	-	•		i i
Г	İ	-	ŀ	COME 1	C1121 -	3	001	5	P.O.	1		ŀ		Ī			-	-
	1	ZORA	100	11921	1222	i.	100	Ş	C277	F	1046	ľ		F		ł	÷	1
	÷	8	9/6	14525	14102	è	7466	1	1593	19	250	ľ		F		ľ		
	1			9236.61	177.229	8	101012	2	25191		2005			I		1		
	i		ŀ	174720	169505	02.6	10916	956	2 1090	5	4720	1		Ī		ļ		
	!		ŀ	179178	179066	5	64066	ŝ	2.079	ľ	MAN	1		ľ		ļ		
г	İ	-	-	8	946	ľ	GOC.	ŝ	120	ľ	-	ŀ	•	ľ		ľ	-	•
		-	-			ſ			-		-	1		ľ				
						ĥ	10.00	ł		ľ		1		Ť				
				20120		ľ		1		1				ľ			1	
								ſ			OF A		5	1	10210			
					10001						ZEAL			Î	2.522	2	22	
Т						ľ	AND A	ł		ľ	9717	ſ	đ	٩	797		2.8	Â
					2072								: - -	ľ	10260		- 1	-
						f		ł		ľ					6/100			401
								ł		ľ		1		Ī				
	Ţ			Case .		I	1000	ľ		ľ		ľ		I				
						-		1		Ī				1	19/000			
Т	İ					Į		ľ	5	1		ľ		ľ		ľ	4	
	i	-				Į		1				9						-
,						Į		ł		ſ		1		Ĩ		S		
2		and the second second				1		Ŗ		ł				ľ		ł		
						į		ľ				1		Ī				
						Į		1						ſ		Į		
Т	l					ľ		Į		ľ		ľ		1		ł		
			1			ľ		ļ		ſ		1		1				- 1
	ł					f		ļ			-	ſ	-	F	-			
5								ł		ľ		ľ		F			1	
					1111	f				ľ		ł	ľ	I		ľ	ľ	
_	ſ								5	1		1		I		ł		
Т	İ				9	Ş	8	ľ	9			ľ		ſ		ļ		
			-			ļ		ľ	-	1		1	- -	ſ		Į		
ŗ	1			999	2252	5		ľ			1.6	P	-	-		ľ		
	ľ			6,2000	3 000	8	000	ľ	3426	ł	9	ľ		F	1992	5		
	ľ			46425	10037	210	124	2		÷	2615	2		Ľ	2560	ľ	77	1795
				1000	2 1492	NAC.	10545	197	2750	Š	1739	2			2502	105	Ľ	3
	j			11000	1270	57.6	3200	291		7	1 571	2	1 200		SCM	121	-	-
	ļ		1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 2252	3116 -	583	3422	DX C	1104 .	101	. 311	8	147		22	6	8	ŝ
		1947	10032	12094	5423	2.4	12	521	- 123	12	. 72.	1	220	E	SOM .	ЪС Т	K	c
_	ļ			000461,	525211	57	45900	233	98521	ŝ	00001	6	2400	2	SPORE .		-	
_	1			000512	114706	525	1 50/5	240	E2621	ľ	C0611	Ľ	2115	ļ	1700			215
	8			250910	138708	2.5	64246	2.5	75221	2	12211	2	20502	1	43992	175		
T	i					ſ		ſ				Ē		Ľ	-			•
	1			•		-	-	•	-	-	-	-		·	•	-	-	-
ē	1	•	-	-	-	-		•	-	-	-	-	-	·		-	-	•
_	!			-	-	-		-	-	•	-	-	-	·	-	-	-	-
_	!		•				-			•	-	-		·		-	-	-
Т	!																	
	i					1		1		1		1		1		1		
	!					1		Ī		1	-	1		Ī		1		1
				-		ľ	-	-		Ī	-	·		Ī		ľ	-	-
						F		F		Ī		Ŧ		F		T		-
						Ī		F		Ì		Ī		F		ľ		ł
	İ					I		Ī		I		Ī		I		I		
	1					ſ		ľ		ľ		ľ		ſ				
	:			-		ſ		ſ		ŀ		Ī		Ŀ		ŀ	-	-
				-	-	ſ		-		ľ		ŀ		Ī	-	·		.
_	1			-	-	ŀ	-	ŀ	-	Ī		†		ſ		ŀ	-	-
	•					F		F		F		F		E		Ē	ł	
			and the second se							•								

_			÷.	ì		-		ŕ		•	-	-	•	-		Ť	÷	1	Ŧ	Ŷ	4	ہم	ų	4	ŝ	ř.	-	÷	Ģ	÷.	بم	Ч	÷.	ř,	÷	4	ĥ	ã.	ü	-	÷		-	Ļ	â	ã.	4	4	تبا		÷	4
ş	505	-11	ŀ	ā	201	1	ā	-	210	415	•	202	2	-			242	10.00	-	- -		$\left \right $	1	-			9		1		ŀ	4		-	a				72	-	10		1	+	- -	$\left \right $	-		ŀ	; -	$\left \right $	ſ
2	31	5.1		8				ſ		2		22	2	-14			325	24			Ī		1					3	1		F			-			1		ষা		F	R.	1		1	F		T	Ī		, {	7
		2	18	10	12	ļ	20	29	201	203	2	ğ	ą			R	2	7	-1	1	T	9	ł			2	ŝ	3	ł	1 S	2		1	8	5	ł	1	3	A	Į	H	7	1	t	1-	FI	7	Ť	<u>+</u> -			F
080011	31.4	Ī	1515	100	2162		10007	SCN -	1901	266	22900	1246	12122	1510		06168	246120	147403		Zitte		21423		52.65		5 (134	29461		1000	1 220	6014	sect a	565	84	125		2564	1.20%	550	Series -	CCOL.				-							_
		2.3	F		ţ	T	1-	ľ	1		म	1	٩	-1-	f	F	1	1	-	Ť	F	Ħ	Ŧ		, H		3	শ	T	-	1	Ť	T	-	7	F	F	7	1	2	2	4	Ŧ	Ŧ	Ē	Fŗ	Ŧ	1	F	-1		-
514	town areas							06	2	57	360	195 4	100 1	8		360	1625	282								7200	1000			-	021			-		T		300	0011	2400	NOT -			-	-					-		
		2.2	2	E,	T,	1	I.	×	-	P	4	1	\$		15		9	7	-	F	F	9	ţ	Ţ	i.	P	3	٩Þ	٩	8	2	7	٩	ষ	Į.	P	Ρ	9	2	8	5	4	Ť	1-	-	-	Ŧ	Ŧ		T	-+-	
	DING BONCT		325			1100	120	1 225	2		2700		222	8		100001	1200	EGENT		Ţ		954			2236	1000	200		-	100	92		320				212	ALLA -	1.1	14100	990			-	-							
, ,	5	23	Ē	4	Ę	2	12	120	Ē	9	ä	1	s	d.	F	19		4	t	÷	F	H	ŧ	ţ	ġ	9	3	ţ	ļ	٩	ষ্	8	Π	d	¢	Ý	1	Я	g	8	F	1	Ŧ	1-	-	FT	+	1-		-		•
	EA MONIER	-	0252	1221	19 AL	22157	1 21020	144	114 ···	8	1221					151051	11/159	1 AGE		+					1470	23662	102501		532	1 120	216		94 1	-		1000		908		1 1 1 1 1 1	PERDI	12021		┿╍ ┥╺ ┥╺	-			+ -	•	-		-
5	2-	ŝ	l i	E.	T,	ļ	-	121	ç	5			ł		F	1	2	1		Ē	F		7		, C	-	7	7	2	2	¥.	Y	X	A			P	ž		1	7	ş	T	1	F	F	Ŧ	1	-	ī	r F	-
	PARTAGUE		2002	806	A5729	103633	1002	2120	1000	515	2112	1 1 W 22			2000	1925	21950	2002							1110	0000	BORDO	State -	8CW -	1 2276	36972	COMP.	2011	- 147-			1124	1109	202	10005	22022	1035		+- - -	-							_
	~	2.2	X		1	ş	R	,	i.	ł,			1	5	ŝ	ð	1	۶			-	2	棲	į	8	g	8	¢	Ş	21		1	Į		F	ł,	R	8		R	2		Ŧ	1-	-	÷	t	+-		ب ا		-
T HOMES	CA055 PROF.	1	11111		10231	112053	162605	1114	122	223	10771	TRUE I			1010	1022201	SEVEC	101012				OUTE	1000		101	10000	CONCI		1980	60 0 0	100001	00100	5145 ·	1221		Sec.	10031	000		12 264	100762				-							-
NAUE DAVISAU	in the second se	Ĩ	00001	111		NO FEEL	119720	6500	30	0675	11210				110514	0052691	020GAL					UNITE	1		LEDI ,	000001	SECTO		1120	1201	201100	A REAL PROPERTY.	14700			1 100	14425	11000		23:200	100511			- -	-							-
NAVT FACHA	A1 COST	3							ŝ	88	Ī																		25524	1000						110 00 0 1 1 1 0 00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					19 1 2 4 M					A Charles			-			
194		3		52					96	100	Ī			1 1 1 1 1	23090										• • • • •		Ţ		25225	10100		14 A A A		IGH		1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1								+		A STATE OF A STATE OF A STATE OF A STATE OF A STATE OF A STATE OF A STATE OF A STATE OF A STATE OF A STATE OF A				-		
90		ā.	i		1	4		Ī	Į	i i i	n L'i	t i	t		111		1			1	Ţ		Ì	ļ	1			Ţ	1				j			1	!	Ì	Ţ,	ļ	2		İ.	1	ł		!	İ.		1		
9	\$	8		1	5					3			ľ		3			Ť		1			ľ		3			Ť		2				ì					ł			T		<u>.</u>		_	T	4.1				

.

•

4

ط

•

• •

-

٠

APPENDIX C. SCO6 FINANCIAL REPORTS

(*)

×,

4

NAVY EXCHANGE, DEPARTMENT J-3, FUELS, NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

FY 1988 - 1992
p												i		_
7		トンイゼ	NAVY EXC	HANGE DIVISI	MILT OFFICE		ļ			-	I CHANGE NO	120180	L	
	5C06	SPACE	E DEPT EMPL	DENETITS-OT	ICH DIA EXP			ALEACT NO	NTEREY CA			29 JAN	46 V	٥
	DEPARTME	ENT	Provision For	HAN ANN	AUC 318 FARES-PICA	ACC JIG	10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-10-1	AREA SUPPORT		MPANE 113		BUT AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND	CINER UNICE	
Ļ		i	•			-			•		-		•	
-		Ţ	929		279	CCC,	0061		9		30	691	226	
	10	1	808		517	001	1903				9	2		•••
-	BARBER ST		C1 E01		1958	4404	21022			<u>C</u> ,	600	2007	2020	
•		2	1001 -	-	1 7925	2645	12012	-	1.280	-	1 522	1251	1682	•••
~ •		j	- 1		-							- 5		•
	<u> </u>		201											•
9	UZ BEAUTY SA	1												2
Ξ		e ÿ	9592		272	2200	21261		961	145	191	2169	121	::
1=		2	- 5684	-	- 463	OSPE	12650	-	202	20		8226		: : -
-	-										250	351, .	007,	:
-	1						192		62		250	0[1	442	: :
2	FUEL	1												::
: :	-	‡ 7	9285		265	5157	. 12276		201	202	197	017		: :
		•			228	22				1111				: :
2		i										1473		2
2	ų										-			-
	SEVC/LAE													2 :
2		1	1010		6505	2852	5051		540	216	1943		7890	
		:	1959/		1. 5972	14112	13121	•	195	255 1	1902	1 2246	1005	::
ŗ		j	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	•	-			: :
		ļ	- 232	-	1 215	. :132	8	-			2			: :
	K2		249											* T
	OPTICAL										240	2152	2962	*
: 2					2455					q	210	1.272	2920	2
Ļ		1			-						-		-	-
2				-	1 1 54	20 1	2611 1 1	-	-	121: 1	100	56	196 · ·	2 :
2	Č	ł	911, ,	-		- - -					8			
	FLOVER SH			-							1			2 1
: 1				Ī							212	252	10.02	*
ř		j									ł			2 : - 1
2		ļ		•	1 366	- 1	1 1 736	•	-	-	223	245		
	KA N	i	22	- -	222									::
;	MIN. MINI			ŀ			13444		162	1962	1900	5821	11001	:
;		1	6927		59.02	12221	10051			1645	1015	1625	12021	::
		j		-	•									::
		}	225											:
	M1									-		-		:
;					104	112	10326		1 24	102	002		1992	::
:		!	4202		103		1112		5	2	210	242	152	
		j												: :
		!												Ť
				- -				- -			-	-	-	÷
2				•										2 77
:		!												::
Ļ		İ												: : T
:		ļ												: 2
		i											 	\$
											-			ł
: :							ł	ŀ						K

PARTMENT PARTMENT Annual Annual Annual Annual Annual Annual	ACC 312	A16 234		1 L L L	14101	ACC 110	ALL]']	AL () 13	ALC 317	ACCS 303	101
All Control of Control		TIN MA	ACC 118		Strend Links	446.4 5098741	STATIONERY Stumpter	LEPAIRS &	alman 3	104 104 114 14	OTHER DARCT
											-
ALL CALLER AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND	1010		502		8661		90		50	169	226
AL DAY OF ALL											
	10502		1000	196/6	22605		065	C8C1	690	1000	200
i muja											
TILLY SALES	616	ſ	1.267	126	106	-	52	16	54	190, 1	115
AUTY SAME	502		515	16	908		7	6	8	102	716
1. i	2112		1592	1 CEEL	10128		226	98	27	2681	
!	56.32		115	22001	21221						
i							205	69E,	. 344	- 263	9861
			595		982			-	1, 250	951	406
81 17	. 6076		4500	2160	12016		991	102	5178	20144	29262
a	. 5624		1 4332	1 2154	12276	•	102	- 4282	197		
j	•	-	-	-	-	-		- 1	- 5		
Į	- 505	-	445	227	1208	-+					
			C67	169			70				
SVC/LAGE							00.01	1250	1730	FEEC	950
¥ ¥									1943	199	78.00
								-	-	-	-
			001	08 -	0	-	1 1 77	•	1 1 20	1 214	712
ļ	212	-	212	1251	000	-	-		2	202	125
TICAL 44				-	-						
8 , 17	3480		2526	16751	7495		1521	52			
1	0651		2542	1260	C60/						
j										247	420
					261.	-	-	121. 1	001	58	366
TLED AN							-			-	-
	1292		877	582	2759		204	467	8	1844	2007
1	1449		326		2788		9				
j	-								274		142
ļ	220	-		2	202			61 1 1	275	245	1412
											-
TN. SNAQ				27.5	1481		168	4495	911E	4601	15021
					12545		234	2541	100	2121	79211
						-	-	4	4		
ł	100	-	110	. 117	010	-	1 : 50	88	100	122	
ļ	226	-	212 -	68 .	1 427	-	-	-	8		
an auto / Adown		•	•	•	-	-					
1.1	1003		787	12831	9376	-	926	209		2907	26.95
1	1924		1207	1551	10326		2	268	2071		1595
5											
ţ				-		-	•	-			
	-	-	-	-	•	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	-		-	-	-	-				-	
Ţ		 - -			-	-	-	-	-	-	
							1	-	4		
						•	-	-	-		-
			-			•	-	-	-	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		-	
						-	-		-		

		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		Not conce									ſ
200	SERVIC	TE DEFT EMPL	HANGE DIVISI	ON TER DIR EXP			SALEACT MON	NTEREY CA		PROMANDE MO	120180 27 JAN	- - - -	- 8
DEPARTME	LN.	ACC 112		4CC 118	ACC 110	1014	ACC 310	ACC 11	ACC 119	ACC 117	ALCS 303	DIME DIME	<u> </u>
													T
												25	- 1 -
										9		7	
		L'and	Ī	NA.		7992	15.3	801	290	665	846	5/7	-
										720	1075		
								5			6014		-
	ļ								9	2	061.	06.	6
				000					-		-	12, 1, 1	-
:										-	195		-
20											2200		6
BEAUTY SA											. 1170		-
										. 725	5664	Я -	
			-									•	5
			-						-	-	-	-	ļ
													Ī
5											2962		-
FUEL											1010		Ī
	ç	7200		419				REPI					12
	!												5
	i	10201	-			0201						Î.	Ē
	ļ												Ē
				245	222								19
SERVC/LAB													19
	Ĭ			1992	2027								Ī
											8	-	19
_	ill		- -						-		-		
Ş				-			-	11	-	- 20	214		2
CALLS I	1		F				420	120	090	000	1200	1 240	8
	ł	1012		25.25	545	6277		101	16	808	100	g	-
	1	2460		1624	112	26 2 /		. 1257	68	. 226	2034		d
	j	1 112				1 1 112	1 1 25	0	9	8			e.
	ł	99	,	59	1 22	1 1 144	-	130	97	-			
ç		1 1 1	•	1 37	-	111, 111	-						
FLOWER SH		782	-	-	-	7022	8	2					Ţ
	ł	1326		525	8	0512							
	!	192											Ś
	Į		-	523	192							-	2
2			-										Ī
FNTN, SNAC		200	-			2202					0001		1
	F			8	217	1225							Ŀ
	!				2703								Г
_										-			Γ
-								-	-	-	-	-	Γ
		-			-	-	-		-	-	-	1 1 1	
				F									
	1												Π
			ſ										Π
									-	-	1	1 - 1 - 1	
-								-	-	-	-		
								-	-	-		-	Γ
													Π
	!		F										
													Π
	1							-	1				T
	ĺ	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	T
	1		-	-	-	-	-	-	- -	- -	- -		Ť
_	ę Ş	-	-	-	-		-						T
	!		•		-								1

k.

•

•

•

							A. 6					
NUMBRI	-11		:11	MC 314 IAMB1-PCA		Ho St	ALOCATOR					
F		2			ŀ	NOT -	1	9	52	1	-	<u> 541.</u>
٣				196	211	C211	-	24	001	22	191	1046
	i				3	COL		961		9		252
		11112				THE T		9	8	8	210	No.
<u>•1</u>		VERT						120			R	
Ť												
:Ľ	Ţ											
1		ļ					ŀ					
						11502		210	061		Sec.	9447
ľ	1			007	202	NON .		101			690	
Ľ		112	-	2002		-		263	0.00	100	0110	1 3126
f		ŝ	.	-			200	1 20	200	090	260	-
Ľ	Į	720	-	170	220	1191	-	. 119	127	12		
		222		207		162		122	120	052	20	
<u>ل</u> ا ل		1001				16,01	2400	280	2400	1200	120	00071
		4004		NAL .	194	1962		FOIL .	0550	0050	7672	10501
Ľ		1990		21120		AGOEL		SCM .	- B725	1112		14-25-121
	ì	0904	•	-		DEOX	01	5. 1. 1	1 1 25	35 · ·		175
		777	-	126 -	1 222	0ZM .	-	202		. 11 - 17 -	500	1655 1 1
	i	114	-	495		202	-	218	522	33	142-	1 1 122
RVC/LAB	2						120	8	959	0.5	720	0102
-1	:	COM -		2002	-	21099		193501	118		2201	11011
	!	T			202	1221		- SW	SER.			02801
-1		440				375					8	900
1	!			200								
												DE DE
1												
Ť												
Т.												
11												
							1					
1	-					0.45		200	3			
f	l											
T												
11			-									
1							-					
1												
1												
<u>_</u>												
		T										
ar,		Ī						ŀ				
Ť		Ī			Ī							
1.		T										
1												
u.		-	. -	. . -								
1,		T										
1:					F						ŀ	
f		Ī										
1.	1											
11												
Ľ	12									-		-
1.		-					-				-	
Ľ		ŀ			F							

•

•

	AVA	E GNU E AND	LERVICES SUP	PORT OFFICE									
SC06	SERVIC	E DEPT EMPL	HANGE DIVIS	HER DIR EXP		NE.	A MONIEREX				NAL 15	23	S
DEPARTME	N	ACC 312		ACC 318			ALC 110 MMEA SUPPORT	STATISTICS	ACC JIS MPANE 6	111 P	ALLS 101 203	101M	Į.
			100 101										
	İ	201											
	1	1000 H											12
5											1111		١
GARGER ST		19991											
	1												
	!	1221	-										
	j	245	-	-									Ľ
	*	1000	-	214	99								3
22		366		222	50	8		12		9	220	-	1
BEAUTY SA	1	272						240	600	80	1280		9
	1	100		66MC	108	2006		A34	1981	2001	26.01	-	3
						808	-	50¥	666	170	1 2097	1 1	20
	į			-		- 103	-	801	000	9 9	207	-	00
			-	9.9	100	-96	-	100	515	2064	1. 1. 1.	-	1
٩			F					011	1 1 2 2 2	72	-		
						2104					80		Ö
FUEL		27.0											Ż
	! ;					RENT							2
	!												
	j	-	-	-	-	-		-		- -		-	[
	ļ		-	-	-	-	-			-			
-	1		-		-	-	-	-	-				ļ
AUTO INS	f						-						
	5							-96	4		W		4
							-			-			
	I	Se la				06.0	-	% -	200	1100	- 300	-	9
							-	1 28	1 277	54		-	345
ļ			-		1 1 2 2 2	1110	-	1	-	12	-	•	Ч, С
						2 and 2			2400	1200	000		0
SERVC/LA								021	246		12100		È
									5	99	1022		9
										-	130	-	010
	I											- -	
	ļ	90	-	30				- -					ļ
Ž	ĺ	1 241	-	28									ł
OPTICAL	1		-	-	-								ļ
	F	1969		2529	345			11	2				
	1	2680		2743		444		30	221	2			Ż
						95			-	-	020	-	ส
							-	-	- 20	-	- 10		: 2
ļ						-	-			-	. 942		72
ÿ													
FLOWER S	ľ	8							505				È
	Ę	2											ļ
	ł			200									ľ
						00							3
	{	ē	-	. 261	- 40		1			1023			2
			-	-		1011	-	1 20		221		-	2
				-	-		-	8	-	2400	0000	-	ğ
FNTN. SC	ļ							-		40.45		- -	Ì
	5								1				ŝ
1	1				VEFT								
								4					
	1		•			-		-					
							-	-	-	-	-	-	_
							-	-	-	-	-	-	-
												ŀ	-
	Ę	-		-								╞	Ļ
	1	-										ļ	ļ
													ļ
						-	-			-	-		1
							-	-	-		-	-	-
								-	-	-	-	-	
							-	-	-			-	
	Ę	-	-	-								ŀ	\$
					-	•							ļ

R.

4

.

APPENDIX D. RADIAN CORPORATION UPGRADE ESTIMATES

FUEL STORAGE TANK UPGRADE ALTERNATIVES I - III

FROM RADIAN CORPORATION RETROFIT STUDY OF UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS AT THE NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA JULY 1992 X;



Table 5-1

Cost Estimate to Retrofit Existing USTs Alternative 1

		Cos	st Estime	ite to Re Altern	trofit Ex ative I	isting US	Ts		
		Cross 1 Tradie			Creek 2 Timb				1
at Matte	1402	236.2	234-3	900		Ŗ	-	346-2	246.5
Vulume (galluaa)	000'01	10,000	10,000	6,000	000.8	12,000	10,000	000)'\$1	20,000
Conserva	No 5 ON	No 5 CH	No 5 Chi	Diesel	Deel	Deed	Unikaded Gan	Unkended Gas	Super Unterded Gas
Date Installed	1952	1952	1952	0861	1975	1861	1973	6961	98-
Construction	Single-well Steel	Single well Steel	Single-wall Steel	Single-wall Fiberglass	Single-well Fiberglass	Durble well Faherglass	Single wolf Fånglate	Sangte well Succi]]]
NITIAL RETROPTITING COSTS	6								
Cethodic Protection	3,400	3,400	3.400	6,600 ²	6,600 ²	6,600 ²	MA	1, 400 ¹	-00¥'E
Overfüll/Spull Protection/ATGS	00€'5	5,300	5,300	10,600	10,600	10.600	NIA	NIA	NIA
Vedoza Zuen and Groundwater Monitoring - Leak Detection	6,700	6,700	6,700	6,700	6,700	V/N	NIA	N/A	MIA
1996 SECONDARY CONTANAMER	IT REPROPE	CORTS-TANK	TV ACHIER S	COULS (1)					
Temporary Fuel Storage	750	750	150	500	600	NIA	750	006	007'1
Concrete Removal	650	650	650	1,000	000'1	ViN	\$50	450	\$30
Excension/Removel/Transportation/ Disposed	1,900	006'ł	1,900	2,100	2.650	M	1,400	1,400	2,400
Soil Sumpling/Andynu/Reporting	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	000'1	NIA	000'1	1,000	000'1
NETACHARAT CORTS (3)									

29.60

9,700

15.750 9,700

X 2000.2

5.000 2,500 2,900

9.700

21,000 13,650

21,000 12.200 s.000 2,500 2,900 1,000

15.750 9,700

15,750 9,700

9,700 15,750 4,950 0SL,1

Labor and Equipment

•

3

4,950 1,350

4,950 066,1 8 1,200

Paint and The Down

9,700

85.1 **80**0'' 1,200

050.1 000⁻ I 1.200

8 3

2,500 000'1

1.000 1.200

008'1

1,800

000,1

000'1

Beck RMAC on part Concrete Stat

Electrical

ŝ

8

143

•

۲

5-3

Tuble 5-1

4

(Continued)

					Care 2 Tak			Card S Tar	
	236.1	296.2	216.3	901	99/	Ŗ	- H	2#6	C BE
PRB 1996 OPERATIONAL COSTS									
Test Cethodic System	1,400/3 yr	TY EVONA, I	1.400/3 yr	1,000/3 yr ²	1,000/3 yr ²	1,000V3 yr ²	VN	1,000/1 yr ^J	⁶ ry 61000.1
Manual Tauk Gougas	NIA	VIN	N/A	VIN	NIA	VIN	VIN	VIN	NN
Investory Costant	1.400/yr	1.400/yr	l.400/yr	1.400/yc	1,400/yr	1.400/yr	1,400/yr	1.400/yr	1.400/yr
Tyburn Tening	600/yr	600/yr	600/yr	600/yr	600/yr	600/yr	600vyr	600/yr	600/yr
NURT-1916-CORRATIONAL CORTS									
Investory Costrol	900/yr	\$00/yr	\$00/yc	900/yr	900/yr	900/yr	900Vyr	900/yr	900/jr
Tighterts Tening	600/3 yr	600/3 yr	77 6/004		ry (1008	600/3 yr	600/yr	6001yr	600/yr
TOTAL PERSON WURTH BATHOOPT CONTS	30,206	36,206	36,206	811,68	54,967	921'62	20,334	27,848	197,261
PREAT WORTH	16,615	16,615	14,415	13.906	13,907	15,906	15,624	8671	(86,11
NUTAL PERMIT	118,42	(1) ,H	628,42	129,00	428.0K	£10,2 \$	859, 5L	45,246	49,45B

5-4

144

1 Ste Le. ser j

Î

1

han 20 fee belo j 2 2 1 Ĩ ìÌ 1.1993. 2

Ĩ ĩ 2

in latin at control

1 5 . . .

í

M LDI/

IN GISTI AND STORE S NO

Table 5-2

Cost Estimate to Replace with New USTs Alternative II

•

		Oraș I Tada			Owny 2 Tends			Care 3 Tada	
Tel Nucles	236-1	236-2	26-3	330	8	708 ¹	348-1 ²	346.2 ²	346.32
Current Capacity (galluna)	10,000	000'01	000'01	6,000	8,000	12,000	10,000	000'51	20,000
Replacement Capacity (gallions)	000'01	10,000	000'01	6,000	8,000	NIA	000'01	15,600	20,000
TANK REMUVAL CORTS (3)									
Temporary Fuel Storage	150	750	150	500	640	N/A	954	006	1,200
Concrete Removel	650	650	650	1.000	1,000	NIA	650	650	650
Excertion/Removel/Transportation/ Disposed	006'1	006'1	006'1	2,100	2.650	N/A	2,400	2,400	2,400
Soil Samping/Andynis/Reputing	000'1	1,000	1,000	000'1	1,000	N/A	000'1	1,000	000'1
REPLACEMENT COSTS (1)									
Labor and Equipment	9,700	9,700	9,700	21,000	21,000	9,700	9,700	9,700	9.700
Overfill/Spill Protection	966	750	750	750	750	150	NA	N/A	NIA
Tet	15,750	15,750	067,21	12,200	13,650	N/A	15,750	22,500	009'62
Pying and Tix Downs	4,950	4,950	4,950	5.000	5,000	5,000	900	90	ŝ
Lask Detection - Task and Piperg/ATGS	000'(000'E	000°E	5,650	6,630	069.6	3,000	3,000	000'E
Electrical	050,1	056,1	050,1	2,500	2,500	2,500	050,1	051,1	051,1

80. 1,200

000-1 1,200

8 1,200

000.1 000,1

2,900 99. 1

2,900 908[.] I

1,000 1,200

00.1 1,200

000'1

Backfill/Compact Concrete Stab

.

5-10

145

RADIAN

•

Table 5-2

(Continued)

					Gung 2 Tests		-		
11	26-1	242	26-3	81	Ŗ	1907	24-12	348-2 ²	346.32
OPERATIONAL COSTS (3)									
Invessory Control	900/yr	900/yr	900/yr	900/yr	900/yr	900/yr	900/yr	900/71	900/yr
Tightness Testing	600/3 yr	sy C/009	400/3 yr	600/3 yr	600/3 yr	14 EADA	600/yr	600/yr	600/yr
TOTAL REPLACEMENT COSTS	42,000	42,000	42,000	56,400	58,500	26,400	37,100	44,000	11,400
PRESERVE WURTH OPERATIONAL CORTS ³	166,9	166.9	166,9	166,9	166,9	166.4	13,180	081,61	13,180
TUTAL PRISIMIT WURTH CURTS (5)	161,12	166,18	166,18	1(1,20	168,63	167,26	50,280	57,180	64,580

Task will sur be replaced Pysag will ser be replaced Based on a 15-year period. Press, worth calculated a

146

1

4

#

×

4

5-11

DI/ Ņ

Table 5-3

•

•

•

Cost Estimate to Replace with ASTs Alternative III

				-				11.	
11	142	242	1	95	2	R.	1 THE	346.2	C W
Current Concerty (authors)	000'01	000'01	000'01	000.4	000°.1	12,000	10,000	15,000	20,000
Construction (millions)	000.01	000'01	000'01	6 ,000	900) ' 8	12,000	6.000	6,000	6.000
TANK REMOVAL CONTR (1)									
Temorar Fuel Stores	9%	750	750	ş	004	750	0%L	906	1.200
Concrete Respond	959	650	650	000'1	000'1	000'1	650	650	650
Escavelina (Removal / Transportation) Diamonal	006'1	006'1	006'1	3,100	2,650	000'(2.400	2,400	2,400
Sail Samine/Andyne/Reporting	000'1	000'1	000'1	000.1	1,000	000'1	000'1	1,000	000
Rect fill/Compect	000'I	000'1	000'1	2,900	2,900	2,900	000'1	000'1	1.000
REFLACEMENT COSTS (3)									
Labor and Eminerated	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,050	5,500	7,900	5,050	5,050	5.050
Contract. Refer. and Barnets	4,000	4,000	4,000	5,000	6,400	000'01	5,000	5,000	5,000
Contro Contro	ŝ	Ş	Ş	95	650	650	80	200	200
	4.050	44,050	44,050	900.14	051,66	52,150	34,000	34,000	34,000
	0,050	4,650	4,650	4,700	4,700	4,700	•	0	•
	g	8	ş	ŝ	8	600	600	999	89
	3	ş	ş	900'1	1,000	1,400	ş	909	8
	2	- 0000	2002 w	2002 **	200/2 yr	200/2 yr	200/2 yr	200/2 yr	200/2 yr
		. · · · ·							

52.645

52,345

52,195

566'98

548'**1**9

59,445

2H2,24

815,845

345,545

TOTAL PRIMER

Ĩ

g a 9.5 interne rate. Inflation act considered.

3

I

tbi 5 3 692/nevy UST/6 92

•

a outerd in Abrahim 2.

Ą

4

4

5-15

147

•

•

•

RADIAN

- -

APPENDIX E. CUSTOMER SURVEY CONMENTS

MARCH - APRIL 1993

The following comments have been compiled from completed surveys. The numbers preceding the comments represent the survey on which the comments were recorded. These numbers were assigned to surveys only upon their return for purposes of results organization and reference. The numbers do not reveal the identity of the respondent.

- 12. - Don't use (station) because use a gas credit card. - The parking capacity would be limited and remote. - People should utilize the bus from La Mesa instead of decreasing services provided on base. - Every means of saving money for the service member needs to be quarded. 14. I believe the NEX gas station is a benefit to me two ways 1) Convenience (close and easy) 2) Economically (inexpensive gas) It would annoy me if the gas station were closed down. 15. Been here for two years - parking has been a nuisance but not unsurmountable. Don't believe should sacrifice a good service for more parking. (Thesis research on the Navy Exchange Gas Station? Get a clue.) 16. Getting rid of a permanent service just for a temporary fix to a problem is not a solution - besides town, when Fort Ord closes where will we go then? 17. If Fort Ord closes entirely then NEX privilege must be maintained.
- 19. You forgot about the key SERVICE. They don't provide it. That's why I go elsewhere for service.
- 22. It's a matter of convenience rather than cost savings. Prices don't seem to be much cheaper than in town.

26. Consider gas station a privilege not a right. What is the point of your thesis? To prove whether or not we need a gas station? You might be better served to do an economic analysis.

×,

20

- 28. Neutral on closing as long as Fort Ord remains available.
- 29. The gas station is another great benefit! Don't take it away.
- 33. What happens when Fort Ord closes?
- 35. I doubt people would want to park there. It's too far to walk to classes.
- 36. I tried to buy gas at NEX once but the attendant was rude and refused to allow me to pump gas at 1701 hours. The station closed at 1700. No service = No customer.
- 37. The bottom line is if the gas station is closed it would take money out of my <u>pocket</u>!
- 38. People should get off their butts and carpool, walk, ride the bus or a bike if they feel parking is a problem.
- 40. Re: Question 8. Benefit vs. right are contrasting terms.
- 41. Closing the gas station in place of additional parking would be a terrible swap.
- 43. The service is poor, the employees attitudes are very poor, and the organization of how you pump gas and pay is ludicrous! I get very frustrated everytime I go there so I usually stay away!
- 44. Exchange gas station does not accept American Express credit card (so I don't use the station).
- 46. Regarding gasoline quality This is a stupid question since none of us has any means of testing it! -I would hate to drive to Fort Ord for gas!
- 50. The current set-up pay inside is stupid. Takes too long to pay making for lines. If the exchange can't get its act together then just drop the station. Also, never checks I.D.s, I've seen <u>everyone</u> filling up there!
- 52. Without the gas station there would be no reason at all to visit this exchange. The exchange is improving but for me the only reason I used it is because I've stopped to get gas.

- 54. Definitely don't close the gas station and leave the mechanics. That is the worst run, most inefficient and unethical service station I've ever been to!
- 56. The exchange gas station should keep more islands open. Quite often you have to wait in line to get gas while half the pumps are blocked off.

R;

- 57. It's convenient and I can pay by check That's why I use it.
- 60. I would like to be able to purchase mid-grade unleaded like at Fort Ord gas station.
- 61. They need to speed up the cashier service.
- 64. As far as I can tell, there is no cheaper place in Monterey.
- 65. Having an exchange gas station is convenient and is also a benefit (privilege) not a right, to members of the Armed Forces.
- 67. Gas station is a privilege vs. a right.
- 70. Gas station is not a right but rather a benefit which offsets the fact that service members cannot live in a locale of their choosing. This type of benefit (NEX in general) offsets the higher costs of goods and services at most naval base locations which are normally higher cost of living areas.
- 74. Keep it open !!
- 75. Only been in town for 6 weeks so I'm not settled yet on exchange gas.
- 76. Gas station is good. Prices are usually lower than most places and I like that I can use my credit card at no extra charge.
- 80. If parking is the reason the gas station would close, than fill in that stupid lake and turn it into a lot!
- 81. Rights are constitutional, privilege is more commensurate, plus, The gas station has been <u>very</u> convenient and cost effective, but hey, what's the gas station? Let's just do away (with) all benefits and the military too!

- 82. Keep the gas station open.
- 84. Although I don't use the station, many of my friends do, so it obviously has some utility.
- 87. Negative of gas station is poor hours.
- 89. Lower the prices!
- 92. Is this survey about the NEX gas station or parking? Get with the program, we don't need more parking - we need more people to use alternative transportation (ie. walkless than 2 mile to La Mesa (housing), ride bicycle, carpool, take the bus)!
- 94. If we lose Fort Ord's station this is the only gas we can get at a discount. If they close their station, you may see more people buying here at NPS.
- 97. We don't need more base parking, we need less cars on base!!! Should also have mid-grade unleaded.
- 98. Question # 8 Its not a right, but I use the privilege. Bring back the shed so we can pay at the pumps! Its a waste of time to walk into the shop to pay (I know they're trying to get us to spend money inside, but now it takes twice as long to get gas.
- 99. **#** 8 is a Poorly worded question, a benefit is just that, a benefit not a right. Poorly done survey.
- 107. Get quality Gas! (Shell/Amoco/Texaco/BP)

108. "I don't want to park all the way over by the "gass" station. The decision to close the gass station should have no connection with parking problems. The gass station provides a service that has value in itself. You should examine the profitability and value of service provided at the station. This is a poorly written survey all questions should in clude "no response" that is not included as a sample statistic. -Question 3. Does not include Diesel (a possible reason why respondents buy elsewhere) -Question 5. Does not use consistent units of measure -Question 6. is ambiguous; Does don't know mean "I don't know how I feel" or "I don't know about the quality of the gas"? -Question 8 is irrelevant. NEX gas station is defined as a privilege not a right. Individual opinions about the

fact don't change it. -Question 9 Does not have a full range of responses. -Questions 10 & 11 are reciprical. If this is a test for respondent consistency they should be separated by other questions.

Overall, these weaknesses in this questionaire will introduce Bias into your Data that you will be unable to account for in your analysis. Result: Sloppy conclusion and a poor grade on your thesis."

- 109. The right and privilege to have a full service gas station should not be taken away for extra parking. If people would carpool, take the bus or walk we wouldn't have a question of more parking come up.
- 110. Parking is not a reason to give up the gas station. More people should ride the bus or carpool into school.
- 112. I always wonder why the NEX Gas Station verifies your I.D. card <u>after</u> pumping gas. What happens if you don't have an I.D. card? Do you have to give the gas back?
- 114. Would use the base gas station more to prevent closure! Also, sometimes octane 92 or higher is not available on base, so I choose to go off base to ensure obtaining higher octane.
- 115. Instead encourage carpooling and bus riding!! Make bus riding and carpooling mandatory for La Mesa residents.
- 117. With NEX Gas station prices only 1¢ different than at a civilian (station), it really doesn't matter.
- 121. Keep it open !!
- 122. The small number of additional parking places that would be provided would not justify closing the gas station. I don't think of it as a <u>right</u> but it is a great convenience.
- 123. There is plenty of parking on base. But to people who complain its not the lack of parking that's the problem, it's the lack of convenience parking that's the problem. I have never had trouble parking, but sometimes it wasn't very close.

126. Keep the service station open and close the exchange and the repair shop at the service station. The gas station provides a more important service than either of the two. Gas station is a privilege rather than a right. X.

- 127. Critical to have better prices than out in town.
- 128. Why don't you ask a question regarding what percentage of students think you ought to be able to get a graduate degree by doing "b---s--t" research such as this?
- 130. If prices were less than in town and if the station carried a mid-grade gas, we would have stronger feelings about keeping the station open.
- 131. There must be better ways to improve parking w/o taking down the gas station once construction stops won't the problem be alleviated somewhat anyway?
- 132. Question #8 It's a privilege!
- 136. More parking...what? There is no <u>effective</u> program to curtail the cars on campus. lets not be hasty. More people can walk or carpool. We all live too close to have these problems!!
- 140. Although the gas station is not a right it is convenient to use. It often takes the NEX station longer to reflect price decreases than stations in town.
- 143. The price charged for fuel is not all that great. They could lower the cost of gas!
- 144. Pave the whole base. Why are three of your choices for Question # 6 negative?
- 146. Question # 5- I fill up either at NPS or Fort Ord. Question # 8- It's a privilege.
- 147. "Perhaps you could get a government grant next to study why plants grow up towards the sun and not down. What a waste of government and Navy time. This is another attempt at the NEX to back out of a commitment to service to the customer. Parking is a "smoke screen." I have had never had trouble finding a parking place. Except I'm not afraid to walk across campus. Idiots that complain of parking are usually single passenger types who could either walk to school from La Mesa, catch the bus, or carpool."

154. Question #8- Although I don't see it as a right I believe it is an important compensation benefit. 4

- 157. Question #11- Depends on cost.
- 161. Certain questions need to be answered prior to completing this. Are we to assume the Presidio and Fort Ord stations will remain open? Are gas prices going to remain lower than town prices?
- 164. Question # 8- Its a privilege. Question #10- Encourage La Mesa residents to use the bus. Build a multi-level parking garage, Don't eliminate services to solve the problem - I <u>like</u> the cheaper gas and convenience.
- 165. "What kind of major do I need to get to do a thesis on a gas station?"
- 167. Question # 8- Unsure.
- 169. Question # 8- It may not be a right, but it's one of the best benefits we get!
- 171. If more base parking is desired, encourage people to ride the bus by charging La Mesa residents who feel a <u>need</u> to drive less than one mile.
- 174. Question # 8 Its not a right, but it is a <u>benefit</u>. It is very convenient and saves \$ and time. Don't waste the money demolishing a service for a few parking spaces. There are plenty of spaces to park - people just don't want to walk far.
- 175. My family and I plan our gas purchase with shopping runs to the exchange and commissary (Ft. Ord). Saving 5-10¢ per gallon is more than enough incentive to come onto the base and shop. I very strongly endorse retaining the Navy Exchange Gas station. LCDR, 12 yrs service.
- 177. Concerning question 6 Quality of gasoline What brand do we have this month? Can't answer when I don't know brand. + Not much thought was put into this thesis survey, are you really a grad student?
- 178. If the cost was constantly lower I would strongly approve of keeping it open. Good luck with your thesis!!

- 182. 1. If Fort Ord gas station closes with the draw down, then we <u>ought</u> to have that service at NPS.
 2. A gas station is more important than parking. The parking problem would be <u>solved</u> if La Mesa residents would ride a bike or use the very excellent BUS SERVICE that's available.
- 183. Question # 8- A privilege not a right. Closing the station for economic reasons is one thing; to simply make more parking spaces is <u>UNSAT</u>.
- 184. For Questions 5 & 6. I used to use the gas station all the time, but I developed a knocking in my engine. My dealer's service center recommended changing to a name brand gas because of quality control. When this solved the problem I became very wary about NEX gas.
- 189. Question # 8- Agree its a right not so much for the gas but for the cheaper service.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

No. Copies 2 12

X)

1.	Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22304-6145	2
2.	Library, Code 052 Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5002	2
3.	Navy Exchange Service Command Attn: Mr Larry Boone, Services Operations Group 210 New York Ave Staten Island, NY 10305	1
4.	LT Lisa Yusak, Navy Exchange Officer Navy Exchange Monterey Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93940-5000	1
5.	Mr. Ken Carlin Navy Exchange Monterey Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	1
6.	LCDR Paul Bosco, Public Works Officer Navy Public Works Department Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	2
7.	Dr. William R. Gates, Code AS/Gt Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5100	1
8.	LCDR Jeffrey M. Nevels, Code AS/Ne Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5100	1
9.	LCDR Daniel F. Geldermann Public Works Officer NAF Atsugi, Box 15	2

FPO AP 96306-1215