Defense Primer: Department of Defense Maintenance Depots

Title 10, United States Code (U.S.C.) §2464 requires the Department of Defense (DOD) to “maintain a core logistics capability that is government-owned and government-operated [GOGO]… to ensure a ready and controlled source of technical competence and resources necessary to ensure effective and timely response to a mobilization, national defense contingency situations, and other emergency requirements.” This capability resides in DOD maintenance depots, which perform depot-level maintenance and repair (defined by 10 U.S.C. §2460 as “material maintenance or repair requiring the overhaul, upgrading, or rebuilding of parts, assemblies, or subassemblies, and the testing and reclamation of equipment”). These GOGO facilities, together with certain government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) facilities, are collectively referred to as the organic industrial base, or OIB. As the Government Accountability Office (GAO) states in a 2019 report (GAO-19-242), these depots “are crucial to maintaining military readiness by ensuring that the services can regularly repair critical weapon systems and return them to the warfighter for their use in training and operations.”

Although each military department (MILDEP) manages and resources the depots that service its weapon systems and equipment, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment (USD (A&S)) is responsible for DOD-wide maintenance policy direction and oversight. In addition to repairing and maintaining military systems, each MILDEP’s depots also serve as repositories for technical data, testing equipment, and unique tooling and design capabilities. Depending on the types of activities supported, DOD may designate facilities performing depot functions as logistics complexes, shipyards, readiness centers, or logistics bases. Depot-level maintenance and repair activities also encompass certain types of software maintenance, but do not include major upgrades, the procurement of parts for safety modifications, or the nuclear refueling and defueling of aircraft carriers.

Organization and Management
Among OIB GOGO facilities, Congress has designated 21 “covered depots” for special oversight under 10 U.S.C. §2476 due to their importance in Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff strategic and contingency plans. Covered depots currently include 18 depots, logistics complexes, shipyards, readiness centers, and logistics bases, as well as 3 Army arsenals with depot maintenance capabilities. Together, they employ a workforce of over 80,000 government civilians (Figure 1).

Army Covered Depots
Army Materiel Command (AMC) operates the following nine Army sites, each of which services particular systems.

- **Anniston Army Depot** (Anniston, AL): Tracked and wheeled ground combat vehicles; small caliber weapons; towed and self-propelled artillery; and rail equipment.
- **Corpus Christi Army Depot** (Corpus Christi, TX): Rotary wing aircraft.
- **Letterkenny Army Depot** (Chambersburg, PA): Air and missile defense; and precision fires systems.
- **Red River Army Depot** (Texarkana, TX): Tactical wheeled vehicles.
- **Tobyhanna Army Depot** (Tobyhanna, PA): Command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance systems; electronics, avionics, and missile guidance/control systems.
- **Rock Island Arsenal** (Rock Island, IL): Joint Manufacturing and Technology Center; Joint Munitions Command; and Army Sustainment Command.
- **Pine Bluff Arsenal** (Pine Bluff, AR): Chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) systems; and specialized ammunition.
- **Watervliet Arsenal** (Watervliet, NY): Cannons, mortars, and associated components.
- **Tooele Army Depot** (Tooele, UT): Equipment for handling, maintaining, and modifying ammunition.

![Figure 1. DOD Covered Depots (10 U.S.C. §2476)](https://crsreports.congress.gov)
Air Force Covered Depots
Air Force Materiel Command’s Air Force Sustainment Center (AFSC) operates the following three air logistics centers, each of which services particular airframes and systems.

- **Ogden Air Logistics Center** (Hill Air Force Base, UT): F-35; F-22; F-16; A-10; C-130; T-38; Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles; and landing gear.
- **Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center** (Tinker Air Force Base, OK): KC-46; KC-135; B-1B; B-52; E-3; E-6; various aircraft engines; and software.
- **Warner Robins Air Logistics Center** (Warner Robins, GA): F-15; C-5; C-130; C-17; and various special operations forces aircraft.

Navy Covered Depots
Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) and Naval Air Systems Command (NAVAIR) manage covered Navy shipyards and fleet readiness centers, respectively.

NAVSEA operates the following four shipyards, each of which services a variety of ships and submarines.

- **Norfolk Naval Shipyard** (Portsmouth, VA)
- **Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility** (Pearl Harbor, HI)
- **Portsmouth Naval Shipyard** (Kittery, ME)
- **Puget Sound Naval Shipyard and Intermediate Maintenance Facility** (Bremerton, WA)

NAVAIR operates the following three fleet readiness centers, each of which services particular Navy and Marine Corps airframes and systems.

- **Fleet Readiness Center East** (Cherry Point, NC): MV-22B; F/A-18 Hornets and Super Hornets; F-35B; UH-1N; CH-53E; and AV-8B.
- **Fleet Readiness Center Southeast** (Jacksonville, FL): P-8; P-3; H-60; F/A-18 Super Hornets; various naval aviation weapon systems; aeronautical components; and life support systems
- **Fleet Readiness Center Southwest** (North Island, CA): AV-8B; E-2; H-60; and UH-1N.

Marine Corps Covered Depots
Marine Depot Maintenance Command operates the following two logistics bases, each of which services a variety of ground combat and combat support equipment.

- **Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany** (Albany, GA)
- **Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow** (Barstow, CA)

Funding
Title 10 U.S.C. §2460 defines depot-level maintenance without regard to which appropriation funds the activity. In FY2021 DOD received $32.5 billion in Operations & Maintenance, PROCUREMENT, and Research, Development, Test, & Evaluation appropriations for depot maintenance activities. DOD budget requests for FY2022 and FY2023 depot maintenance reached $32.6 and $35.1 billion, respectively. According to DOD, the FY2023 budget request would fund 50% of total executable Army depot maintenance requirements; 71% of Navy requirements; 80% of Marine Corps requirements; 85% of Air Force requirements; and 83% of Space Force requirements.

Relevant Statutory Requirements
Title 10 U.S.C §2460 explicitly provides a role for depot-level maintenance and repair performed by private sector contractors. Title 10 U.S.C. §2466 prohibits DOD from spending more than 50% of its annual depot-level maintenance funds on contracting with non-federal entities in a given fiscal year (sometimes referred to as the 50-50 rule). DOD is also barred by 10 U.S.C. §2472 from managing depot employees by end strength.

Considerations for Congress
Resourcing maintenance depots. In a 2022 report, GAO assessed the condition of most depot facilities and equipment as “fair-to-poor;” in response, some in DOD and Congress have raised concerns that the resourcing of maintenance depots is insufficient. These concerns informed Section 374 of the FY2023 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), which modified MILDEPs’ investment obligations by increasing the minimum investment requirement from 6% of the average annual depot workload to 8% of this total, with the further requirement that 25% of this investment be used for FSRM. Congress may oversee the MILDEPs’ execution of this requirement, and might consider whether further modifications to investment requirements and priorities could improve the condition of depot infrastructure.

Improving depot planning, management, and reporting. Planning depot-level maintenance is complex, requiring MILDEPs to estimate optimal workforce levels at each covered depot by balancing peacetime and wartime requirements. In addition to scheduled maintenance, depots must also perform unplanned maintenance to address emergent issues. The difficulty of planning can lead to negative impacts, including maintenance backlogs, spare parts shortages, and the failure of major weapon systems to meet readiness goals. Congress may direct DOD to continue reporting recurrent maintenance problems and identify changes to improve depot performance.
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