

DCN: 12121

Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2005 2:02 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Saxon, Ethan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Wasleski, Marilyn, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Abrell, Timothy, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Felix, Kevin, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Installations Affected by Multiple Recommendations
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 6:30 AM
Flag Status: Flagged
Attachments: Installations Affected by Multiple Recommendations.doc

Ed - Thanks - great start

David - Dan -

This is Ed's first cut on actions that should initially be considered for advancing into the leading recommendation as part of the legislative model process. If this list were all encompassing and deemed to make sense by respective Team Leads - our plan would be to move up to the leading recommendation those trailing recommendations.

In this model it probably would make sense to brief each of the 2, 3....6,.. or 14 related recommendations before voting on any ??

Please quickly send or provide copies of you latest legislative draft for our review and to assure our numbers and letters match yours - thanks

Also - as of now we do not recommend nor feel comfortable with bringing the ANG recommendations up front because ANG actions are involved in 37 of the 42 USAF recommendations. Two possible alternatives

- o move the USAF recommendations up to the first group (too include the DoN item on Willow Grove
- o present a big picture showing the single or even more than one overarching methodology used and suggested for execution with individual votes as they occur.

TLs -

as Ed notes this is first cut, I need the Team with the the leading recommendation for each recommendation to sort out whether the trailing impact is significant enough to warrant this grouping concept. Please be prepared to give your comments, suggestions or conclusions in this matter no later than Tuesday AM (Nat Please watch this suspense)

TLs - Also (with Tim A, Marilyn and Kevin) please note Ed's comments on leased, DFAS and Transformation)

Frank

From: Ed Brown [mailto:edbrown61@verizon.net]

8/12/2005

DCN: 12121

Sent: Friday, August 05, 2005 5:34 PM
To: Frank Cirillo; Bob Cook
Subject: Installations Affected by Multiple Recommendations

Frank and Bob:

In developing the attached table, I went through Tyler's Tab 3 and included only those installations where I felt the rejection of one or more of the noted recommendations would have a "major" personnel impact. I have not included any of the leased facilities and DFAS sites. I have not included some installations that have both gains and losses. Lackland AFB, TX and Shaw AFB, SC are examples. I also didn't include the "Undistributed or Overseas Reductions" – frankly I didn't know how to handle them.

I'm not sure what the next step should be. Trying to orchestrate the final deliberation hearing based on the attached does not seem to be workable – you'll have no service of cross-service group structure. Hopefully, when you "grade" the Commissioner's "Checklist" homework, you'll get a better idea of what recommendations might be rejected or amended and how to proceed.

Hope this helps somewhat but I am not convinced it does. Let me know if there is anything I can be doing to help in my "spare time" while I'm away.

Ed

8/12/2005

DCN: 12121

Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Saturday, August 06, 2005 2:02 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Saxon, Ethan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Wasleski, Marilyn, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Abrell, Timothy, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Felix, Kevin, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Installations Affected by Multiple Recommendations
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Due By: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 6:30 AM
Flag Status: Flagged
Attachments: Installations Affected by Multiple Recommendations.doc

Ed - Thanks - great start

David - Dan -

This is Ed's first cut on actions that should initially be considered for advancing into the leading recommendation as part of the legislative model process. If this list were all encompassing and deemed to make sense by respective Team Leads - our plan would be to move up to the leading recommendation those trailing recommendations.

In this model it probably would make sense to brief each of the 2, 3...6,.. or 14 related recommendations before voting on any ??

Please quickly send or provide copies of you latest legislative draft for our review and to assure our numbers and letters match yours - thanks

Also - as of now we do not recommend nor feel comfortable with bringing the ANG recommendations up front because ANG actions are involved in 37 of the 42 USAF recommendations. Two possible alternatives

- o move the USAF recommendations up to the first group (too include the DoN item on Willow Grove
- o present a big picture showing the single or even more than one overarching methodology used and suggested for execution with individual votes as they occur.

TLs -

as Ed notes this is first cut, I need the Team with the the leading recommendation for each recommendation to sort out whether the trailing impact is significant enough to warrant this grouping concept. Please be prepared to give your comments, suggestions or conclusions in this matter no later than Tuesday AM (Nat Please watch this suspense)

TLs - Also (with Tim A, Marilyn and Kevin) please note Ed's comments on leased, DFAS and Transformation)

Frank

From: Ed Brown [mailto:edbrown61@verizon.net]

8/7/2005

DCN: 12121

Sent: Friday, August 05, 2005 5:34 PM
To: Frank Cirillo; Bob Cook
Subject: Installations Affected by Multiple Recommendations

Frank and Bob:

In developing the attached table, I went through Tyler's Tab 3 and included only those installations where I felt the rejection of one or more of the noted recommendations would have a "major" personnel impact. I have not included any of the leased facilities and DFAS sites. I have not included some installations that have both gains and losses. Lackland AFB, TX and Shaw AFB, SC are examples. I also didn't include the "Undistributed or Overseas Reductions" – frankly I didn't know how to handle them.

I'm not sure what the next step should be. Trying to orchestrate the final deliberation hearing based on the attached does not seem to be workable – you'll have no service of cross-service group structure. Hopefully, when you "grade" the Commissioner's "Checklist" homework, you'll get a better idea of what recommendations might be rejected or amended and how to proceed.

Hope this helps somewhat but I am not convinced it does. Let me know if there is anything I can be doing to help in my "spare time" while I'm away.

Ed

8/7/2005

Installations Affected by Multiple Recommendations
Indicating [REDACTED] for Review Using Adds, A, N, AF, JCSG Order

Installation	Recommendation Numbers		
Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD	[REDACTED] E&T-6 H&SA-18 H&SA-19	H&SA-46 Med-4 Med-6	Med-15 S&S-7 Tech-22
Air Reserve Personnel Center (Buckley Annex), CO	H&SA-33	H&SA-37	[REDACTED]
Andrews AFB, MD	[REDACTED] Air Force-24	Air Force-32 H&SA-3	H&SA-8 Med-12
Anniston Army Depot, AL	[REDACTED] DoN-6	Ind-4 Ind-7	S&S-5 S&S-13
Elmendorf AFB, AK	[REDACTED]	Air Force-18	Air Force-43
Fort Belvoir, VA	[REDACTED] E&T-13 H&SA-8 H&SA-10 H&SA-12	H&SA-15 H&SA-30 H&SA-46 Med-4	Med-15 S&S-7 Tech-5 Tech-18
Fort Bliss, TX	[REDACTED]	E&T-12	
Fort Eustis, VA	[REDACTED] Army-19 E&T-5	E&T-6 H&SA-31 H&SA-35	H&SA-41 Med-12
Fort Hood, TX	[REDACTED]	Army-22	
Fort Knox, KY	[REDACTED] Army-19 Army-20	Army-115 H&SA-22 H&SA-33	H&SA-46 Med-12
Hickam AFB, HI	[REDACTED]	Air Force-53	H&SA-41
Hill AFB, UT	[REDACTED] Air Force-47 H&SA-19	S&S-5 S&S-7 S&S-13	Tech-18 Tech-24
Moody AFB, GA	[REDACTED]	Air Force-35	E&T-14
NAS Jacksonville, FL	[REDACTED] DoN-28 DoN-35	H&SA-22 Ind-19	S&S-13 Tech-9
NAS Patuxent River, MD	[REDACTED] Ind-19	Tech-9 Tech-15	Tech-26
NAS Pensacola, FL	[REDACTED] DoN-12 DoN-35 E&T-10	E&T-14 H&SA-17 H&SA-22	H&SA-37 Med-15 Tech-9
NAWS China Lake, CA	[REDACTED] Tech-15	Tech-19	Tech-28
NB Coronado, CA	[REDACTED]	Ind-19	
NB Ventura County, CA	[REDACTED] Ind-19	Tech-9 Tech-15	Tech-28
Naval District Washington, DC	[REDACTED] H&SA-5	H&SA-8 H&SA-49	Tech-9 Tech-13
NS Newport, RI	[REDACTED] DoN-12 DoN-14	DoN-25 DoN-44	E&T-9 Tech-9
NS Norfolk, VA	[REDACTED] DoN-25 DoN-26 DoN-28 DoN-44	H&SA-22 H&SA-26 H&SA-31 H&SA-37 Ind-18	Ind-19 S&S-5 S&S-13 Tech-9
NS Pearl Harbor, HI	[REDACTED] H&SA-19	H&SA-37	S&S-5
NSWC Dahlgren, VA	[REDACTED] Tech-9	Tech-15	Tech-19
Pope AFB, NC	[REDACTED] Army-6 Army-8	Air Force-25 Air Force-52	[REDACTED]

Installations Affected by Multiple Recommendations
 Indicating [REDACTED] for Review Using Adds, A, N, AF, JCSG Order

Installation	Recommendation Numbers		
Randolph AFB, TX	[REDACTED] Air Force-65 E&T-14	H&SA-19 H&SA-33	H&SA-41 Med-6
Redstone Arsenal, AL	[REDACTED] Army-11 E&T-6	H&SA-15 H&SA-46 S&S-7	Tech-7 Tech-26
Robins AFB, GA	[REDACTED] Air Force-16 H&SA-19	H&SA-33 S&S-7 S&S-13	Tech-24 Tech-26
Rock Island Arsenal, IL	[REDACTED] H&SA-19	H&SA-37 H&SA-46	Ind-7 S&S-7
Wright Patterson AFB, OH	H&SA-19 Med-6 Med-15	Tech-6 Tech-22 Tech-24	Tech-26 [REDACTED]