

DCN: 2167

06 April 2005

Education and Training JCSG 2nd Briefing Notes

Date: Monday, April 04, 2005

Time: 10:00-11:30

Place: 3E752

JCSG Chairman: Mr. Charles S. Abell, PDUSD(P&R)

JCSG Executive Secretary: Mr. Robert Howlett

- Mr. Charles S. Abell, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel & Readiness)/Chairman, Education & Training Joint Cross-Service Group
- Col James Briggs, USAF, POC, Specialized Skills Training Subgroup
- Col Jerry Lynes, USMC, Chairman, Professional Development Education Subgroup
- Mr. Tom Macia, USA, POC, Ranges Subgroup
- CAPT Gene Summerlin, USN, POC, Flight Training Subgroup
- Nancy Weaver, E&T JCSG

Red Team Attendees:

- Honorable H.T. Johnson
- Honorable Robin Pirie
- General Leon Salomon
- Mr. John Turnquist

Subject: *Second* Candidate Recommendation Briefing by Education and Training JCSG to BRAC Red Team

Items of Import:

- E&T-0004A and E&T-0058 have not gone to IEC and there are two other candidate recommendations that have yet to go to the ISG.

Questions that arose:

- What is the “SecDef’s Vector”? (Salomon)
- Were you able to make any progress [on joint pilot training?]? *No. We are preparing modestly, most services didn’t like the proposal because it was “too joint”. Then we had through-put issues. We thought it was a good idea for the future but they [the services] weren’t ready.* (Johnson)
- What do you mean by “jet pilot” (Slide 5)? What point are you trying to make? “Jet pilot” is a broad category. *We were tasked to look at JSF.* Ok, you might want to have a backup chart that indicates what is and is not included in “jet pilot”. (Salomon)
- What are UFT, FTU, and FRS (Slide 5)? *Undergraduate flight training,* (Salomon)
- What do you mean by “Preserve Service and Joint Combat training programs” (Slide 5)? Does this mean that you took these programs off the table and did not look at them? *No, it means that we were not going to modify the curriculum of these programs.* (Salomon)
- Can you say you looked at ranges and did not close any? *Yes.* (Johnson)
- Does “Roadmap” really help you? *We say roadmap because we had strategies that were unsuccessful.* Consider not mentioning those unsuccessful strategies (Slides 5, 6, 7, and 8). (Salomon)
- Is the DoDIG pleased (Slide 11)? *Yes.* (Johnson)

- How did you handle surge? *We asked the services if they required any surge in the E&T area, and the services came back with the answer “No.” We did have a fudge factor, a “capability hedge”. You should look back to policy to double check this. (Salomon)*
- Are there really 3,318 installations where there are or will be JSFs (Slide13)? (Salomon)
- What does “9 of 9” mean (Slide 15)? (Salomon)
- Did you use Optimization Model throughout? *It depended. If there was a high number of options we used the optimization model. If there were just a couple alternatives, we just reviewed each alternative ourselves. Did you use it for ranges? We used a type of optimization to achieve jointness in that they looked for combinations of ranges with joint attributes. (Johnson)*
- What does “military unique sub-elements of extant grad-level” mean (E&T-0003R)? *These are special courses that the CNO has recently said we can find in the private sector. The only remaining issue with this recommendation is how international students will be handled as far as funding is concerned. What about the Homeland Security Masters? Professors for those courses usually flew in to teach as opposed to being resident professors or the classes taught via distance learning, so we can send students to a class and continue distance learning from various locations.*
- How are you going to reconcile the never payback (E&T-0052)? *The \$209M in implementation costs are contract costs which come from outside BRAC. (Johnson)*
- Why call it the “Land Warfare University? *That’s what the Army wanted to call it.*
- What do you mean by “Lowest One-Time Cost” in justification (E&T-0062)? What are the alternatives? (Salomon)
- What is left at Ft. Knox when you move this out (E&T-0063)? (Johnson)
- Is the Army comfortable with a “maneuver center” (E&T-0063)? What does this mean? (Salomon)
- Is there really room for everything at Ft. Lee? (Salomon)

Informal observations provided at briefing:

- No other group has discussed the “SecDef’s Vector” - should try to be consistent with other groups.
- Add “excess capacity” to your “Transforming E&T Through BRAC” slide (Slide 3). Although minimizing redundancy or duplication gets at excess capacity, you should try to use BRAC language.
- Be careful with your wording. On slide 5, “Preserve Service...programs” may imply that you did not look at these at all. On Slide 6, “Re-balance Joint...spectrum” implies that it is not balanced now. Neither of these two implications are the point you are trying to make with these two statements.
- Strategy seems to be confused with goals or desired endstate. On May 16th, the SecDef has a strategy. Should try to state a strategy in the beginning of presentation that has a high level of generality and is integrable with an overall DoD strategy.
- Put a strategy block in your “process overview” chart (Slide 9) to indicate that this was a strategy-driven process. You may also want to indicate where military judgment was applied in this process or at least be able to say where during a briefing.
- Double check the JSF universe number on Slide 13 – 3318 seems quite high.
- Typographical error on Slide 16 – “Principals” should be principles.
- May want to use a more positive statement in your justification for E&T-0003R as opposed to “Eliminates need for...NPS and AFIT.”

- Consider adding two columns to cost and savings numbers on E&T-0052. One column for BRAC costs and another for JPO numbers.
- DoD’s story for JPO and overseas moves has to be consistent – should help them find a way to articulate the story.
- Double check the military value block on quad chart for E&T-0058. Why are there so many sites? Furthermore, why is the job loss so high?
- Be careful with the daisy chain – there is a lot going on at Fort Eustis.
- Your candidate recommendations really need to be tied to your strategy. Consider creating a chart that has your strategy on it and use the same words in your justifications.
- Clarify what you mean by “jet pilot”.
- You are breaking new ground in some cases and it might help to show what is and what is not BRAC.
- Figure out a way to reconcile the fact that you handled surge differently than other groups and the Services.
- Develop a strong argument to justify the military judgment used to take graduate pilot training off table. Furthermore, going to need a strong rationale for why the 58% excess capacity in UPT has not been addressed.

Additional observations to consider:

- Almost all candidate recommendations are not in the correct format for submission. Ensure that all candidate recommendations are in the following format:

BRAC Action	where	by what	to where	and retaining what
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Close • Realign • Inactivate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • losing installation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • moving • relocating • consolidating • privatizing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gaining installation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enclaves • functions • activities

- Justification phrases should be removed from candidate recommendation statements.
- Actions that are independent of each other should not be lumped together into the same candidate recommendation.
- During the integration process, need to add retained actions (if any) at each losing installation.
- Since transformation is not one of the final selection criteria, transformational justifications have no legal basis and should be removed. These candidate recommendations should be justified in terms of military value or the force structure plan.
- Candidate recommendations should be organized in presentation in the following order:
 - Tier I: Traditional BRAC – Military value applied, net savings, capacity reduction.
 - Tier II: Strategy Driven – Military judgment applied, net savings, capacity reduction.
 - Tier III: Operationally Driven – Military judgment overrides, net savings.
 - Tier IV: Transformationally Driven – No military value justification, military judgment sole rationale, not cost effective, long paybacks.
- E&T-0003R: How was the capacity of the private sector to absorb additional graduate students analyzed? If it was analyzed (and it's presumably sufficient), why would there need to be a caveat that some curricula elements may need to be relocated?

- E&T-0012: Since move to lower mil value installation is recommended in order to combine like schools, need more information about why co-location of schools is beneficial especially because candidate recommendation description says merging of common support functions is "probable" (rather than a guaranteed).
- E&T-0014: Candidate recommendation description states that it supports transformation options, but we were told these options were never formalized. Consider re-wording.
- E&T-0032: Can the Department build on the new parcel acquired at Fort McNair?
- E&T-0039: Why are the one-time costs so high and the payback so long? Why is there an outdoor recreation facility in the MILCON costs?
- E&T-0046: How does this recommendation impact the "mil value" of the losing installations (e.g., Moody, Randolph, and Whiting Field)? Have the Services evaluated these installations in light of this recommendation? Why not consolidate UPT into even fewer locations--why do you need 7 training bases? What are the MILCON costs for (they are only listed by facility # not type of facility)?
- E&T-0052: There appear to be some significant environmental hurdles to successful implementation. Can these be overcome? What are the MILCON costs for (they are listed by facility # not type of facility)?
- E&T-0061: This candidate recommendation appears to have been put forward by the Army. The environmental impacts seem significant; is the Army confident they will not become impediments to successful implementation? Why is there an "exchange sales facility" included in the MILCON costs?
- E&T-0062: Note this candidate recommendation appears to have been put forward by the Army. Why is Rucker, the receiver, losing military and civilian personnel?
- E&T-0063: This candidate recommendation appears to have been put forward by the Army. The environmental impacts seem significant; will they be an impediment to successful implementation? Why is there a chapel, dental facility, exchange sales facility, and indoor physical fitness facility as part of the MILCON?
- E&T-0064: This appears to have been put forward by the Army. How are the environmental impacts going to be dealt with? Why are a chapel, an indoor physical fitness facility, a child care facility, a recreation center, a dental facility, and an exchange sales facility part of the MILCON costs?