

MSGtoPDF

From: Hill, Christopher, LTC, WSO-HSAJCSG
Sent: Friday, February 11, 2005 2:26 PM
To: Coulson, Carla, COL, WSO-HSAJCSG
Cc: Philbrick, Christopher, COL, WSO-HSAJCSG; Layman, Andrew, 1stLT, WSO-HSAJCSG
Subject: FW: MAH Capacity Analysis 3 Feb 2005 (extract).xls (UNCLASSIFIED)

Ma'am,

FYI, I believe we have solved the Army capacity data and RPLNS issue. We will fix the case-by-case issues with RPLNS. There are a few other minor data points we are still working with the Army, but I do not anticipate any issues.

Thanks

Chris

LTC Christopher M. Hill
 LTC, AR
 Operations Research Analyst
 703.696.9448, ext. 148

Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only

Do Not Release Under FOIA

Notice: This email may contain pre-decisional Department of Defense information that is provided to the addressees on a need-to-know basis. Do not forward outside of the Department of Defense and/or OSD BRAC channels without the expressed permission of the originator.

-----Original Message-----

From: Tarantino, William J COL ASA(I&E) [mailto:William.Tarantino@us.army.mil]
Sent: Friday, February 11, 2005 1:46 PM
To: Hill, Christopher LTC WSO-HSAJCSG; Mencl, Pegge N Ms OASA(I&E)
Cc: Maguire, Michael F Mr ASA(I&E)/BCP; Manners, Kathleen E Ms ASA(I&E); Layman, Andrew 1stLT WSO-HSAJCSG; Philbrick, Christopher R COL Army G8
Subject: RE: MAH Capacity Analysis 3 Feb 2005 (extract).xls (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
 Caveats: NONE

Chris, drive on. We will help where we can and default to our method when needed. We understand your position.

COL T

-----Original Message-----

From: Hill, Christopher LTC WSO-HSAJCSG
Sent: Friday, February 11, 2005 1:31 PM
To: Tarantino, William J COL ASA(I&E); Mencl, Pegge N Ms OASA(I&E)
Cc: Maguire, Michael F Mr ASA(I&E)/BCP; Manners, Kathleen E Ms ASA(I&E); Layman, Andrew 1stLT WSO-HSAJCSG; Philbrick, Christopher R COL Army G8
Subject: RE: MAH Capacity Analysis 3 Feb 2005 (extract).xls (UNCLASSIFIED)
Importance: High

Sir and Peg,

Roger I understand your answer and it helps somewhat. I have additional issues imposed

upon us by our DOD(IG) audits. If we do a wholesale replace of Q303 and 445 data with RPLNS, it creates issues for me. After the update, based on our approach, we do not look like our data gets "well" because we use personnel counts to derive "excess." In addition, our IG will likely flag us for using different approaches between the services. DCN: 11213

I recommend we use the RPLNS data to fix the specific issues we addressed with Peg and Kathy. Namely Forts Gordon, Hamilton, Monroe, Polk, Rucker, Wainwright, Schofield Barracks, and Walter Reed. If we use RPLANS supply and demand fields, all get fixed from my perspective, with the exception of Schofield Barracks. The personnel counts at Schofield compared to the supply space makes it look like there is excess--a fact we know doesn't make sense. In addition Schofield, we still need to resolve personnel counts at Hamilton, Monroe, and Wainwright.

Please remember that OSD has requested a memo to explain why we are using RPLNS vice 303 and 445 in these cases.

I acknowledge that we will have different views between HSA and TABS on capacity. We used it primarily as a starting point and I feel comfortable with it as is. If our differences cause an issue later down the road, I will recommend we defer to your position as you obviously have a better understanding of capacity on Army Installations.

If you disagree with my recommendation, please let me know and we will address it.

Thanks for the support,

Chris

LTC Christopher M. Hill
LTC, AR
Operations Research Analyst
703.696.9448, ext. 148

Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only

Do Not Release Under FOIA

Notice: This email may contain pre-decisional Department of Defense information that is provided to the addressees on a need-to-know basis. Do not forward outside of the Department of Defense and/or OSD BRAC channels without the expressed permission of the originator.

-----Original Message-----

From: Tarantino, William J COL ASA(I&E) [mailto:William.Tarantino@us.army.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2005 5:28 PM
To: Hill, Christopher LTC WSO-HSAJCSG
Cc: Mencl, Pegge N Ms OASA(I&E); Maguire, Michael F Mr ASA(I&E)/BCP
Subject: RE: MAH Capacity Analysis 3 Feb 2005 (extract).xls (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Caveats: NONE

Chris, it is flat wrong to think the Army has excess on all installations in all areas. The Army is short numerous types of facilities, we make up for it through temp facilities, over crowding, "red" facilities, and use of facilities with other than intended use. That is the way it is.

I would be happy to discuss with you in detail. (I feel your pain, this is not an easy sell)

COL T

From: Mencl, Pegge N Ms OASA(I&E)
Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2005 5:05 PM
To: Tarantino, William J COL ASA(I&E)
Subject: FW: MAH Capacity Analysis 3 Feb 2005 (extract).xls (UNCLASSIFIED)
Importance: High

DCN: 11213

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Ok help Chris just went beyond my level of knowledge.

Peg

From: Hill, Christopher LTC WSO-HSAJCSG
Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2005 5:01 PM
To: Mencl, Pegge N Ms OASA(I&E)
Cc: Manners, Kathleen E Ms ASA(I&E); Maguire, Michael F Mr ASA(I&E)/BCP; Layman, Andrew 1stLT WSO-HSAJCSG
Subject: RE: MAH Capacity Analysis 3 Feb 2005 (extract).xls (UNCLASSIFIED)
Importance: High

Peg,

I need to think through this a bit, and I have a few more questions. First, the fact that demand exceeds supply will likely be something the lawyer chokes on. Can you give me a better explanation as how this happens? The intent of our metric, I believe, was to base it on square feet available versus used (not based on personnel). Given that, it does not make sense that we are sitting on more space than is available. Please help me out on this one. If we decide to use RPLNS for both, we may need some kind of explanation in the memo.

I will investigate dropping the current capacity part, as that will fix our problem, but I doubt I will get support on it.

Also, we may get OSD pushback on using some of RPLNS and some of our questions. Can RPLNS give us data for personnel and surge?

I'll run this by the boss tomorrow, any additional info will be greatly appreciated.

Thanks

Chris

LTC Christopher M. Hill

LTC, AR

Operations Research Analyst

703.696.9448, ext. 148

Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only

Do Not Release Under FOIA

Notice: This email may contain pre-decisional Department of Defense information that is provided to the addressees on a need-to-know basis. Do not forward outside of the Department of Defense and/or OSD BRAC channels without the expressed permission of the originator.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mencl, Pegge N Ms OASA(I&E) [mailto:Pegge.Mencl@hqda.army.mil]

Sent: Wednesday, February 09, 2005 2:34 PM

To: Hill, Christopher LTC WSO-HSAJCSG

Cc: Tarantino, William J COL ASA(I&E); Manners, Kathleen E Ms ASA(I&E); Maguire, Michael F Mr ASA(I&E)/BCP

Subject: MAH Capacity Analysis 3 Feb 2005 (extract).xls (UNCLASSIFIED)

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Chris - pls look at 4th worksheet that shows Army Rplans data.

From Rplans I used current demand to determine current capacity and current supply to determine Maximum capacity

Although it does seem backwards in some cases the current demand does exceed the capacity. This is the Army - we will cram people in everywhere and anywhere. OSD legal needs to get their minds around this I believe. COL T -- if I'm way off base pls advise.

When processing SDCs I used Rplans to determined whether or not MILCON was required.

In my humble opinion using data gathered from CDC #303 and #445 provides numbers totally out of whack with what Army had identified as excess capacity.

Also, using Rplans supports scenarios where MILCON is required and not required.

Believe Army would prefer HSA use Rplans data rather than data from CDC. Questions in CDC were too easily misunderstood by responders. Use of Rplans matches Army data.

Understand Mike McAndrew stated HSA could use if Army would provide memo stating we believe Rplans is far more accurate.

Chris - let me know what you think after you review.

Peg

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE

Classification: UNCLASSIFIED

Caveats: NONE