DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 SOUTH CLARK STREET, SUITE 600
ARLINGTON, VA 22202
TELEPHONE: 703-699-2950
FAX: 703-699-2735

July 13, 2005
JCS #13

Chairman:
The Honorable Anthony J. Principi

Commissioners:
The Honorable James H. Bilbray
The Honorable Philip E. Coyle, III
Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.)
The Honorable James V. Hansen
General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.)
General Lloyd W. Newton, USAF (Ret.)
The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner
Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)

Executive Director:
Charles Battaglia

Mr. Bob Meyer
Director
BRAC Clearinghouse
1401 Oak St.
Roslyn VA 22209

Dear Mr. Meyer:

I respectfully request a written response from the Department of Defense concerning the following requests:

Regarding the recommendation to establish a Joint Center for Religious Training:

How similar are the current curriculums at the religious education schools operated by the services? (Please provide any available curriculum comparisons).

Moreover, what courses currently taught at the schools would be combined? Is the focus on religious education or service customs/operations/procedures/etc.?

Regarding recommendation to establish a Joint Center for Culinary Excellence:

The Air Force and Navy de-consolidated culinary training after several years of consolidated training because there were too many cultural issues and differences in methods of food preparation that could not be resolved. How would these differences be reconciled if the culinary programs for all the services were consolidated at Fort Lee?

The Air Force contends that since their students now transfer from basic training to the culinary tech school via bus, there will be a large increase in costs for flying the students from basic to Fort Lee. They also contend that costs will be increased due to TDY costs for Guard and Reserve students. How will these costs affect the annual recurring savings of the recommendation?

Service officials have told us that the Air Force and Navy schools will not be relocated to Fort Lee simultaneously. If this is the case, what factors are causing the planned staggered implementation?

The Navy has started a $1.9 million renovation for a new culinary training facility at Great Lakes NAS. Why are they renovating a facility for culinary training if DOD plans to move the school to Fort Lee? Does DOD propose to consolidate the Army and Air Force programs at Fort Lee and leave the Navy at Great Lakes? If the Navy does not move its school to Fort Lee, how will the purported savings of the recommendation be affected? If the Navy does not move its school to Fort Lee, what is the benefit of forcing the Air Force to move its school?

Regarding the recommendation to establish a Consolidated Center for Transportation Management Training:

A comparison of Air Force/Army Transportation Management Training curriculums provided by Air Force officials shows vast differences in what is currently trained by each service. What analyses were conducted to assure DOD that if the programs are combined the uniqueness of each service's needs can still be met at a savings in training costs?

I would appreciate your response by July 19, 2005. Please provide a control number for this request and do not hesitate to contact me if I can provide further information concerning this request.

Yours sincerely,

Frank Cirillo
Director
Review & Analysis

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
4000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-4000

DCN 4940

PERSONNEL AND READINESS

15 JULY 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR OSD CLEARING HOUSE

Subj: OSD BRAC CLEARING HOUSE TASKER #0554

The attached file forwards the response to subject query for your consolidation. All information was derived from unclassified information provided by the Services for BRAC analysis by E&T JCSG subgroups.

If you have any questions, please contact Mark Horn at the E&T JCSG Coordination Team, (703) 696-6435 ext. 206 or Mark.Horn@wso.whs.mil.

Robert D. Howlett
E&T JCSG Coordination Team

Attached:
1. E&T Response 0554

Tasker C0544

Establish a Joint Center for Religious Education and Training:

Q: How similar are the current curriculums at the religious education schools operated by the services? Moreover, what courses currently taught at the schools would be combined?

ANSWER: Members of the E&T JCSG Subgroups (Specialized Skills Training (SST) and Professional Development Education (PDE)) analyzed the Services' curricula for both officer and enlisted education and training functions, with the goal of establishing a Joint Center of Excellence for Religious education and training functions, while preserving service-unique culture. By co-locating the religious core function at a single location, the intent was to eliminate any redundancy for similar courses and programs; merge common support functions; train as we fight "jointly"; and co-locate in close proximity to operational forces (of all services). Below is the list of specialized skills training and professional continuing education courses, by Service. E&T JCSG analysis indicated that sometimes a specific Service course correlated with another Services' course, and in other instances, one course would correlate with all three Services.

SST / PDE courses, by Service

Air Force	Army	Navy / Marine Corps
Basic Chaplains Course	Chaplain Officer Basic Course (Active Duty)	Class "A" School
Chaplain Professional Continuing Education	Chaplain Officer Basic Course, Phase 1 (Reserve Components)	Navy Chaplain Staff and Leadership
Intermediate Chaplains Course	Chaplain Officer Basic Course, Phase 2 (Reserve Components)	Navy Chaplain Strategic Leadership and Ministry
Wing Chaplain Course	Chaplain Officer Basic Course, Phase 3 (Reserve Components)	Religious Program Specialist Class A
Readiness Chaplain Course	Chaplain Career Course	Religious Program Specialist Class F
Chaplain Candidate Course	Chaplain Career Course, Phase 1 (Reserve Components)	Amphibious/Expeditionary Chaplain Course
Chaplain Service Support Apprentice Course	Chaplain Career Course, Phase 2 (Reserve Components)	Chaplain and RP Expeditionary Skills Training (CREST) "C" School
Chaplain Assistant Craftsman Course	Chaplain Initial Military Training	Religious Program Specialist Advanced
	Chaplaincy Resources Managers Course	
	Chaplain Training Managers Conference	
	Fund Clerk Course	
	Non Appropriated Fund Refresher Seminar	
	Chaplain Assistant Advanced Individual Training	
	Chaplain Assistant Basic Noncommissioned Officer Course	
	Chaplain Assistant Advanced Noncommissioned Officer Course	
	Chaplain Assistant Reserve Component	

Reclassification Course
Chaplain Assistant Basic Noncommissioned Officer Course Technical Track
Chaplain Assistant Advanced Noncommissioned Officer Course Technical Track
Installation Chaplain Course
Division Level Chaplain Course

Q: Is the focus on religious education or service customs/operations/procedures/etc.?

ANSWER: Both. Analysis of the religious core function indicated the Service schools conducted similar lessons within courses to provide skills and knowledge required by religious program specialists and/or chaplain assistants. With reference to religious education, the E&T JCSG saw similarities in lesson content for: teaching religious ministries and coordination of religious education programs and instructional methods. With reference to service customs/operations/procedures, etc., E&T JCSG analysis indicated similarities in lesson content for the following areas: computer systems and IT support, sexual violence, counseling services and deployment support, logistic and administrative support, and financial analysis and management. Skills and knowledge related to these fundamental principles appeared to span across the Services' religious education and training schools. The E&T JCSG felt that by co-locating (vice consolidation) of religious education functions, the Service acculturation of its members would remain intact.

Regarding recommendation to establish a Joint Center for Culinary Excellence:

Question: The Air Force and Navy de-consolidated culinary training after several years of consolidated training because there were too many cultural issues and differences in methods of food preparation that could not be resolved. How would these differences be reconciled if the culinary programs for all the services were consolidated at Fort Lee?

Answer: Ft. Lee currently performs consolidated culinary specialized skills training (SST) for initial, skill progression, and functional training for all services (Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard) except for the initial culinary training performed at Lackland AFB for the Air Force and Navy. The existing culinary initial, skill progression and functional training level courses at Ft. Lee taught to all services have successfully resolved the "cultural issues and differences in methods of food preparation." The specifics of how these differences that caused the Air Force and Navy to de-consolidate culinary training are details of the implementation plan, which are several levels of detail below the much more macro BRAC process. Given Ft. Lee's established and ongoing success in resolving the "cultural issues and differences in methods of food preparation," it is very reasonable to have high confidence the implementation plan (developed subsequently to BRAC process and approval) will successfully address and resolve these cultural and methods issues.

Question: The Air Force contends that since their students now transfer from basic training to the culinary tech school via bus, there will be a large increase in costs for flying the students from basic to Fort Lee. They also contend that costs will be increased due to TDY costs for Guard and Reserve students. How will these costs affect the annual recurring savings of the recommendation?

Answer: BRAC rules of engagement did not allow the consideration of TDY costs. Thus, TDY costs were not considered in the COBRA analysis.

Question: Service officials have told us that the Air Force and Navy schools will not be relocated to Fort Lee simultaneously. If this is the case, what factors are causing the planned staggered implementation?

Answer: This recommendation anticipates the move of all services in FY06. Implementation details, which are the root of this question, are post-BRAC process and approval. There could be a variety of factors that may cause the implementation to be different from the recommendation's anticipation of a FY06 move. For example, required construction may not be completed in FY06. This would cause the implementation plan to shift the move to FY07 (or later as the case may be) and/or to stagger the move. The bottom line is that the implementation plan will fill in the details (micro decision-making process) that were not part of the BRAC macro decision-making process.

Question: The Navy has started a $1.9 million renovation for a new culinary training facility at Great Lakes NAS. Why are they renovating a facility for culinary training if DoD plans to move the school to Fort Lee?

Answer: DoN developed a plan (before BRAC and independent of BRAC) to move its culinary training from Lackland AFB to Great Lakes NAS. This recommendation would negate some of the contracts let for the move, and thus incur a one-time cost of $500K.

Question: Does DoD propose to consolidate the Army and Air Force programs at Fort Lee and leave the Navy at Great Lakes?

Answer: No.

If the Navy does not move its school to Fort Lee, how will the purported savings of the recommendation be affected?

Answer: By deleting the Navy component moving to Ft. Lee, the savings will be reduced as follows:

Payback Measures	Recommendation	Without Navy to Ft. Lee
One Time Cost	$5.355M	$4.770M
Net Implementation Savings	$2.570M	$1.292M
Annual Recurring Savings	$1.396M	$1.078M
Payback Period	2 Years	5 Years
Net Present Value in 2025 (savings)	$15.738M	$11.464M

Note: the without Navy COBRA analysis deleted the Navy component from the recommended scenario and did not account for (cost) the Navy move to Great Lakes.

If the Navy does not move its school to Fort Lee, what is the benefit of forcing the Air Force to move its school?

Answer: The DoD functional benefit is fostering jointness in the CSS Center at Ft. Lee, specifically in CSS training and doctrine development, which promote training effectiveness and functional efficiencies. The DoD financial benefit is illustrated in the foregoing chart of a Net Present Value of $11.464M in 2025.

Regarding the recommendation to establish a Consolidated Center for Transportation Management Training:

Question: A comparison of Air Force/Army Transportation Management Training curriculums provided by Air Force officials shows vast differences in what is currently trained by each service. What analyses were conducted to assure DoD that if the programs are combined the uniqueness of each service's needs can still be met at a savings in training costs?

Answer: The BRAC provides the overarching framework – a macro analysis. Specifically, we identified similarities in skill sets (in this case, Air Force AFSC and Army MOS) while acknowledging service uniqueness. The detailed (micro) analysis to assure DoD that the combined of programs will retain and be responsive to service unique requirement is the Interservice Training Review Organization (ITRO) process. The ITRO

process between the respective services will ensure the curriculum meets the unique needs of the respective services while being combined (fostering jointness among the services).