

BRAC 2005
Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)
Daily Conference Call
Meeting Minutes of 10 January 2005

Dr. Segal chaired the meeting. The agenda is enclosed in attachment 1. The list of attendees is enclosed in attachment 2. Read ahead materials for the meeting are enclosed in attachment 3. The primary objective for the meeting was to review RFC and Scenario Data Call Status and to review any proposed subgroup scenario data assumptions. The agenda topics are listed below in the order in which they were covered. The key points, decisions and action items from the meeting are as follows:

RFC and Scenario Data Call Status

Key Points

- The Army is making progress with their scenario data.
- The Navy is making progress with their data as well and should have all initial data certified and submitted by the end of this week.
- The Air Force will have all initial scenario data certified and submitted by Wednesday, 12 January 2005.
- Two Critical RFCs are still outstanding: Navy China Lake RFC and the Ft. Rucker RFC.
- Mr. Shaffer requested the Service Principals to assign additional resources to working the data discrepancies so the data are cleaned up in the near term.

Decisions

- Mr. Simmons will request that the Army BRAC office release all Army data that is currently available.

Subgroup Scenario Data Assumptions

Key Points

- Mr. Mleziva, C4ISR Subgroup Lead, presented proposed data assumptions for COBRA runs for TECH-0008 and TECH-0042.
- Historically, 15% in manpower savings have been realized using COBRA for consolidation scenarios in past BRAC rounds. Therefore, Mr. Shaffer recommended the TJCSG standardize this 15% assumption across the board for all TJCSG consolidation scenarios.
- Dr. Berry, Enabling Technologies Subgroup Lead, presented COBRA run assumptions for TECH-0032.
- Dr. Schuette, Innovative Systems Subgroup Lead, indicated COBRA presented RFCs and COBRA assumptions for TECH-0040.

January 10, 2004

BRAC FOUO

- Dr. Schuette indicated a COBRA run will be completed for discussion at tomorrow's TJCSG Meeting.
- Mr. Mathes requested the FFRDC issue regarding the movement of FFRDCs be resolved at tomorrow's TJCSG Meeting.
- Dr. Higgins, Weapons and Armaments Subgroup Lead, indicated they will present assumptions for COBRA runs for TECH-0019 and TECH-0043 during tomorrow's teleconference.

Decisions

- The TJCSG approved COBRA run #2 to be performed for C4ISR scenarios TECH-0008 and TECH-0042 as presented. The decision regarding manpower cost savings assumptions will be deferred until tomorrow's TJCSG Meeting.
- The TJCSG approved a COBRA run to be performed for Enabling Technologies scenario TECH-0032. However, two COBRA runs will be performed: one assuming MILCON at Aberdeen and one assuming no MILCON at Aberdeen.
- The FFRDC issue will be added to the agenda for tomorrow's TJCSG Meeting.

Action Items:

1. Mr. Strack will add the FFRDC issue to tomorrow's TJCSG Meeting agenda.

Approved: _____


Mr. Al Shaffer

Chairman, Capabilities Integration Team

Attachments:

1. Outline -Agenda
2. List of Attendees
3. Read Ahead Materials

Attachment 2
Technical JCSG Meeting
January 10, 2005
Attendees

Members:

Dr. Ron Segal, Chairman
Dr. Dan Stewart, Air Force Alternate for Mr. Blaise Durante, Air Force
Mr. Brian Simmons, Army
Dr. Barry Dillon, Marines
Mr. George Ryan, Navy Alternate for RADM Jay Cohen
Mr. Jay Erb, JCS

Other:

Mr. Al Shaffer, CIT Chairman
COL Walt Hamm, Marines CIT Rep
Mr. Gary Strack, OSD
Mr. Roger Florence, DoD IG
Mr. Larry Schuette, Innovative Technologies Subgroup Lead
COL Pete DeSalva, Analytic Team
Mr. Jerry Schiefer, OSD BRAC
Mr. Doug Nation, Air Force
Mr. Matt Mleziva, C4ISR Subgroup Lead
Dr. Bill Berry, Enabling Technologies Subgroup Lead
Dr. Karen Higgins, Weapons & Armaments Subgroup Rep
Mr. Pete Cahill, Army
Dr. Jim Short, OSD
Mr. Al Goldstain, Air Force CIT Rep
Mr. Thom Mathes, ALSS Subgroup Lead

TJCSG Daily Teleconference Call

Agenda

1700-1730 hrs EST

- **Scenario Data Call Status**
- **Criteria 8 Status**
- **Subgroup Scenario Data Assumptions**

Scenario	Priority	Army Data Call		Navy Data Call		Air Force Data Call		DTRA Data Call		DARPA Data Call		DISA Data Call		MDA Data Call		Part 2 Data Call		
		Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In	MIIDep /DefAg
0002	3	7-Dec	7-Jan	3-Dec	4-Jan	3-Dec	3-Dec	3-Dec	22-Dec					3-Dec	7-Jan			USA DON USAF
0005	3	7-Dec		7-Dec	23-Dec	7-Dec	21-Dec									10-Jan 10-Jan		USA DON
0006	3	6-Dec	7-Jan	7-Dec	23-Dec	18-Dec												USA USAF
0008	2	24-Nov		10-Jan		24-Nov	21-Dec									18-Dec 18-Dec		USA USAF
0009	1	24-Nov	27-Dec	24-Nov	21-Dec	24-Nov	20-Dec											USA USAF
0010	4	24-Nov	17-Dec	24-Nov	14-Dec	24-Nov	13-Dec	24-Nov	8-Dec	24-Nov	10-Dec					14-Dec		USA USA
0013	3	13-Dec	7-Jan	13-Dec	21-Dec	14-Dec										6-Jan		USA USAF
0014	3			14-Dec	21-Dec	14-Dec										30-Dec		USA
0017	3	9-Dec	7-Jan	9-Dec	28-Dec	9-Dec	14-Dec											USA USA
0018	3	6-Dec	7-Jan	6-Dec		6-Dec		8-Dec	7-Jan					6-Dec	7-Jan			USA DON USAF
0019	2			3-Dec	20-Dec													
0020	1	7-Dec	27-Dec	7-Dec	22-Dec	7-Dec	15-Dec									18-Dec		DON DON
0030	3	13-Dec		13-Dec	29-Dec							13-Dec	6-Jan			10-Jan		USA USA
0032	1	26-Nov	27-Dec	26-Nov	13-Dec	26-Nov	16-Dec	26-Nov	10-Dec	26-Nov	10-Dec					17-Dec		USA USA
0034	4	26-Nov		26-Nov	20-Dec	26-Nov	20-Dec											
0038	4	26-Nov	17-Dec	26-Nov	20-Dec	26-Nov	13-Dec	26-Nov	8-Dec	26-Nov	14-Dec					14-Dec		DON DON
0039	4	26-Nov	17-Dec	26-Nov	20-Dec	26-Nov	13-Dec	26-Nov	8-Dec	26-Nov	14-Dec					14-Dec		DON DON
0040	1	26-Nov	17-Dec	26-Nov	20-Dec	26-Nov	13-Dec	26-Nov	8-Dec	26-Nov	14-Dec					14-Dec		DON DON
0041	4	26-Nov	17-Dec	26-Nov	20-Dec	26-Nov	14-Dec	26-Nov	8-Dec	26-Nov	14-Dec					16-Dec		USAF USAF
0042	2	22-Dec		3-Dec	22-Dec	3-Dec	4-Jan									22-Dec		USA USAF
0043	2			6-Dec	28-Dec											20-Dec		USAF USAF
0044	4	9-Dec	7-Jan	9-Dec	28-Dec	9-Dec	14-Dec											DON DON
0046	4	3-Dec		16-Dec	20-Dec	3-Dec	13-Dec			3-Dec	14-Dec					3-Jan		USA USA
0047	4	13-Dec		13-Dec	29-Dec	13-Dec						13-Dec	6-Jan					USAF USAF
0054	4			29-Dec														
0055	4			29-Dec														
0056	4			29-Dec	7-Jan											10-Jan		USAF USAF
		No Action/Not Applicable																
		Routine Action																
		Overdue/Urgent Action																
		Completed																

OUTSTANDING RFC STATUS

	Sup Cap	% of Sup Cap RFCs	Mil Val	% of Mil Val RFCs	Total	% of All RFCs
TOTAL ARMY	2	.42%	3	.21%	5	.26%
PEO-SOLDIER	0	0	2	.14%	2	.10%
ABERDEEN	0	0	0	0	0	0
REST OF ARMY	2	.42%	1	.07%	3	.16%
NAVY	0	0%	1	.07%	1	.05%
AIR FORCE	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
FOURTH ESTATE	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	2 of 472	.42%	4 of 1394	.28%	6 of 1866	.32%

January 7, 2005

Slide1

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY - DO NOT RELEASE UNDER FOIA

Material RFC Status

- 1 Army Capacity (FTE) RFC Remaining
 - Army (Fort Rucker, AL)
 - 4277
- 1 Navy MILVAL RFC Remaining
 - China Lake, CA
 - 3002 no change, 4277 data not received.

January 7, 2005

Slide2

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY - DO NOT RELEASE UNDER FOIA

Assumptions for COBRA Run #2
TECH-0008/0042

Parts 1 & 2: awaiting SDD responses (realignment of Maritime RDAT&E work to Dahlgren and San Diego)

Parts 3, 4, & 5: still awaiting Army SDC responses (realignment of Land RDAT&E work to Adelphi, Ft. Monmouth/Ft. Belvoir, and Ft. Huachuca)

Part 6: in scenario analysis (realignment of Air Sensors RD&A work to WPAFB)

Part 7: (realignment of various Information System RD&A work to Hanscom AFB)

. Eliminate all Brooks AFB related costs (e.g., Screen 3 tonnage) as the FTEs they reported under Information Systems are in support of their Human Systems work and will be addressed by the scenario remanded to the AF by the TJCSG [Brooks elimination approved by the TJCSG on 5 Jan 2005]

. Eliminate all Patuxent River related FTE/costs as they invoked the "Maritime exclusion" and reported one position to move [approved by the TJCSG on 5 Jan 2005] – all this work will be addressed by the Navy in Part 2 of TECH-0008/0042

. Since Hanscom has over 4000 FTEs of available space per the Capacity_Percentage_Report010705, no new MILCON is required to house the less than 2000 D&A FTEs from WPAFB, Lackland AFB, and Maxwell AFB and the less than 850 of AFRL/IF FTEs from WPAFB and Rome, NY.

. Since it is unknown what the net result of the manpower gains and losses at Hanscom AFB will be, it is premature to estimate any costs for increases to support infrastructure such as Child Care Facility additions, etc.

. The net result of the above two assumptions is to remove all the Screen 5 MILCON costs from the next COBRA run for TECH-0008/0042, Part 7.

. Since no manpower savings were yet taken for the benefits of consolidation, an estimated reduction of 272 total positions – 180 positions from WPAFB, 85 positions from Maxwell AFB and 7 positions from Lackland AFB - (less than 15% of the 1826 positions involved) will be made as the benefits of consolidation and be included as manpower savings in the next COBRA run.

Part 8: (realignment of various C4ISR Air Domain T&E work to Edwards AFB)

. Eliminate all Patuxent River related costs as they invoked the "Maritime exclusion" and reported no positions to move [approved by the TJCSG on 5 Jan 2005] – all this work will be addressed by the Navy in Part 2 of TECH-0008/0042

. Since Edwards AFB has over 2000 FTEs of available space per the Capacity_Percentage_Report010705, no new MILCON is required to house the 139 T&E FTEs from Holloman AFB and Eglin AFB.

. Since it is unknown what the net result of the manpower gains and losses at Edwards AFB will be, it is premature to estimate any costs for increases to support infrastructure such as Child Care Facility additions, etc.

. The net result of the above two assumptions is to remove all the Screen 5 MILCON costs from the next COBRA run for TECH-0008/0042, Part 8.

. Since no manpower savings were yet taken for the benefits of consolidation, an estimated reduction of 20 total positions - 9 positions from Eglin AFB and 11 positions from Holloman AFB - (less than 15% of the 139 positions involved) will be made as the benefits of consolidation and be included as manpower savings in the next COBRA run.

Assumptions for TECH 0032 – Chemical Biological Defense RDA Consolidation

I have reviewed the data from the Scenario Data Call (SDC), the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) analysis and the Military Value Data Call (MVDC) analysis. I am still awaiting an upload of RFC responses from the AF (Brooks City Base) and the Army (Walter Reed) before I can validate the SDC inputs from those facilities. However, given verbal information on what will be uploaded, I would like to proceed with a baseline COBRA based on the following assumptions:

1. No FTEs from DARPA will be available to move in this scenario as DARPA will move collectively as part of TECH 0040 and DARPA's CB Defense Program is programmed to end circa 2008.
2. The ET subgroup did not agree with DTRA/CB assertions in the SDC that they must remain with the rest of DTRA at Ft Belvior. Thus they will move to Aberdeen as proposed in the original Tech 0032 Scenario Proposal.
3. No new MILCON will be needed at either of the gaining sites. This assumption is based on the excess capacity at both Aberdeen (3,148 FTE spaces) and Ft. Detrick (1,331 FTE spaces) and discussions with Dr. Chen Huo at the Army BRAC Office and Dr. Frazier Glenn from Ft. Detrick (also on the MJCSG) regarding already programmed MILCON at Ft. Detrick and proposed medical MILCON at Aberdeen (relevant to WRAIR FTEs moving to USAMRICD, Aberdeen).
4. Clerical and administrative FTEs will be reduced by 50% for efficiencies achieved by this consolidation.
 - a. FTEs reported under ACOB in the SCDC were calculated to be 30% of the total FTEs reported in the CBD R and D&A bins and thus 30 % of the number of FTEs reported in the SDC will be reduced by 50% for each of the donor organizations. (i.e. $131 \text{ total FTEs} \times 30\% = 39.3 \text{ ACOB FTEs}$ $\times 50\% = 19.7$ or 20 FTEs. Thus the total FTEs to move is $131 - 20 = 111$ FTEs.)
5. All technical personnel (reported under P&T category in the MVDC) will move as CBD is and will continue to be a growing R D&A area for the foreseeable future.

With these assumptions , I request permission to run a baseline COBRA for TECH 0032.

W. O. Berry
10 Jan 05

TECH 40 RFCS

AF

Assumptions: We will move in 2008 not 2006

No RFCs to the AF

ARMY

Assumptions: We will move in 2008 not 2010/2011

There are no RFCs for the ARMY

Navy

No assumptions for CNR

RFC – Reoccurring Savings, Cell 17, Screen 5 – verify that Physical security costs are included in the reoccurring savings.

Navy: Gaining RFCS

Screen 7:

Row 291: Explain the 29,578 square yard parking lot. This appears to be sufficient for 7,400 vehicles.

Assumption on Building – appears larger than required by DoD standards. Reduce square footage to 220 per person.

DARPA

Assumptions

Screen 5

They meant Millions, not Billions

Furniture is included in COBRA, SCIFs as well.

Lease Term and restoration will be zero.

Travels will be zero

One Time IT costs will be substantially less and will be included in the Milcon

Recurring Savings will be the \$38.5M a year identified by DARPA as their reoccurring costs.

Screen 5

Justify and itemize and detail on the costs listed on this screen. Also note that the responses are supposed to be in Kilo Dollars, not Dollars.

Thursday, January 06, 2005

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE BRAC FOUO, NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Also: Row 36 – Who is the one time Moving Cost being paid to?

Row 42 – Provide a copy of the DARPA building Lease to the TJCSG for Legal review

Screen 6

Row 39 and Row 41. Please read the instruction on Row 36. This screen is not the personnel being moved by the BRAC action, but rather personnel needed at the receiving location in addition to those being moved. The answer is likely 0. Please confirm and change accordingly.

DTRA

Assumptions – they are currently in leased space and thus we will move them from leased to Anacostia.

RFC:

Screen 5: RFC: Please provide current lease costs for current lease facility.

Additionally, provide the total number of DTRA employees located at the leased facility.

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDDC Answered	J. SDD Answer
001	12/28/2004	Pending	TECH-0032	ET	Bill Berry	<p>In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 163 FTEs at NSWC-Dahlgren Div (N00178) in the Chem-Bio Defense (CBD) area (i.e. 40 in Research (R) and 123 in Development and Acquisition (D&A)); however, in the Scenario Data Call (SDC) for TECH 0032 the Navy certified a total of 131 FTEs at NSWC-DD working in CBD that would potentially move to Aberdeen. Please clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the number is different since both were certified.</p>	Navy		
002	12/28/2004	Pending	TECH-0032	ET	Bill Berry	<p>In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 82 FTEs at NSWC-Crane Div (N00164) in the Chem-Bio Defense (CBD) area working in D&A; however, in the SDC for TECH 0032 the Navy certified a total of only 54 FTEs at NSWC-CD working in CBD that would potentially move to Aberdeen. Please clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the number is different since both were certified</p>	Navy		
003	12/28/2004	Pending	TECH-0032	ET	Bill Berry	<p>In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 36 FTEs at NMRC-Silver Spring (32398) in the Medical-Biological Chem-Bio Defense (CBD) area working in Research; however, in the SDC for TECH 0032 the Navy certified a total of only 18 FTEs (plus 40 students) at NMRC-Silver Spring working in Medical-Biological CBD that would potentially move to Ft. Detrick. Please clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the number is different since both were certified.</p>	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. Scenario ID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDD Answered	J. SDD Answer
004	12/29/2004	Pending	TECH-0032	ET	Bill Berry	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Air Force certified a total of 79 FTEs at Brooks City-Base (FCRB) in the Chem-Bio Defense (CBD) area working in Development and Acquisition (D&A); however, in the Scenario Data Call (SDC) for TECH 0032 the Air Force certified a total of 168 FTEs at Brooks City Base working in CBD that would potentially move to Aberdeen. Please clarify which number is the correct Air Force certified number and why the number is different since both were certified.	Airforce		
005	12/30/2004	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Pete O'Neil	Navbase Ventura City has been added to the scenario and some data provided for it (Navbase Ventura City wasn't included on screens 5 or 6). No data has been provided for Louisville. Is the Navbase Ventura City data actually Louisville data? We had provided the Louisville location in the scenario data call for the Port Huenebma Louisville detachment to ensure more accurate costing in the COBRA model. Request that Louisville data be reported under the Louisville location.	Navy		
006	12/30/2004	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Pete O'Neil	The Over Water Gun Range and associated equipment, etc., is included in the response for Dahlgren. The W&A subgroup had proposed retaining this range at Dahlgren. We had assumed that this was an OAR, so it wouldn't be covered by our data call. Request that the Navy remove all items associated with the Over Water Gun Range from its response to the TECH-0017 scenario data call.	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDDC Answered	J. SDD Answer
007	12/30/2004	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Pete O'Neil	No response was provided for Fallbrook, with no explanation for the absence of data. Request that appropriate data be provided or an explanation be included in Section 7 of Screen 9 as to why data was not provided.	Navy		
008	12/30/2004	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Pete O'Neil	The additional TABs in the Excel workbook provide detailed back-up information on equipment movement and costs. Facility requirements are not addressed. You have the opportunity to list facility requirements in Section 3 of the Worksheet.	Navy		
009	12/30/2004	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Pete O'Neil	Data discrepancy: On Screen 3, for Dahlgren, military heavy/special vehicles lists 24. The supporting data on Tab Question 14 sums to 25 vehicles.	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDDC Answered	J. SDD Answer
010	12/30/2004	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Pete O'Neil	Data discrepancy: On Screen 5, for Dahlgren, one-time moving costs lists \$1504K. The supporting data on Tab Question 20 sums to \$1514K.	Navy		
011	12/30/2004	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Pete O'Neil	Data discrepancy: On Screen 5, for Navbase Ventura Cb, one-time unique costs lists \$8870K. The supporting data on Tab Question 18 sums to \$16970K.	Navy		
012	12/22/2004	Pending	(Tech-002-Parent) TECH-0018	W&A	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	Your(scenario worksheet) Screen 5 total moving costs are not consistent with Screen 9 in-service engineering, in which you binned all your efforts. It seems they should be identical. Please clarify which one is correct.	DTRA		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. Scenario ID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDDC Answered	J. SDD Answer
013	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Buckelew	NAVEDDTECHDIV moving to Eglin AFB only list Research personnel. The intent of the action was to move all personnel and capability at the NAVEDDTECHDIV including D&A personnel. Please update data to include all personnel and associated equipment and facilities. See scenario worksheet actions 14, 15 and 16.	Navy		
014	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Buckelew	No data for NSWC Earle is reported. The intent was to move all W&A (PHS&T) capability to Picatinny. Please update data to include all personnel and associated equipment and facilities. Earle must be reported independently of Indian Head data, in the Earle tables, to ensure proper costing in the Cobra model. See scenario worksheet action 13.	Navy		
015	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Buckelew	No data is reported for Fallbrook. Please update data to include all personnel and associated equipment and facilities. Fallbrook must be reported independently of Crane data, in the Fallbrook tables, to ensure proper costing in the Cobra model. See scenario worksheet action	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDDC Answered	J. SDD Answer
016	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Buckelew	No data is reported for Port Hueneme (Louisville, LV). Please update data to include all personnel and associated equipment and facilities. Louisville (LV) must be reported independently of Port Hueneme data, in the Louisville tables, to ensure proper costing in the Cobra model. See scenario worksheet action 6.	Navy		
017	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Buckelew	CDR MCB Quantico has no explanation listed for the recurring cost of \$500,000 per year. Please provide supporting rationale.	Navy		
018	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Buckelew	NAVBASE LOMA (Port Hueneme San Diego Detachment) did not report any personnel moving to NSWC Dahlgren, but it appears the data does show up under NAVBASE Ventura City tables. Please provide Port Hueneme San Diego Detachment data in the NAVBASE LOMA tables. See scenario worksheet action 4.	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDD Answered	J. SDD Answer
019	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Buckelew	Seal Beach did not report any data related to the move to China Lake although there is approximately 60 FTEs listed for that site. Seal Beach must be reported independently of Indian Head data, in the Seal Beach tables, to ensure proper costing in the Cobra model. Please update data to include all personnel and associated equipment and facilities. See scenario worksheet action 12.	Navy		
020	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Buckelew	No data is reported for Fallbrook. Please update data to include all personnel and associated equipment and facilities. Fallbrook must be reported independently of Crane data, in the Fallbrook tables, to ensure proper costing in the Cobra model. See scenario worksheet action 2.	Navy		
021	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Buckelew	Screen 5 NAVSUPACT Corona data includes information concerning a move to China Lake and the move to Fort Huememe. Please provide back-up information to show the break out of the movement costs for each of these parts.	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDDC Answered	J. SDD Answer
022	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Buckelew	Fallbrook data does not show up in any scenario although our intention was to move that capability to other sites. Please update data to include all personnel and associated equipment and facilities for each the moves. Same comment was previously made for TECH 17 and 44.	Navy		
023	1/5/2005	Pending	Tech-0019 (Parent) TECH-0043	W&A	Marc Maglinec	We would expect to see the same number of personnel and non-vehicle mission equipment in TECH 0019 and TECH 0043 moving from Yorktown. Please review, explain and if warranted update submission	Navy		
024	1/5/2005	Pending	Tech-0017 (Parent) TECH-0044	W&A	Pete O'Neill	Please explain and/or correct in the tables the discrepancy for Navy personnel and tonnage (screen 3 -- NSWCD Indian Head) between TECH 0017 (& 0044) and TECH 0002.	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service Agency	I. Date SDDC Answered	J. SDD Answer
025	1/5/2005	Pending	Tech-0017 (Parent) TECH-0044	W&A	Pete O'Neil	Screen 5, NSWCD Indian Head, shows very similar cost data for TECH 0002 and TECH 0017, even though half the tonnage and personnel are being moved in TECH 0017 (& TECH 0044). Please explain or correct.	Navy		
026	1/5/2005	Pending	(Tech-0017 - Parent) TECH-0044	W&A	Pete O'Neil	Please correct or explain Screen 9, Question 7.1, differences in mission support contractors between TECH 0017 (& TECH 0044) and TECH 0002. Eliminations are included for NSWCD, Dahlgren, CDR MCB Quantico, and NAVBASE Ventura City in TECH 0017, while none are included for these sites in TECH 0002. The number of eliminations for NAVSUPPORT CRANE is higher in TECH 0017 than in TECH 0002. Please explain or correct.	Navy		
027	1/5/2005	Pending	(Tech-002 - Parent) TECH-0018	W&A	Dr. Robin B. Buckelaw	The number of people listed to be moved to China Lake exceeds the number reported in capacity question 4277. That question reported total 124 FTE's at DTRA Alb, including 55 government technical people reported in military question 3002. Screens 3 and 9 propose to move 142 government positions and 92 mission support contractors from Kirtland to China Lake.	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy) ZEROs (for Redstone) Needs a RFC to explain response given capacity and MIL VAL submission.	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDD Answered	J. SDD Answer
028	1/5/2005	Pending	TECH-0006	ALSS	Jon Ogg		Army		
029	1/6/2004	Pending	TECH-0032	ET	Bill Berry	The Army's response as gainer for Tech 0032 (Screen 7) requests MILCON at both Aberdeen and Fort Detrick. Please provide justification for the proposed incoming FTE's.	Army		
030	1/6/2004	Pending	TECH-0032	ET	Bill Berry	The Army's response as gainer for Tech 0032 (Screen 3) shows only 7 FTE's from <u>Walter Reed</u> proposed to move to Aberdeen; and only 9 FTE's as we discussed previously, are too low. Please certify the correct data in terms of FTE's moving from Walter Reed to both Aberdeen and Fort Detrick.	Army		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID (Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDD Answered	J. SDD Answer
031	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Air Force certified a total of 116 FTE's at Holloman AFB (FFVHC) working in Test & Evaluation; however in the Scenario Data Call response that would potentially move to Edwards AFB. Clarify which number is the correct Air Force certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Airforce		
032	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Air Force certified a total of 86 FTEs at Lackland AFB (FFRXB) working in Information Systems Technology Research, Development & Acquisition; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-008/0042, the Air Force certified a total of 51 FTEs at Lackland AFB (FFRXB) working in Information Systems Technology Research, Development & Acquisition that would potentially move to Hanscom AFB. Clarify which number is the correct Air Force certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Airforce		
033	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Air Force certified a total of 42 FTEs at Brooks City-Base (FFGR4) working in Information Systems Technology Development & Acquisition; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-008/0042, the Air Force certified no FTEs at Lackland AFB (FFGR4) working in Information Systems Technology Development & Acquisition that would potentially move to Hanscom AFB. Clarify which number is the correct Air Force certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Airforce		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID (Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDD Answered	J. SDD Answer
034	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 283 FTEs at NRL (N00173) working in Sensors D&A; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified a total of 23 FTEs at NRL (N00173) working in Sensors D&A that would potentially move to Dahlgren, Va. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified. Additionally, provide the portion, if any, of the certified FTEs that work on undersea sensor activity.	Navy		
035	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 193 FTEs at Corona (64267) working in Sensors DAT&E; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified a total of 6 FTEs at Corona (64267) working in Sensors D&A that would potentially move to Dahlgren, Va. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified. Additionally, provide the portion, if any, of the certified FTEs that work on undersea sensor activity.	Navy		
036	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 151 FTEs at Point Loma (N66001) working in Sensors RT&E; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified a total of 3 FTEs at Point Loma (N66001) working in Sensors RT&E that would potentially move to Dahlgren, Va. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified. Additionally, provide the portion, if any, of the certified FTEs that work on undersea sensor activity.	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID (Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDD Answered	J. SDD Answer
037	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 399 FTEs at Charleston (N65236) working in Sensors RDAT&E; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified a total of 14 FTEs at Charleston (N65236) working in Sensors RDAT&E that would potentially move to Dahlgren, Va. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified. Additionally, provide the portion, if any, of the certified FTEs that work on undersea sensor activity.	Navy		
038	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 71 FTEs at NAS Oceana (N63273) working in Sensors DAT&E; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified a total of 14 FTEs at NAS Oceana (N63273) working in Sensors DAT&E that would potentially move to Dahlgren, Va. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified. Additionally, provide the portion, if any, of the certified FTEs that work on undersea sensor activity.	Navy		
039	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 108 FTEs at NRL (N00173) working in Information Systems D&A; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified no FTEs at NRL (N00173) working in Information Systems D&A that would potentially move to San Diego, CA. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID (Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDD Answered	J. SDD Answer
040	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 948 FTEs at Newport (66604) working in Information Systems RDAT&E; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified a total of 70 FTEs at Newport (66604) working in Information Systems RDAT&E that would potentially move to San Diego, CA. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Navy		
041	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 2022 FTEs at Charleston (N65236) working in Information Systems RDAT&E; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified a total of 37 FTEs at Charleston (N65236) working in Information Systems RDAT&E that would potentially move to San Diego, CA. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Navy		
042	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 549 FTEs at Dahlgren (N00178) working in Information Systems RD&A; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified a total of 30 FTEs at Dahlgren (N00178) working in Information Systems RD&A that would potentially move to San Diego, CA. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDDC Answered	J. SDD Answer
043	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 359 FTEs at Corona (64267) working in Information Systems DAT&E; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified no FTEs at Corona (64267) working in Information Systems DAT&E that would potentially move to San Diego, CA. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Navy		
044	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 514 FTEs at Norfolk (N68561) working in Information Systems D&A; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified a total of 98 FTEs at Norfolk (N68561) working in Information Systems D&A that would potentially move to San Diego, CA. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Navy		
045	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 145 FTEs at Ventura City (63394) working in Information Systems D&A; however, in the Scenario Data Call response for TECH-0008/0042, the Navy certified a total of 6 FTEs at Ventura City (63394) working in Information Systems D&A that would potentially move to San Diego, CA. Clarify which number is the correct Navy certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Navy		

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID (Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDD Answered	J. SDD Answer
046	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	To Edwards AFB: in the Scenario Data Call response to TECH-0008/0047, the proposed realignment of C4ISR T&E activity from Holloman AFB to Edwards AFB includes 481 tons of non-vehicle mission equipment. Would Edwards AFB please determine if they need all that equipment to perform the realigned workload and, if not, how much (tons) could be left at Holloman AFB.	Airforce		
047	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	For Hanscom AFB: in the Scenario Data Call response to TECH-0008/0047, the proposed realignment of C4ISR RD&A activity from Lackland AFB to Hanscom AFB includes 1166 tons of non-vehicle mission equipment. Would Hanscom AFB please determine if they need all that equipment to perform the realigned workload and, if not, how much (tons) could be left at Lackland AFB.	Airforce		
048	1/6/2005	Pending	(Tech-008-Parent) TECH-0042	C4ISR	Matt Mieziva	To Dahlgren (N00178): in the Scenario Data Call response to TECH-0008/0047, the proposed realignment of C4ISR Sensor RDAT&E activity to Dahlgren from (a) NRL (N00173) includes 178 tons of non-vehicle mission equipment and 111 tons of Support Equipment, (b) Crane (N00164) includes 518 tons of non-vehicle mission equipment and 2436 tons of Support Equipment, and (c) Charleston (N65236) includes 71 tons of non-vehicle mission equipment. . . . Would Dahlgren please determine if they need all that equipment to perform the realigned workload and, if not, how much (tons) could be left in place at each donor site.			

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDD Answered	J. SDD Answer
049	1/7/2005	Pending	TECH-0005	ALSS	Barry Basket	In reviewing the latest Air Force responses to TECH-5 and TECH-0006 reported (i.e., officers, WO, enlisted and lians) reported by Tinker, Robins and Hill for TECH-0006 rted more people than they did in question 4277. In fact, lime cases it was off by a factor of 10.	Airforce		
050	1/6/2005	Pending	TECH-0006	ALSS	Jon Ogg	In reviewing the latest Air Force responses to TECH5 and TECH-0006 reported (i.e., officers, WO, enlisted and lians) reported by Tinker, Robins and Hill for TECH-0006 rted more people than they did in question 4277. In fact, ome cases it was off by a factor of 10.	Airforce		
051	1/7/2005	Pending	TECH-0006	ALSS	Jon Ogg	The capacity and MIL VAL data calls from Lakehurst reported in excess of 1100 and 700 FTE's, respectively, in thr Platform DTAP category. A total of 32 civilian work's (13 RW + 19 FW) were listed in the responses to the suit scenarios. This discrepancy requires reconciliation. t accompanying the scenario data call responses stat that remaining work years constituted " other missing are These "other missing areas" must be related to DT. Revise the TECH-0005 and TECH-0006 scenario dcall responses to include in the air platform DTAP cateç all work years not specifically binned in any of the otheelve DTAP areas.			

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDDC Answered	J. SDD Answer
052	1/7/2005	Pending	TECH-0005	ALSS	Barry Basket	<p>The capacity and MIL VAL data calls from Lakehurst reported in excess of 1100 and 700 FTE's, respectively, in the Air Platform DTAP category. A total of 32 civilian work years (13 RW + 19 FW) were listed in the responses to the subject scenarios. This discrepancy requires reconciliation. Text accompanying the scenario data call responses stated that remaining work years constituted "other missing areas". These "other missing areas" must be related to DTAP's. Revise the IECH-0005 and TECH-0006 scenario data call responses to include in the air platform DTAP category all work years not specifically binned in any of the other twelve DTAP areas.</p>			
053	1/10/2005	Pending	TECH-0040	IS	Larry Schuette	<p>Screen 5: Justify and itemize and detail on the costs listed on this screen. Also not that the responses are supposed to be in Kilo Dollars, not Dollars.</p>			
054	1/10/2005	Pending	TECH-0040	IS	Larry Schuette	<p>Screen 5: Row 36- Who is the one time Moving Cost being paid to?</p>			

A. SDD #	B. Date SDD Initiated	C. SDD Tracking Status	D. ScenarioID	E. Scenario Sponsor	F. Scenario POC	G. SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	H. Service/Agency	I. Date SDD Answered	J. SDD Answer
055	1/10/2005	Pending	TECH-0040	IS	Larry Schuette	Screen 5: Row 42: Please provide a copy of the DARPA building Lease to the TJCSG for Legal review.			
056	1/10/2005	Pending	TECH-0040	IS	Larry Schuette	Screen 5: Row 39 and Row 41: Please read the instruction on Row 36. This screen is not the personnel being moved by the BRAC action, but rather personnel needed at the receiving location in addition to those being moved. The answer is likely 0. Please confirm and change accordingly.			