

BRAC 2005
Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)
Daily Conference Call
Meeting Minutes of 12 January 2005

Dr. Sega 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. They anticipate having all of their initial data by the end of this week.
- 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 Thursday. However, Part 3 of TECH-0006 will be submitted around Tuesday of next week.
- The TJCSG scenarios still require the environmental analyses.
- Two Critical RFCs are still outstanding: Navy China Lake RFC and the Ft. Rucker RFC. The Analysis Team does not expect any data on these until next week at the earliest.

Decisions

- The Subgroup Leads will provide the FTEs and facilities information to the Service BRAC offices so the environmental analyses can be performed in parallel with the initial COBRA runs.
- The Ft. Rucker RFC will be addressed by Mr. Simmons at the 13 January 2005 TJCSG Meeting.
- The China Lake RFC will be addressed by COL DeSalva at the 13 January 2005 TJCSG Meeting.

Subgroup Scenario Data Assumptions

Key Points

- No COBRA assumptions were presented. However, the Weapons and Armaments Subgroup will present some COBRA assumptions for TECH-0019 at the Thursday, 13 January 2005, TJCSG Meeting. If the assumptions are approved, then the COBRA run will be reviewed.

January 12, 2004

BRAC FOUO

- The same will be done for TECH-0020.

Decisions

- The TJCSG will review COBRA runs for TECH-0032 (with and without MILCON), TECH-0019 (after approval of any assumptions), TECH-0020 (after approval of any assumptions), and TECH-0040 at the Thursday, 13 January 2005, TJCSG Meeting.
- The TJCSG will forward any candidate recommendations to the General Counsel. However, if new iterations of COBRA are performed due to new data or assumptions, these candidate recommendations will be forwarded for another review by the General Counsel.
- The Subgroup Leads will provide estimated dates for when their COBRA runs will be conducted. This will be reviewed by the TJCSG at the Thursday, 13 January 2005, TJCSG Meeting.
- The companion TJCSG scenarios for TECH-0040 will be terminated.

Action Items:

1. COL DeSalva will check on the status of data for TECH-0018 to see if any data remains outstanding and report back during the Thursday, 13 January 2005 TJCSG teleconference call.
2. The Subgroups will contact the Service BRAC offices and request the environmental analyses for their scenarios as soon as the COBRA information is available.
3. The Subgroup Leads will provide an estimate for when their COBRA dates will be run. This will be reviewed by the TJCSG at the Thursday, 13 January 2005, TJCSG Meeting.

Approved: _____

Mr. Al Shaffer

Chairman, Capabilities Integration Team

Attachments:

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

January 12, 2004

BRAC FOUO

Attachment 2
Technical JCSG Meeting
January 12, 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. Larry Schuette, Innovative Technologies Subgroup Lead
COL Pete DeSalva, Analytic Team
Mr. Doug Nation, Air Force
Mr. Matt Mleziva, C4ISR Subgroup Lead
Dr. Jim Short, OSD
Ms. Marie Felix, OSD
Mr. Doug Nation, Air Force
Ms. Pam Houghtaling, Navy
Mr. Jerry Schiefer, OSD BRAC
Mr. Al Goldstain, Air Force
Dr. Bill Berry, Enabling Technologies Subgroup Lead
Mr. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC
Mr. Pete Potochney, OSD BRAC

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		DITRA 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
0002	3	7-Dec	7-Jan	3-Dec	4-Jan	3-Dec	22-Dec	3-Dec	22-Dec					3-Dec	7-Jan	11-Jan	USA
0005	3	7-Dec		7-Dec	23-Dec	7-Dec	21-Dec									11-Jan	DON
0006	3	6-Dec	7-Jan	7-Dec	23-Dec	18-Dec										11-Jan	USAF
0008	2	24-Nov		10-Jan		24-Nov	21-Dec									10-Jan	USA
0009	1	24-Nov	27-Dec	24-Nov	21-Dec	24-Nov	20-Dec									10-Jan	DON
0010	4	24-Nov	17-Dec	24-Nov	14-Dec	24-Nov	13-Dec									12-Jan	USAF
0013	3	13-Dec	7-Jan	13-Dec	21-Dec											18-Dec	USA
0014	3			14-Dec	21-Dec	14-Dec										18-Dec	USAF
0017	3	9-Dec	7-Jan	9-Dec	28-Dec	9-Dec	14-Dec									14-Dec	USA
0018	3	6-Dec	7-Jan	6-Dec	10-Jan	6-Dec		8-Dec	7-Jan							6-Jan	USA
0019	2			3-Dec	20-Dec											30-Dec	USAF
0020	1	7-Dec	27-Dec	7-Dec	22-Dec	7-Dec	15-Dec									11-Jan	USA
0030	3	13-Dec	11-Jan	13-Dec	29-Dec											11-Jan	USA
0032	1	26-Nov	10-Jan	26-Nov	13-Dec	26-Nov	16-Dec	26-Nov	10-Dec	26-Nov	10-Dec	13-Dec	6-Jan			17-Dec	USA
0034	4	26-Nov		26-Nov	20-Dec	26-Nov	20-Dec									17-Dec	USA
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
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
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
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
0042	2	22-Dec		3-Dec	22-Dec	3-Dec	4-Jan									22-Dec	USA
0043	2			6-Dec	28-Dec											20-Dec	USAF
0044	4	9-Dec	7-Jan	9-Dec	28-Dec	9-Dec	14-Dec									11-Jan	DON
0046	4	3-Dec	11-Jan	16-Dec	20-Dec	3-Dec	13-Dec			3-Dec	14-Dec					3-Jan	USA
0047	4	13-Dec	11-Jan	13-Dec	29-Dec	13-Dec						13-Dec	6-Jan			12-Jan	USAF
0054	4			29-Dec													
0055	4			29-Dec													
0056	4			29-Dec	7-Jan											10-Jan	USAF
		Not Applicable															
		Pending/Routine Action															
		Overdue/Urgent Action															
		Issues/Open SDD															
		Completed/Validated															

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

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Draft Deliberative Document--For Discussion Purposes--
Only Do Not Release Under FOIA

Remarks to the JCSG O-6 Leaders by Pete Potochney on January 12, 2005

Pete Potochney requests from each JCSG:

1. Schedule for bringing draft candidate recommendations to the ISG meetings (Fridays, January 21 - February 25)
2. COBRA runs based on competent (can be less than Service certified) data
3. List of critical data deficiencies

I summarize Mr. Potochney's remarks:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

A serious Pete Potochney met with the JCSG O-6 leaders this morning. His message is intended for everyone associated with the JCSGs. He observed that people appointed to the JCSGs are leaders, people who have a proven record for completing what they start. We are nearing the end game of BRAC. It is important that we enable the Department to position itself for the 21st century defense of the country by writing good recommendations. Good recommendations are understandable, actionable, legal & supported by the data.

SCHEDULE

Mr. Potochney is concerned that if the draft candidate recommendations do not come faster, the ISG & IEC will be left with insufficient time to make informed recommendations to the Secretary. Informed recommendations will make as much sense as an integrated set from the DoD-level perspective as each does individually from the Service or JCSG perspective.

The JCSGs & Services have estimated there will be more than 500 draft candidate recommendations (the TJCSG portion is about 11). At the moment, less than half the draft candidate recommendations are on the ISG schedule (none belong to the TJCSG). We need to schedule the rest. Five opportunities remain to present draft candidate recommendations (Fridays, January 21 through February 25). The draft candidate recommendations go to the ISG one week prior to their meeting. Ms Bayert stands ready to help sharpen our drafts, particularly the quad charts and the recommendation summary. She will make extraordinary effort to assist us.

COMPETENT COBRA RUNS

It is true we need to complete selection criteria 5-8 to make a candidate recommendation. It is true we need to assemble complete COBRA input data to complete selection criteria 6-8. Mr Wynne invites us to come to the ISG with COBRA results based on best available information (those three words are from BRAC policy memo #4 on COBRA). Mr. Wynne wishes to receive competent draft candidate recommendations. Presentations to the ISG must be competent; they do not have to be perfect or final. We will have the opportunity to amend our drafts to be consistent with subsequent data changes.

When the 11 days to execute a scenario data call are past, if there is missing data or when a TJCSG disputes the data, it is not necessary to achieve 100% agreement or to wait for a Service response to run a COBRA analysis. When a Service subject matter expert of a JCSG agrees to the specific end state of a scenario (e.g., number of people from his/her Service to move, similarly for any piece of COBRA input data relative to his/her Service), the subject matter expert has assured that his/her Service portion of the COBRA analysis has competent input data.

With regard to environmental selection criterion, the Services are required to promptly give the JCSGs either certified or preliminary data. When the Services are unacceptably delayed providing certified data, each JCSG is authorized to prepare draft candidate recommendations based on the preliminary environmental data.

LIST OF CRITICAL DATA DEFICIENCIES

Mr. Potochney believes the best recommendations are sometimes the most controversial recommendations. Consequently it would not shock him to learn that a Service does not promptly execute a data call because the Service does not believe in the foundation upon which the scenario is based. Each JCSG should create a list of critical COBRA data which is both unacceptably late and to which the Services have not been responsive to inquiries by the JCSG Service Principals. Mr. Potochney will present the list to our highest leaders, those on the ISG & IEC. They are committed to supporting the JCSGs. They will get the data we need from their Service.

JIM SHORT'S CLOSING COMMENT

I extend to each subgroup a commitment Larry Schuette extracted from me today. Knowing you are busy with subsequent scenarios, I will carry your draft candidate recommendations to Ms. Bayert if that be your preference. I will enjoy playing the role of a Philadelphia lawyer.

I will post this message on the portal in today's telecon folder to assure those I forget to place on the "to" line have an opportunity to receive this summary.

Jim Short

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
001	12/28/2004	Closed	TECH-0032	ET	Bill Berry	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 163 FTEs at NSWV-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 NSWV-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.	Navy	1/7/2005	Navy Activities Reviewed, and SDC data submitted is Correct. Value will not be changed.
002	12/28/2004	Closed	TECH-0032	ET	Bill Berry	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC) the Navy certified a total of 82 FTEs at NSWV-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 NSWV-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.	Navy	1/7/2005	Navy Activities Reviewed, and SDC data submitted is Correct. Value will not be changed.
003	12/28/2004	Closed	TECH-0032	ET	Bill Berry	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.	Navy	1/7/2005	Navy Activities Reviewed, and SDC data submitted is Correct. Value will not be changed.
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 (FGR4) 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 (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 Hueneme 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		
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		
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 City, 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 Bucklelew	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		
013	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Bucklelew	NAVODTECHDIV moving to Eglin AFB only list Research personnel. The intent of the action was to move all personnel and capability at the NAVODTECHDIV 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		

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		J. SDD Answer
							I. Date SDD Answered	Answered	
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 Pictainny. 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 13.	Navy		
016	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Robin Buckelew	No data is reported for Port Hueme (Louisville, LV). Please update data to include all personnel and associated equipment and facilities. Louisville (LV) must be reported independently of Port Hueme 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 Hueme 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 Hueme San Diego Detachment data in the NAVBASE LOMA tables. See scenario worksheet action 4.	Navy		
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 Port Hueme. Please provide back-up information to show the break out of the movement costs for each of these parts.	Navy		
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 of 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	Mairc 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'Neil	Please explain and/or correct in the tables the discrepancy for personnel and tonnage (screen 3 -- NSWC Indian Head) between TECH 0017 (& 0044) and TECH 0002.	Navy		
025	1/5/2005	Pending	Tech-0017 (Parent) TECH-0044	W&A	Pete O'Neil	Screen 5, NSWC 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. 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 NSWC 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 NAVSUPACT 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. Buckelew	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 mil val question 3002. Screens 3 and 9 propose to move 142 government positions and 92 mission support contractors from Kirtland to China Lake.	Navy		
028	1/5/2005	Pending	TECH-0006	ALSS	Jon Ogg	ZEROs(for Redstone) Needs a RFC to explain response given capacity and MIL VAL submission.	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		

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
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 Waller Reed 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 Waller Reed to both Aberdeen and Fort Detrick.	Army		
031	1/6/2005	Complete	(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	1/11/2005	SDC number is correct.
032	1/6/2005	Complete	(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	1/7/2005	Contractor personnel make up the difference.
033	1/6/2005	Complete	(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	1/7/2005	IS Personnel support HS Mission- will be included in AF-110 Holloman remains open.
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		
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		

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
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		
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		
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 358 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		
046	1/6/2005	Complete	(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	1/10/2005	Most Tonnage Industrial, not C4ISR.
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-0008/0042, 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. Scenario ID	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-0005 and TECH-0006 reported (i.e., officers, WO, enlisted and civilians) reported by Tinker, Robins and Hill for TECH-0006 reported more people than they did in question 4277. In fact, in some 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 TECH-0005 and TECH-0006 reported (i.e., officers, WO, enlisted and civilians) reported by Tinker, Robins and Hill for TECH-0006 reported more people than they did in question 4277. In fact, in some 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 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 TECH-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.			
052	1/7/2005	Pending	TECH-0005	ALSS	Barry Basket	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 TECH-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.			
053	1/10/2005	Pending	TECH-0040	IS	Larry Schuette	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.	DARPA		
054	1/10/2005	Pending	TECH-0040	IS	Larry Schuette	Screen 5: Row 36- Who is the one time Moving Cost being paid to?	DARPA		
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.	DARPA		
056	1/10/2005	Pending	TECH-0040	IS	Larry Schuette	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.	DARPA		
057	1/10/2005	Closed	TECH-0040	IS	Larry Schuette	Screen 5: cell17: Verify that Physical security costs are included in the reoccurring savings.	Navy	1/10/2005	Did not see answer from Navy. Larry Schuette has answer provided by Navy.
058	12/22/2004	Closed	TECH-0002 AND TECH-0018	W&A	Robin Bucklelew	We have reviewed MDA inputs parts 1, 3, and 4 to Tech Scenarios 0002 and 0018. For Part 3, the movement in Screen 9 for MDA-AL -2 for govt employees does not match what is reported in the worksheet at 2.1.4. Screens 3 and 5 for either scenario have been left blank and should be filled in. Please address the discrepancy.	MDA	12/22/2004	Corrected data per notes below. New files (dated 22 Dec) for Tech Scenarios 0002 and 0018, Part 3, have been uploaded into the MDA completed folder.
059	12/22/2004	Closed	TECH-0018	W&A	Robin Bucklelew	We have reviewed MDA inputs parts 1, 3, and 4 to Tech Scenarios 0002 and 0018. For Part 3, 0018, the tables in Screen 7 and 8 have been deleted. Please supply the missing data and address the discrepancy.	MDA	12/22/2004	Corrected data per notes below. New files (dated 22 Dec) for Tech Scenarios 0002 and 0018, Part 3, have been uploaded into the MDA completed folder.

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
060	1/12/2005	Pending	TECH-0013	ALSS	Thom Mathes	<p>1) DRPM AAA (48396) receiver data was interpreted by the Army. The Army determined that the data for FY06-08 and 2010-2011 was repeated 5 times. As such, they adjusted the total population to 30 officers and 264 civilians. DRPM uniformly distributed the officer and civilian positions across each year. 2006-2011 (i.e., 5 and 44, respectively). DRPM AAA needs to provide the rationale for uniformly distributing the FTEs in lieu of implementing the change in a single year.</p> <p>2) 2 billets reported by DRPM AAA (483961) vs 7 & 48 FTEs reported in capacity performing D&A were zero'd out by the Navy. They noted these positions do no D&A. DRPM AAA needs to reconcile the scenario data call with the data submitted with MIL VAL & Capacity Data</p> <p>3) Spoke to Chien Huo on screen 7 regarding the following MIL CON - 12,000sf parking lot, 30,000sf general office (new MILCON), and 1,000sf for enlisted unaccompanied personnel housing. The data provided came from the Army "R" forms</p>	Navy		
061	1/10/2005	Closed	TECH-0040	IS	Larry Schuette	<p>Please provide the Lease Cost for the AF OSR. This will be used on Screen 5 as a Recurring savings</p> <p>1) Please provide current lease costs for current lease facility.</p> <p>2) Additionally, provide the total number of DTRA employees located at the leased facility.</p>	Air Force	1/10/2005	Ron Mahm sent certified data file.
062	1/10/2005	Closed	TECH-0040	IS	Larry Schuette		DTRA	1/10/2005	<p>Email from John Eddy: Screen 5 for Scenario 38 should have been replicated in all of that family of scenarios. It shows a \$1,963 yearly cost avoidance if the scenario is implemented. This roughly equates to \$5,000 per person per year. This is the carrying cost for supporting these people in the Ft. Belvoir Headquarters Complex - the space they will be occupying within a year.</p> <p>Talking your model against the current situation (not appropriate in my opinion). This year we project to pay \$4,056k as "lease type" costs, for the Hybla Valley Federal Building. There are currently 600 personnel in that space. We plan to vacate that space by 1 January 2006.</p>
063	1/11/2005	Closed	TECH-0040	IS	Larry Schuette	<p>You informed the TJCSG that the lease cost for ARG is 504.5K per year. If you email me back that this answer is also correct for TECH 40 in addition to TECH 10, I can accept the answer as a Certified BRAC response.</p>	Army	1/12/2005	Sorry for the late response. The answer is yes.