

**BRAC 2005**  
**Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)**  
**Daily Conference Call**  
**Meeting Minutes of 14 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 Monday, 17 January 2005.
- The Navy is making progress with their data as well and should have all initial data certified and submitted by Tuesday, 18 January 2005.
- The Air Force will have all initial scenario data certified and submitted by Sunday, 16 January 2005. However, Part 3 of TECH-0006 will be submitted around Tuesday of next week.
- COL Hamm will have the environmental assessment, (Criterion 8) for TECH-0040 back from the Navy on Tuesday, 18 January 2005.
- Mr. Shaffer will be ready to request environmental assessment (Criterion 8) for TECH-0020 on Tuesday, 18 January 2005. The COBRA assumptions will be reviewed at the Tuesday, 18 January 2005 TJCSG Meeting. Mr. Shaffer indicated the new assumptions allow for an ROI of one year.
- The TJCSG plans to submit TECH 0040, TECH-0020, and TECH-32 to the General Counsel next week and present to the ISG on 28 January 2005.

**Decisions:**

- None

Subgroup Scenario Data Assumptions

**Key Points:**

- No COBRA assumptions were presented.
- C4ISR will run COBRA for TECH-0054 and TECH-0055 next week. There were no assumptions made for the data.
- ALSS will run COBRA for TECH-0005, TECH-0006 and TECH-0014 next week.

January 14, 2004

BRAC FOUO

- W&A will run COBRA for TECH-0017 and TECH-0043 on Monday, 17 January 2005 and supplemental COBRA runs for both by 21 January 2005. They plan to have their final candidate recommendations ready by 4 February 2005.
- The Army BRAC office will have the COBRA runs for their remanded scenarios sometime next week.

**Decisions:**

- None

**Action Items:**

None

Approved: \_\_\_\_\_



Mr. Al Shaffer

Chairman, Capabilities Integration Team

**Attachments:**

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

# **TJCSG Daily Teleconference Call Agenda**

**1700-1730 hrs EST**

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

**Attachment 2**  
**Technical JCSG Meeting**  
**January 14, 2005**  
**Attendees**

**Members:**

Dr. Ron Sega, 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  
COL Pete DeSalva, Analytic Team  
Mr. Doug Nation, Air Force  
Mr. Matt Mleziva, C4ISR Subgroup Lead  
Dr. Jim Short, OSD  
Mr. Doug Nation, Air Force  
COL Buckstad, OSD BRAC  
Col Eileen Walling, Air Force  
Maj Ron Mahn, Air Force  
Mr. Jerry Schiefer, OSD BRAC



## 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%	0	.0%	0	.0%
AIR FORCE	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
FOURTH ESTATE	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
TOTAL	2 of 472	.42%	3 of 1394	.21%	5 of 1866	.26%

January 14, 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

January 14, 2005

Slide2

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

**Scenario Data Discrepancy Status 1/14/2005**

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Answered	SDD Answer
001	12/28/2004	Closed	TECH-0032	ET	Dr. Bill Berry	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.	Navy	1/7	Navy Activities Reviewed, and SDC data submitted is Correct. Value will not be changed.
002	12/28/2004	Closed	TECH-0032	ET	Dr. Bill Berry	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.	Navy	1/7	Navy Activities Reviewed, and SDC data submitted is Correct. Value will not be changed.
003	12/28/2004	Closed	TECH-0032	ET	Dr. 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	Navy Activities Reviewed, and SDC data submitted is Correct. Value will not be changed.
004	12/29/2004	Pending	TECH-0032	ET	Dr. 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.	Air Force	1/7	Attached is the response from the Books Base discussing their second response: In Data Calls 1 & 13 we reported 78.64 FTEs for FY03. For this query we reported 59 manpower positions for FY05-11. The difference is primarily (12 FTEs) due to the double booking of military personnel against authorizations. The remaining difference of 7 can be attributed to organizational changes between 03 and 05.
005	12/30/2004	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Dr. Bill Berry	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 Hueneume Louisville detachment to ensure more accurate costing in the COBRA model. Request that Louisville data be reported under the Louisville location.	Navy		

Scenario Data Discrepancy Status 1/14/2005

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Answered	SDD Answer
006	12/30/2004	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Dr. Bill Berry	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	Mr. 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	Mr. 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	Mr. 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	Mr. 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	Mr. 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 0002/ 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		
013	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	NAVEODTECHDIV moving to Eglin AFB only list Research personnel. The intent of the action was to move all personnel and capability at the NAVEODTECHDIV 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	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	No data for NSWC Earle is reported. The intent was to move all W&A (PHS&T) capability to Picalinny. 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	Dr. Robin B. 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		

Scenario Data Discrepancy Status 1/14/2005

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Answered	SDD Answer
016	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	No data is reported for Port Hueneume (Louisville, LV). Please update data to include all personnel and associated equipment and facilities. Louisville (LV) must be reported independently of Port Hueneume 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	Dr. Robin B. 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	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	NAVBASE LOMA (Port Hueneume 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 Hueneume San Diego Detachment data in the NAVBASE LOMA tables. See scenario worksheet action 4.	Navy		
019	1/4/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Dr. Robin B. 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	Dr. Robin B. 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	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	Screen 5 NAVSUPACT Corona data includes information concerning a move to China Lake and the move to Port Hueneume. 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	Dr. Robin B. 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/ TECH-0043	W&A	Mr. Marc Magdinec	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/ TECH-0044	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Please explain and/or correct in the tables the discrepancy for personnel and tonnage (screen 3 -- NSWCD Indian Head) between TECH 0017 (& 0044) and TECH 0002.	Navy		
025	1/5/2005	Pending	TECH 0017/ TECH-0044	W&A	Mr. 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/ TECH-0044	W&A	Mr. 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		

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

Scenario Data Discrepancy Status 1/14/2005

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Answered	SDD Answer
027	1/5/2005	Pending	TECH 0002/ 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 AIB, 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.	DTRA		
028	1/5/2005	Closed	TECH-0006	ALSS	Mr. Jon Ogg	ZEROS(for Redstone) .... Needs a RFC to explain response given capacity and MIL VAL submission.	Army	1/7	J. Fath has answer with updated file rec'd 1/7/2005.
029	1/6/2004	Pending	TECH-0032	ET	Dr. 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	Dr. Bill Berry	The Army's response as gainer for Tech 0032 (Screen 3) shows only 7 FTE's from Walter 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 Walter Reed to both Aberdeen and Fort Detrick.	Army		
031	1/6/2005	Closed	TECH 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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.	Air Force	1/11	SDC number is correct.
032	1/6/2005	Closed	TECH 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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.	Air Force	1/7	Contractor personnel make up the difference.
033	1/6/2005	Closed	TECH 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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.	Air Force	1/7	IS Personnel support HS Mission- will be included in AF-110.

Scenario Data Discrepancy Status 1/14/2005

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Answered	SDD Answer
034	1/6/2005	Pending	TECH 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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		

Scenario Data Discrepancy Status 1/14/2005

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Answered	SDD Answer
039	1/6/2005	Pending	TECH 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziwa	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 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziwa	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 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziwa	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 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziwa	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 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziwa	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 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziwa	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		

**Scenario Data Discrepancy Status 1/14/2005**

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Answered	SDD Answer
045	1/6/2005	Pending	TECH 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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	Pending	TECH 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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.	Air Force		
047	1/6/2005	Complete	TECH 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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.	Air Force	1/10	Most Tonnage Industrial, not C4ISR.
048	1/6/2005	Pending	TECH 0008/ TECH 0042	C4ISR	Mr. 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.	Navy		
049	1/7/2005	Closed	TECH 0005/ 0006	ALSS	Mr. Barry Baskel	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.	Air Force	1/14	IAW direction of Scenario Sponsor
050	1/6/2005	Pending	TECH 0005/ 0006	ALSS	Mr. 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.	Air Force		

Scenario Data Discrepancy Status 1/14/2005

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service (Agency)	Date Answered	SDD Answer
051	1/7/2005	Pending	TECH 0005/0006	ALSS	Mr. 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.	Navy		
052	1/7/2005	Pending	TECH 0005/0006	ALSS	Mr. 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.	Navy		
053	1/10/2005	Pending	TECH-0040	IS	Dr. 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	Dr. 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	Dr. 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	Dr. 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	Pending	TECH-0040	IS	Dr. Larry Schuette	Screen 5: cell 17: Verify that Physical security costs are included in the reoccurring savings.	Navy	1/10	Dr. Larry Schuette has answer provided by Navy.
058	12/22/2004	Pending	TECH-0002/TECH-0018	W&A	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	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	1/7	See 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.

**Scenario Data Discrepancy Status 1/14/2005**

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Answered	SDD Answer
059	12/22/2004	Pending	TECH-0018	W&A	Dr. Robin B. Bucklewe	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	1/7	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.
060	1/12/2005	Pending	TECH-0013	ALSS	Thom Mathes	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. 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. 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	Navy		
061	1/10/2005	Closed	TECH-0040	IS	Dr. Larry Schuette	Please provide the Lease Cost for the AF OSR. This will be used on Screen 5 as a Reoccurring savings	Air Force	1/10	Air Force (MAJ Mahn sent a certified data file.
062	1/10/2005	Closed	TECH-0040	IS	Dr. Larry Schuette	Please provide current lease costs for current lease facility and provide the total number of DTRA employees located at the leased facility.	DTRA	1/10	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 avoided 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. Taking 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 plant to vacate that space by 1 January 2006.
063	1/11/2005	Closed	TECH-0040	IS	Dr. Larry Schuette	You informed the TJCSG that the lease cost for ARO 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.	Army	1/12	The answer is yes.
064	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0020	ET	Dr. Bill Berry	Screen 5 shows a One-Time Moving Savings for NRL WASH of \$11K in FY09. The Worksheet labelled 'Question 20' corresponds to the Navy's submitted One-Time Moving Costs data. This Worksheet shows the Navy NRL WASH costs as \$11K, occurring in FY09. These two entries are in conflict: Screen 5 shows it as a Savings and Worksheet Question 20 shows it as a Cost.	Navy		

Scenario Data Discrepancy Status 1/14/2005

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Answered	SDD Answer
065	1/7/2005	Pending	TECH-0018	W&A	Dr. Robin Buckelew	For DON TECH-0018 Scenario, there was no submission for Part 1, there was no submission for Part 2, there appears to be no data in the tables for Part 3, e.g., screen 3, screen 5, or Section 7 of screen 9. There is limited data for Part 4, which was submitted on two spreadsheets. We understand that the TECH 0018 submission is supposed to represent a delta from the DON TECH 0002 submission. However, as certified data, we can only use what the DON provides in its TECH 0018 submission. Therefore, the DON must copy appropriate data from the TECH 0002 submission into the TECH 0018 submission. Also, there should be only one spreadsheet for each part of the scenario.	Navy		
066	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 3, movement table, Adelphi to Picalinny, has no entry for movement of non-vehicle mission equipment and for support equipment. Provide an appropriate entry for these rows (for numbers greater than zero, please include a detailed breakout of equipment being moved).	Army		
067	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 3, movement table, Aberdeen to Picalinny, has no entry for movement of non-vehicle mission equipment and for support equipment. Provide an appropriate entry for these rows (for numbers greater than zero, please include a detailed breakout of equipment being moved).	Army		
069	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 3, movement table, Watervliet to Picalinny, has an entry for support equipment. Please provide a detailed breakout of equipment being moved	Army		
070	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 5, base information (dynamic) table, Aberdeen, includes one-time moving costs of \$30000K in FY2011. Provide a detailed breakout of what's included in this cost.	Army		
071	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 5, base information (dynamic) table, Aberdeen, includes only an entry for one-time moving cost. Verify that there are no other costs or savings that should be included in this table.	Army		

**Scenario Data Discrepancy Status 1/14/2005**

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Answered	SDD Answer
072	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 5, base information (dynamic) table, Adelphi, includes one-time moving costs of \$3700K in FY2011. Provide a detailed breakout of what's included in this cost.	Army		
073	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 5, base information (dynamic) table, Adelphi, includes only an entry for one-time moving cost. Verify that there are no other costs or savings that should be included in this table.	Army		
074	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 5, base information (dynamic) table, Watervliet, includes only an entry for miscellaneous recurring savings. Verify that there are no other costs or savings that should be included in this table.	Army		
075	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 5, base information (dynamic) table, Picatinny, includes only an entry for miscellaneous recurring costs of \$1800K. Provide an explanation for these costs.	Army		
075	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 7, base information (military construction) table, includes an RDT&E Laboratory, with a cost of \$116.5K. Note that this cost differs from that provided under TECH 0017 and TECH 0018, when we would expect to see the same cost. Per the instruction for this cell, you must provide heavy documentation for overriding the COBRA calculation for this value, for this cost to be considered valid.	Army		
076	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 7, base information (military construction) table, includes an 83100 SF Weapon Production Plant. Provide an explanation for the purpose of this facility.	Army		
077	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 7, base information (military construction) table, includes a 121900 SF Weapon RDT&E facility. Provide an explanation for the purpose of this facility.	Army		
079	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 9, Question 7.1. There are no entries for mission support contractors for Adelphi, Aberdeen, or Watervliet. Please provide an appropriate entry for these rows (zero or higher numbers).	Army		
080	1/13/2005	Pending	TECH-0017	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 9, Questions 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.3, and 6.1.4. No answer was provided for these questions, please provide appropriate responses.	Army		
081	1/14/2005	Pending	TECH-0002	W&A	Dr. Robin Buckelew	I have reviewed 0018, and in Screen 9 the tables for Kirtland and China Lake are identical. Neither is consistent with Screen 5 (I am only referring to Base information tables). Should we disregard 9 in favor of 5?	DTRA		