

**BRAC 2005  
Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)  
Daily Conference Call  
Meeting Minutes of 2 February 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 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:

Scenario Data Call Status

**Key Points:**

- The Army should have their data tomorrow.
- The Air Force should have their data by tomorrow.
- The Navy should have Lakehurst data tomorrow.

**Decisions:**

- The TJCSG decided to cut-off all scenario data on Friday, 4 February 2005.

Subgroup Scenario Data Assumptions

**Key Points:**

- For TECH-0020, the TJCSG previously decided the square footage requirement for Research would be 310 sq ft. The Enabling Technologies Subgroup requested to make an exception for TECH-0020 to use the square footage requirement for office space which is 160 sq feet instead as this type of work requires office space rather than office space.
- The Weapons and Armaments Subgroup presented COBRA assumptions regarding personnel and MILCON/facilities. The W&A Subgroup will present additional assumptions at tomorrow's TJCSG Meeting.

**Decisions:**

- The TJCSG decided to allow the sq footage requirement for the Research piece of TECH-0020 to be 160 sq ft instead of 310 sq ft. However, this will be documented and the Enabling Technologies Subgroup will validate this is an accurate requirement.
- The TJCSG approved the COBRA assumptions for the W&A scenarios as presented. However, the reference to MDA will be removed. Also, a 15% personnel reduction

February 2, 2004

BRAC FOUO

will be applied for all headquarters mission support contractors and the government administrative personnel.

The Thursday, 3 February 2005, TJCSG Meeting will take place from 1400-1600 EST in the Pentagon, Rm 4E987. Mr. Strack will set up a "Meet-Me" number for the meeting.

**Action Items:**

1. The CIT will review the list of SDDs and determine if closure is obtainable and if not recommend to the TJCSG specific assumptions to allow the analysis to continue. This will be done by COB tomorrow, 3 February 2005.

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**  
**February 2, 2005**  
**Attendees**

**Members:**

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

**Other:**

Mr. Al Shaffer, CIT Chairman  
Dr. Bob Rohde, Army CIT Rep  
COL Walt Hamm, Marines CIT Rep  
Mr. Matt Mleziva, C4ISR Subgroup Lead  
Mr. Gary Strack, OSD  
Col Eileen Walling, Air Force  
Maj Ron Mahn, Air Force  
Ms. Pamela Houghtaling, Navy  
Ms. Marie Felix, OSD  
Dr. Karen Higgins, Weapons & Armaments Subgroup Lead  
Mr. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC  
Dr. Jim Short, OSD  
Mr. Tom Carroll, Innovative Systems Subgroup Rep  
Mr. Roger Florence DOD IG  
Mr. Thom Mathes, ALSS Subgroup Lead  
Dr. Bill Berry, Enabling Technologies Subgroup Lead  
COL Pete DeSalva, Marines  
COL Bob Buckstad, OSD  
Ms. Pamela Houghtaling, Navy  
Mr. Doug Nation, Air Force  
Dr. Bill Berry, Enabling Technologies Subgroup Lead  
Mr. Jerry Schiefer, OSD BRAC





<b>OUTSTANDING RFC STATUS</b>						
	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%
February 2, 2005 <span style="float: right;">Slide1</span> 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
  - Army updated response and re-certified
    - Data delivered 31 Jan
  - Newly certified Army data doesn't appear to include OAR component at Ft. Rucker Aviation Technical Test Center
  - ALSS Subgroup working on resolution

February 2, 2005 Slide2  
 DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY - DO NOT RELEASE UNDER FOIA

# SDD Age

Service	< 5 Days	Between 5 and 10	Between 10 and 15	> 15 Days	Change in # SDDs Since Last Report <sup>1</sup> (Net)	Change in # SDDs Since Yesterday (Net)
USA	4	4	29	4	4	4
USN	0	2	1	20	0	0
USAF	0	0	1	2	0	0
DTRA	0	0	0	5	0	0
DARPA	0	0	0	0	0	0
MDA	0	0	0	2	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>

**NOTES:**

(1) Last report loaded onto Portal on 31 Jan (Mon)

2/2/2005

# ADDITIONAL ASSUMPTIONS FOR W&A REQUIRING APPROVAL

WEAPONS AND ARMAMENTS  
Feb 2, 2005

2/1/05

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

1

## NEW EXCURSION ASSUMPTIONS REQUESTED [2/2/05]

- PERSONNEL
  - Allow 15% reduction in all headquarters mission support contractors [vs 15% of support personnel only]: specific to MDA
  - Allow recurring savings of \$200K per year per mission support contractor that has been eliminated [consistent with Innovative Systems Assumptions]: specific to MDA
  - Remove Sustainment and Weapons Integration Personnel from Scenarios
    - Use sub-DTAP breakout provided in scenario data
    - Leave at current location as originally recommended
- MILCONS/ FACILITIES
  - Eliminate movement of operational facilities [e.g. silos in MDA]
  - Eliminate movement of facilities and equipment from Prime Contractors [e.g. Boeing for MDA]

2/1/05

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

2

# Backup

2/1/05

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

3

## NEW EXCURSION ASSUMPTIONS [1/27/05]:

Approval received to use these plus previous assumptions

### MILCON & FACILITIES

- Delete MILCON associated with MWR functions
- Use Donor MILCON data when receiver data unavailable
- Correct obvious MILCON errors [e.g. unit counts/ sq ft]
- Use std sq ft for MILCON when no entries available but expert military judgment deems significant and required
- Delete demolition & reclamation costs for bases not closed [COBRA may require expected use or lack of use—some costs automatic in COBRA]

### EQT & MATERIALS

- Delete costs for special purpose but infrequently used eqt that is available at receiving site or within W&A community
- Delete large IT costs [COBRA includes]; add \$1200 per seat where significant IT warranted
- Resupply of dual use eqt/ matl allowed only at receiver site
- Delete costs for personal office material movements
- Allow 10% of long and unsupported lists of equipment that include disallowable items.
- Allow transfer of unique special purpose equipment such as Navy shock eqt when mission requires

### ENVIRONMENTAL

- Allow decontamination costs for eqt and materials being relocated [proportional to % eqt moved]

2/1/05

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

4

## PREVIOUS EXCURSION ASSUMPTIONS

- Previous Assumptions approved for 17, 44; 19, 43:
  - Personnel movement IAW TJCSG guidance ['06 non-MC; '08 MC]
  - Deleted decontamination costs for sites remaining open [OSD policy]
  - 15% Efficiency for support personnel [support FTE percentage derived from capacity/MV data #4277 #3002; protect critical P&T] Note: TJCSG discussion to ensure understanding of 15% support personnel, rather than 15% of all personnel: recognized Expert Military Judgment]
  - 25% general purpose eqt only allowed if receiver has similar mission; efficiencies gained by superset labs at prime sites [IAW W&A core/specialty strategy]
  - 25% of donor storage, movement and disposal of consumables allowed
  - Scrub MILCON based on expert knowledge [use receiver/donor inputs]; change to rehabilitation where appropriate
  - Reduce costs of doc xfer [clean files]: allow 1/3 local; 2/3 formal library
  - Dahlgren Over Water Range remains open [0017]; large caliber Naval Guns & Army Vehicles [guns] at Dahlgren remain [gun system integ].
  - Delete moving some specialized machining/ mfg eqt from Watervliet [0017] [already at receiver site; keep sim, experimental/ analysis eqt]
  - Delete coordination/ transition oversight, new program coord costs/ maintaining interfaces

2/1/05  
Do Not Release Under FOIA

5

SDD #	Date Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario			Scenario			SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service Agency	Date Closed	SDD Answer	SDD AGE
			Scenario #	Part	Scenario	Sponsor	POC						
012	12/22	Pending	TECH-0002	Part 4	W&A	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	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			42	
027	1/5	Pending	TECH-0002	Part 4	W&A	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	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.	DTRA			28	
082	1/14	Pending	TECH-0002		W&A	Dr. Robin Buckelew	Dr. Robin Buckelew	There are some small discrepancies remaining in MDA Part 3 submissions for 0002 and 0018. 0002: Screen 3 for Schriever references 1204 mission support contractors to go to Redstone Arsenal, but Screen 9 references 1412. For 0018, Screen 9, W&A 5 references 1204 contractors, the same as Screen 3. But Screen 9.7.1 shows 1412 contractors. Tech 0018 shows 87 civilians from Schriever as opposed to 88 in 0002, Screen 3, although there should not be any difference. Screen 9. Section 9 in 0018 has several inconsistencies with respect to number of officers from Colorado (25, not 23), civilians from CO (95, not 88), enlisted from NCR (4, not 12), enlisted from CO (5, not 4), shows 13 enlisted to Redstone Arsenal, different from the total of 9 leaving, and 769 civilians leaving locations, but 729 going to Redstone.	MDA			19	
013	1/4	Pending	TECH-0002	Part 1	W&A	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	NAVEDTECHDIV 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			29	
017	1/4	Pending	TECH-0002	Part 3	W&A	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	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			29	
021	1/4	Pending	TECH-0002	Part 4	W&A	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	Dr. Robin B. Buckelew	Screen 5 NAVSUPACT Corona data includes information concerning a move to China Lake and the move to Port Hueneme. Please provide back-up information to show the break out of the movement costs for each of these parts.	Navy			29	
093	1/20	Pending	TECH-0002	Part 1	W&A	Dr. Robin Buckelew	Dr. Robin Buckelew	Screen 9 says that Hill totals more enlisted personnel in in-service engineering and sustainment (95) than they show in W&A (77) in Screen 3. Also in Screen 9, Tinker totals 53 civilians in in-service engineering, sustainment, and weapon sys integration, but only 52 total in Screen 3. The Edwards submission in Screen 9 on in-service engineering is identical to that for weapons systems integration, down to the one-time construction cost. In any case, adding them makes the civilian numbers come out too high compared to Screen 3. Please provide clarification on the discrepancies between Screen 3 and Screen 9. Individuals should not be counted in more than one category of activity in Screen 9.	Navy			13	
216	2/1	Pending	TECH-0005	Part 2	ALSS	Thom Mathes	Thom Mathes	Screen 5: Redstone identified One-Time IT cost of \$101K and One-Time Unique Costs of \$1732K in 2209. Please provide a description justifying these costs and how they were determined.	Army			1	
217	2/1	Pending	TECH-0005	Part 2	ALSS	Thom Mathes	Thom Mathes	Screen 7: Redstone identified New MILCON for a General Admin Bldg, Aircraft RDT&E facility, Misc RDT&E facility, Misc Item & Equipment RD, Surfaced Aircraft Apron, Depot Aircraft Maintenance Hanger, Aircraft Shelter and General Use Library. Please provide a description justifying these costs and how they were determined.	Army			1	

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Tracking Status	Scenario #	Part	Scenario	Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Closed	SDD Answer	SDD AGE
214	1/27	Pending	TECH-0006	Part 1	ALSS	Thom Mathes	Thom Mathes	In reviewing the Navy's responses to TECH-0006 Part 1 need clarification on the responses from Pt. Mugu and Corona: NAWC PT MUGU: All personnel, mission equipment, and facilities in the air platform T&E TCA at this activity are outdoor air range operations. These are an integrated, fixed base capability that must remain at the Point Mugu site to continue sea range operations supporting other TCAs. The Patuxent River site has similar equipment and thus would not need to replicate this capability. The following work years and mission equipment would not move: 1 military officer, 18 military enlisted, 139 civilians, and 33 contractors. 3796 tons of mission equipment. Question - Under question 4277 Pt. Mugu reported 191.9 FTEs doing air platform T&E. There appears to be conflict between the E&T TJCSG for T&E Ranges and the TJCSG that has purview over the non-open air range portion of the T&E mission. Were these same people in essence double reported under OAR and non-OARs? Of the 191 how many were perform OAR T&E and how many non-OAR T&E (i.e., other 5 test categories). In reviewing the Navy's Lakehurst response to question 47 of TECH-0006 Part 1, which addressed their FTE breakdown of personnel involved in non-ALRE (e.g., ground support systems) work, request all sections of the scenario data call format be provided by Lakehurst to enable movement of such workload to be analyzed.	Navy			6
215	1/28	Pending	TECH-0006		ALSS	Thom Mathes	Thom Mathes		Navy			5
046	1/6	Pending	TECH-0008	8	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	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			27
178	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 3	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC), the Army certified a total of 156 FTEs at Redstone working in Information Systems and Sensors Research; however, in the Scenario Data Call (SDC) response for TECH-0008/0042, Part 3, the Army certified a total of 3 FTEs at Redstone working in Information Systems and Sensors Research that would potentially move to Adelphi. Please clarify which number is the correct Army certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Army			14
179	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 3	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC), the Army certified a total of 648 FTEs at Ft. Monmouth working in Information Systems and Sensors Research; however, in the Scenario Data Call (SDC) response for TECH-0008/0042, Part 3, the Army certified a total of 488 FTEs at Ft. Monmouth working in Information Systems and Sensors Research that would potentially move to Adelphi. Please clarify which number is the correct Army certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Army			14
180	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 3	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC), the Army certified a total of 264 FTEs at Ft. Belvoir working in Information Systems and Sensors Research; however, in the Scenario Data Call (SDC) response for TECH-0008/0042, Part 3, the Army certified a total of 532 FTEs at Ft. Belvoir working in Information Systems and Sensors Research that would potentially move to Adelphi. Please clarify which number is the correct Army certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified. NOTE: we suspect that some D&A FTEs may have inadvertently been included with the Research FTEs in the SDC response.	Army			14
181	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 3	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Please provide a listing/description of the vehicles and equipment making up the tonnage (Screen 3) to be shipped from Ft. Monmouth to Adelphi.	Army			14

SDD #	Date SDD Tracking		Scenario #	Part	Scenario	Sponsor	POC	Scenario	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service (Agency)	Date Closed	SDD Answer	SDD AGE
	Initiated	Status											
182	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 3	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Scenario	Please ask Adelphi to confirm that they need all the vehicles and equipment proposed to be moved by Ft. Monmouth in order to accomplish the realigned workload from Ft. Monmouth.	Army			14
183	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 3	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Scenario	Please confirm that the \$37.05M One-Time Moving Costs for Ft. Monmouth (Screen 5) are solely from the movement of equipment/vehicles listed on Screen 3 or provide a listing/description of the Costs not due to the equipment/vehicles listed on Screen 3.	Army			14
184	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 3	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Scenario	Please confirm that the \$27.449M One-Time Unique Costs for Adelphi (Screen 5) are the costs of the Facilities newMILCON listed on Screen 7.	Army			14
192	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 4	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Scenario	FTEs at Redstone working in Information Systems and Sensors D&A; however, in the Scenario Data Call (SDC) response for TECH-0008/0042, Part 4, the Army certified a total of 175 FTEs at Redstone working in Information Systems and Sensors D&A that would potentially move to Ft. Monmouth. Please clarify which number is the correct Army certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Army			14
194	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 4	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Scenario	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC), the Army certified a total of 1316 FTEs at Ft. Belvoir working in Information Systems and Sensors D&A; however, in the Scenario Data Call (SDC) response for TECH-0008/0042, Part 4, the Army certified a total of 205 FTEs at Redstone working in Information Systems and Sensors D&A that would potentially move to Ft. Monmouth. Please clarify which number is the correct Army certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Army			14
195	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 4	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Scenario	Please confirm that the \$8.950M One-Time Unique Costs for Ft. Monmouth (Screen 5) are the costs of the Facilities newMILCON listed on Screen 7.	Army			14
198	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 5	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Scenario	In the Supplemental Capacity Data Call (SCDC), the Army certified a total of 246 FTEs at White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) working in Information Systems and Sensors T&E; however, in the Scenario Data Call (SDC) response for TECH-0008/0042, Part 5, the Army certified a total of 117 FTEs at WSMR working in Information Systems and Sensors T&E that would potentially move to Ft. Huachuca. Please clarify which number is the correct Army certified number and why the numbers are different since both were certified.	Army			14
199	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 5	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Scenario	Please provide a listing/description of the vehicles and equipment making up the tonnage (Screen 3) to be shipped from WSMR to Ft. Huachuca.	Army			14
200	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 5	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Scenario	Please ask Ft. Huachuca to confirm that they need all the vehicles and equipment proposed to be moved by WSMR in order to accomplish the realigned workload from WSMR.	Army			14
201	1/19	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 5	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Scenario	Please confirm that the \$30.214M One-Time Unique Costs for Ft. Huachuca (Screen 5) are the costs of the Facilities newMILCON listed on Screen 7.	Army			14
048	1/6	Pending	TECH-0008	Part 1	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Scenario	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			27

SDD #	Date Initiated	SDD Status	Scenario #	Part	Scenario	Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Closed	SDD Answer	SDD AGE
210	1/27	Pending	TECH-0009	n/a	IS		Dr. Larry Schuette	We have additional questions based on a review of the Tech 0009 responses in V3.2. 1) TAB A shows a partial equipment list of \$48M worth of the \$175M worth of equipment. We are having issues with the cost estimate of \$153M to tear down, pack, un-pack and reinstall at the receiving location. We need better fidelity into the cost estimate. Accordingly (and we are doing this to other locations), please provide a break down of the unique costs. This should include a listing of every item valued over \$10,000 scheduled to be moved, the current age of the item, the purchase price of the item and the cost estimate to move that item and how the cost estimate was obtained. Additionally an estimate of the weight of the item should be provided.  The cost estimate to move the equipment from the southwest was also felt to be too high. Please provide a list of equipment with the same fidelity as above.	Army			6
211	1/27	Pending	TECH-0009	n/a	IS		Dr. Larry Schuette	We have additional questions based on a review of the Tech 0009 responses in V3.2. 2) The Army provided a single \$\$ estimate of the cost of the milcon at the receiving location. Better fidelity is required to assess the costs. Please provide the square footage by FAC code. Please break this out for both losing locations. Also provide a list of the GFE (and \$\$ value per item) that will be provided in the building. For clean room spaces, please provide the number of square feet and indicate if the GFE used for the space will be moved from the losing location, or if it will be new. Also, indicate if the GFE is already counted in item #1 above.	Army			6
212	1/27	Pending	TECH-0009	n/a	IS		Dr. Larry Schuette	We have additional questions based on a review of the Tech 0009 responses in V3.2. 3) You indicated that sufficient admin space is available at the receiving location. Please indicate if that space is category three or category two for rehab purposes (will it cost \$110 or 49 per sf to rehab?).	Army			6
213	1/27	Pending	TECH-0009	n/a	IS		Dr. Larry Schuette	We have additional questions based on a review of the Tech 0009 responses in V3.2. 3) You indicated that sufficient admin space is available at the receiving location. Please indicate if that space is category three or category two for rehab purposes (will it cost \$110 or 49 per sf to rehab?).	Army			6
092	1/20	Pending	TECH-0013	n/a	ALSS		Thom Mathes	Just looked at the latest data response from Redstone regarding the \$4,076K. There submission requires additional information to substantiate them being recurring costs. In looking at the seven contracts identified on the worksheet prompts the question whether they are programmatic or pertain to recurring costs for facilities and equipment. Please provide a description of each effort and when each of these contractual efforts will expire.	Army			13
218	2/1	Pending	TECH-0013	n/a	ALSS		Thom Mathes	Based upon the USMC SDD response pertaining to the Direct Reporting Program Manager Advanced Amphibious Assault (DRPM AAA) [UIC 48396] part of TECH-0013 please revise your input to reflect the 50 officers and 248 civilians moving to Detroit Arsenal in FY11.	Army			1
219	2/1	Pending	TECH-0013	n/a	ALSS		Thom Mathes	In evaluating the Facility requirements for TECH-0013, can you provide me with a copy of the Detroit Arsenal facility input (building and SF) they provided you for TECH-00457?	Army			1
122	1/13	Pending	TECH-0017	n/a	W&A		Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 9, Questions 6, 1: No answer was provided for this question, please provide appropriate responses.	Army			20
123	1/13	Pending	TECH-0017	n/a	W&A		Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 7, base information (military construction) table, includes an RDIT&E Laboratory, with a cost of \$89500K. Note that this cost differs from that provided under TECH 0002, 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			20

SDD #	Date SDD Initiated	SDD Status	Scenario #	Part	Scenario Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Closed	SDD Answer	SDD AGE
006	12/30	Pending	TECH-0017	n/a	W&A	Mr. 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			34
007	12/30	Pending	TECH-0017	n/a	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 9 as to why data was not provided.	Navy			34
008	12/30	Pending	TECH-0017	n/a	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			34
009	12/30	Pending	TECH-0017	n/a	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			34
010	12/30	Pending	TECH-0017	n/a	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			34
011	12/30	Pending	TECH-0017	n/a	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Data discrepancy: On Screen 5, for Navbase Ventura Cty, one-time unique costs lists \$8870K. The supporting data on Tab Question 18 sums to \$16970K.	Navy			34
024	1/5	Pending	TECH-0017	n/a	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			28
025	1/5	Pending	TECH-0017	n/a	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			28
026	1/5	Pending	TECH-0017	n/a	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 Cty 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			28
081	1/14	Pending	TECH-0018		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			19
065	1/7	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			26
023	1/5	Pending	TECH-0019		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			28
196	1/19	Pending	TECH-0042	Part 4	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Please confirm that the \$30.998M One-Time Unique Costs for Ft. Belvoir (Screen 5) are the costs of the Facilities newMILCON listed on Screen 7	Army			14
197	1/19	Pending	TECH-0042	Part 4	C4ISR	Mr. Matt Mieziva	Please confirm that the \$38.730M One-Time Moving Costs for Ft. Monmouth (Screen 5) are solely from the movement of equipment/vehicles listed on Screen 3 or provide a listing/description of the Costs not due to the equipment/vehicles listed on Screen 3	Army			14
158	1/13	Pending	TECH-0044	n/a	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 3, movement table, Pictirmy to Dahlgren, has an entry for support equipment. Please provide a detailed breakout of equipment being moved.	Army			20

SDD #	Date SDD Tracking		Scenario #	Part	Scenario	Sponsor	Scenario POC	SDD (Scenario Data Discrepancy)	Service /Agency	Date Closed	SDD Answer	SDD AGE
	Initiated	Status										
159	1/13	Pending	TECH-0044	n/a	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil	Screen 3, movement table, Picalinny to Dahlgren, has an entry for Military Heavy/Special Vehicles. Provide a list of vehicle types and quantities. 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.	Army				20
115	1/5	Pending	TECH-0044	n/a	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				28
116	1/5	Pending	TECH-0044	n/a	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				28
117	1/5	Pending	TECH-0044	n/a	W&A	Mr. Pete O'Neil		Navy				28