BRAC 2005
Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)
Daily Conference Call
Meeting Minutes of 1 March 2005

Mr. Shaffer 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 the status of the candidate recommendation packages. 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:

Candidate Recommendation Package Status

Key Points:

- The OGC is currently reviewing all remaining scenarios except TECH-0013, 0009B and 0040B.
- A concern was raised that there may be a potential conflict with the HS&A JCSG for TECH-0047 as they are proposing to move DISA to another location.
- The COBRA run for TECH-0018E will be completed tomorrow and will be ready for discussion at tomorrow's, 2 March 2005, TJCSG Meeting.

Decisions:

- None

Subgroup COBRA Assumptions

Key Points:

- For TECH-0013, the Marines indicated 10 Marine billets could be moved from Lima to Detroit. However, no data calls went out to Lima. A total of 30 Marine billets could be moved to Detroit.
- The ALSS Subgroup proposed moving 49 billets initially.
- For TECH-0018B, the assumptions regarding rehab facilities at Picatinny need to be revised and COBRA will be re-run.

Decisions:

- The TJCSG directed the ALSS Subgroup to run COBRA for TECH-0013 for 30 Marine billets to Detroit. An additional COBRA run will be performed for the 10 of these 30 billets moving from Lima to Detroit.
- The TJCSG will discuss TECH-0013 more at tomorrow's, 2 March 2005, TJCSG Meeting.

Other Information:

- The TJCSG will have a Principals only meeting on Wednesday, 2 March 2005, from 1330-1500 hrs EST, Pentagon Rm 3E1014, to discuss increasing the footprint (more than a couple of sites) for Chem-Bio Defense and Missile Defense.
- The Navy raised an issue regarding Lakehurst. The initial Navy position was to move Lakehurst to PAX River. Later the Navy decided to cantone the catapult and restraining gear workload. Now the Navy is concerned that PAX River does not have adequate capacity to accommodate the movement of Lakehurst on TECH-0005 and 0006. The TJCSG will discuss this more tomorrow, 2 March 2005, at the TJCSG meeting.

Action Items:

- The ALSS Subgroup will run COBRA for TECH-0013 for 30 Marine billets to Detroit. An additional COBRA run will be performed for the 10 of these 30 billets moving from Lima to Detroit.

Approved: _____
Mr. Al Shaffer
Executive Director
Technical Joint Cross Service Group

Attachments:

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

TJCSG Daily Tecleconference Call Agenda 1700-1730 hrs EST

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

DCN: 11470

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

Attachment 2
Technical JCSG Meeting
March 1, 2005
Attendees

Members:
Dr. Ron Sega, Chairman
Mr. Matt Mleziva, Alternate for Mr. Blaise Durante, Air Force
Mr. Brian Simmons, Army
RADM Jay Cohen, Navy

Other:

Mr. Al Shaffer, CIT Chairman
Mr. George Ryan, Navy
Dr. Bob Rohde, Army CIT Rep
Mr. Pete Cahill, Army
Mr. Gary Strack, OSD
Maj Ron Mahn, Air Force
COL Pete DeSalva, Marines
Mr. Jerry Schiefer, OSD BRAC
Dr. Karen Higgins, Weapons and Armaments Subgroup Lead
Dr. Jim Short, OSD
Dr. Larry Schuette, Innovative Systems Subgroup Lead
COL Bob Buckstad, OSD
Mr. Al Goldstayn, Air Force CIT Rep
Mr. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC
Mr. Thom Mathes, ALSS Subgroup Lead
Dr. Bill Berry, Enabling Technologies Subgroup Lead

OUTSTANDING RFC STATUS

	Sup Cap	% of Sup Cap RFCs	Mil Val	% of Mil Val RFCs	Total	% of All RFCs
TOTAL ARMY	2	.42%	2	. 14%	4	.21%
PEO-SOLDIER	0	0	2	.14%	2	.11%
ABERDEEN	0	0	0	0	0	0
REST OF ARMY	2	. 42%	0	0%	2	.11%
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%	2 of 1394	.14%	4 of 1866	. 21%

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 to Portal on 31 Jan
    - Data not in 7 Feb version of Military and Capacity Analysis Databases
  - Newly certified Army data doesn't appear to include OAR component at Ft. Rucker Aviation Technical Test Center
  - ALSS Subgroup working on resolution

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

Criteria 8 Data Call Status as of 3/1/2005 at 3:06 PM

Scenario	COBRA	Army		Navy		Air Force	
Number	RUN	Out	In	Out	In	Out	In
0005	16-Jan	31-Jan	3-Feb	31-Jan	23-Feb	31-Jan	17-Feb
0006	16-Feb			31-Jan	23-Feb	16-Feb	17-Feb
0008	1-Feb			1-Feb	14-Feb	1-Feb	9-Feb
0009A	24-Jan					8-Feb	23-Feb
0009B	23-Feb	25-Feb	25-Feb				
0013	31-Jan	31-Jan	22-Feb	14-Feb	25-Feb		
0018	28-Jan	8-Feb	23-Feb	8-Feb	23-Feb	8-Feb	23-Feb
0018 Pt 5	25-Feb			16-Feb	18-Feb	16 Feb	22-Feb
0020	19-Jan	21-Jan	4-Feb	21-Jan	7-Feb		
0031	10-Feb	11-Feb	22-Feb	31-Jan	23-Feb		
0032	13-Jan	14-Jan	20-Jan	19-Jan	24-Jan	19-Jan	25-Jan
0035	24-Feb	10-Feb	18-Feb				
0040	12-Jan	19-Jan	20-Jan	14-Jan	21-Jan		
0042	4-Feb			11-Feb	23-Feb	11-Feb	18-Feb
0045	9-Feb	9-Feb	11-Feb				
0047	24-Jan	26-Jan	27-Jan	26-Jan	28-Jan	26-Jan	1-Feb
0054	18-Jan			19-Jan	26-Jan		
0058	28-Feb					22-Feb	22-Feb

	Not Applicable
	Pending/Routine Action
	Need revision
	Overdue/Urgent Action
	Completed

Report Changes/Errors/Omissions to Jim Geith, 703-602-7294, James.Geith@navy.mil

DCN: 11470

SDD Age

Service	< 5 Days	Between 5 and 10	Between 10 and 15	> 15 Days	Change in # SDDs Since Last Report[1] (Net)	Change in # SDDs Since Yesterday (Net)
USA	0	0	0	10	0	0
USN	0	0	0	11	0	0
USAF	0	0	0	0	0	0
DTRA	0	0	0	2	0	0
DARPA	0	0	0	0	0	0
MDA	0	0	0	2	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	25	0	0

Note 1: Last report posted 2/25.

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

DCN: 11470

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
027	1/5	Pending	TECH-0002	Part 4	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.	DTRA			55
082	1/14	Pending	TECH-0002		W&A	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			46
214	1/27	Pending	TECH-0006	Part 1	ALSS	Thom Mathes	In reviewing the Navy's responses to TECH-0006 Part I 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 activitiy 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).	Navy			33
215	1/28	Pending	TECH-0006		ALSS	Thom Mathes	In reviewing the Navy's Lakehurst response to question 47 of TECH-0006 Part I, 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			32

DCN: 11470

NOTE:SDDs that are identical to those of a parent/sibling Scenario or related to an inactive Scenario are excluded from this report. They are still being tracked for closure.

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
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 teardown, pack, unpack 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			33
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			33
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			33
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			33
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			40

DCN: 11470

NOTE:SDDs that are identical to those of a parent/sibling Scenario or related to an inactive Scenario are excluded from this report. They are still being tracked for closure.

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
218	2/1	Pending	TECH-0013		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			28
219	2/1	Pending	TECH-0013		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-0045?	Army			28
220	2/3	Pending	TECH-0013		ALSS	Thom Mathes	On screen 5 there is a one-time cost attributed for utilities of $4,779K in 2008 amd $979K in one-time IT costs for infrastructure IT upgrades. Please provide a description and how they were determined.	Army			26
221	2/3	Pending	TECH-0013		ALSS	Thom Mathes	Also, per our telecon, need to reconcile between RIA's response of 7 FTEs in P&FTE and 10 ACO&BFTE vs the 8 W0KAA.	Army			26
222	2/3	Pending	TECH-0013		ALSS	Thom Mathes	Looking at Redstone's numbers we have a disconnect between what they submitted in response to the scenario data call and the latest and greatest 4277. They are as follow: UIC 4277 Scenario WS W1DFAA 36.8/5.7 0 ofc/25 civ W27P50 10.0/22 3 ofc/15 civ W1HTAA 36.8/5.7 0 ofc/18 civ W27P8C 10.5/12 0 ofc/0 civ W4T801 0/0 0 ofc/15 civ W4T801 may have rebinned themselves under weapons, sensors or info systems - but nothing under ground vehicles. Please reconcile and advise of any corrections.	Army			26
223	2/3	Pending	TECH-0013		ALSS	Thom Mathes	While trying to reconcile the Army numbers on TECH-0013 I relooked at what the USMC reported on the scenario data call and what was reported in the latest 4277. It would appear that your data call is over stated. UIC 4277 Scenario WS P&T ACO&B OFC ENL CIV M67854 3 32 22 25 62 Can you reconcile it?	Navy			26
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			61
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 7 of Screen 9 as to why data was not provided.	Navy			61

DCN: 11470

NOTE:SDDs that are identical to those of a parent/sibling Scenario or related to an inactive Scenario are excluded from this report. They are still being tracked for closure.

Scenario Data Discrepancy Status--Scenarios Approved
to Proceed to ISG and Active Scenarios

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
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			61
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			61
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			61
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			53
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			55

DCN: 11470

NOTE:SDDs that are identical to those of a parent/sibling Scenario or related to an inactive Scenario are excluded from this report. They are still being tracked for closure.