

**BRAC 2005**  
**Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)**  
**Daily Conference Call**  
**Meeting Minutes of 25 March 2005**

Dr. Segal chaired the meeting. The agenda is enclosed in attachment 1. The list of attendees is enclosed in attachment 2. Read ahead materials for the meeting are enclosed in attachment 3. The primary objective for the meeting was to continue the deliberations regarding TECH-0014. 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:

“Due-Outs” Status

**Key Points:**

- The TECH-0060 Candidate Recommendation (CR) package has been submitted to the OGC.
- The ALSS Subgroup has posted the latest COBRA results for TECH-0005 and TECH-0006 using the most recent data they had available. However, the Lakehurst data is still incomplete.
- For TECH-0035R, a TJCSG member recommended integrating it with another scenario(s) to get the 20 year payback period down to a shorter time period.
- The discussion for TECH-0059 was deferred.

**Decisions:**

- The TJCSG decided to go forward with TECH-0005(excursion 2) and TECH-0006(excursion 3) as CRs.

Continuation of TECH-0014 Deliberations

**Key Points:**

- The ALSS Subgroup provided a quick synopsis of the discussion that took place at yesterday's, 24 March 2005, TJCSG Teleconference Call.
- Tech-0014 was a strategy-driven scenario developed by the ALSS last Oct/Nov.
- In January, the TJCSG deliberated and voted to "terminated" Tech-0014 based on Military Judgment.
- ISG tasked the MilDeps and the JCSGs to work together to examine potential opportunities for base closures.
- The specific tasker for the TJCSG was for the "TJCSG to complete its analysis to enable closure of Los Angeles AFB".

- In its recent response to TJCSG and the OSD BRAC Office, the Air Force has resurrected its companion base closure scenario (AF-0013) and is preparing COBRA to do its companion analysis.
- The Air Force stated it was waiting for the TJCSG's functional analysis and requested the TJCSG address the following concerns:
  1. Has the TJCSG looked at other alternatives other than Peterson AFB...ie, Vandenberg or Kirtland?
  2. Has TJCSG analyzed the potential short term (2-10 yrs) impact to the National Security Space Program of this proposal.
- The ALSS Subgroup has completed the functional COBRA analysis in agreement with the TJCSG approved assumptions. They have provided the results for three cases to bound the FFRDC issue and to address the risk associated with the intellectual capital.
- The upper bounded COBRA run included the movement of the FFRDC. The lower bounded COBRA run excluded the movement of the FFRDC.
- The ALSS Subgroup ran another COBRA analysis as a middle ground between the upper and lower bounds. This COBRA run estimated a cost of \$200M would be necessary to mitigate the risk associated with re-establishing the technical workforce at the new location since the FFRDC would not be moved in that particular excursion.
- The ALSS has also provided the justification for moving the D&A mission and their assessment of risk.
- The Air Force Principal provided two suggested options for satisfying the TJCSG's responsibilities in ISG memo and answering the questions requested by the Air Force.

Option 1 Retain the TJCSG deliberative position from January 2005 regarding the decision to delete the scenario, forward the functional COBRA results to the Air Force so they can combine with AF-0013 scenario and complete the base closure analysis, and report out to the ISG on 1 April 2005.

-- The Air Force will then be responsible to report the final combined results to the TJCSG as soon as possible thereafter.

-- The Air Force questions become OBE since the TJCSG would not be changing its earlier decision and supporting rationale.

Option 2 Use the latest justification and risk assessment provided by the ALSS to alter the TJCSG deliberative position from January 2005 and forward it with the functional COBRA results to the Air Force so they can complete their responsibilities as outlined in Option 1.

- OSD BRAC office indicated that the \$200M technical workforce re-establishment cost is not a reasonable cost for the ALSS Subgroup to consider.
- The ALSS Subgroup indicated they had based the \$200M risk mitigation cost on their best expert technical military judgment to mitigate any risk associated with the National Security Space Program.

- An idea that the movement of the Los Angeles AFB mission to Peterson AFB had to be an all or nothing scenario and that there may be some transformational value for moving part of the Los Angeles mission to Peterson AFB.
- The ALSS Subgroup indicated there would be no value in moving only a portion of the Los Angeles mission.

**Decisions:**

- In response to the question posed by a TJCSG member "Is there transformational value in moving the D&A mission from Los Angeles AFB" the Principals responded as follows:
  - The mission should remain at Los Angeles AFB
  - There's not sufficient value to justify moving the mission.
  - Keep the mission in place at Los Angeles AFB.
  - There may be some transformational value for considering Peterson AFB
  - The mission should be moved from Los Angeles AFB to Peterson AFB as they believe there will be sufficient transformational value for doing so.

**Action Items:**

- The ALSS Subgroup will prepare the CR package for TECH-0005(Excursion 2).
- The ALSS Subgroup will prepare the CR package for TECH-0006(Excursion 3).

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

  
Mr. Al Shaffer  
Executive Director  
Technical Joint Cross Service Group

**Attachments:**

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

**Attachment 2**  
**Technical JCSG Meeting**  
**March 25, 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, Navy  
Mr. Jay Erb, JCS

**Other:**

Mr. Al Shaffer, OSD  
Dr. Bob Rohde, Army CIT Rep  
COL Walt Hamm, Marines  
Mr. Pete Cahill, Army  
Mr. Gary Strack, OSD  
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. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC  
Mr. Pete Potochney, OSD BRAC  
Mr. Thom Mathes, ALSS Subgroup Lead  
Mr. Roger Florence, DoD IG  
COL Steye Evans, Marines  
Mr. Steve Kratzmeier, Army  
Mr. Matt Mleziva, C4ISR Subgroup Lead  
Maj Ron Mahn, OSD  
Mr. Al Goldstayn, Air Force CIT Rep

# **TJCSG Daily Teleconference Call Agenda**

**1700-1730 hrs EST**

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

DCN: 11488

**Attachment 2**  
**Technical JCSG Meeting**  
**March 25, 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, Navy  
Mr. Jay Erb, JCS

**Other:**

Mr. Al Shaffer, OSD  
Dr. Bob Rohde, Army CIT Rep  
COL Walt Hamm, Marines  
Mr. Pete Cahill, Army  
Mr. Gary Strack, OSD  
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. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC  
Mr. Pete Potochney, OSD BRAC  
Mr. Thom Mathes, ALSS Subgroup Lead  
Mr. Roger Florence, DoD IG  
COL Steve Evans, Marines  
Mr. Steve Kratzmeier, Army  
Mr. Matt Mleziva, C4ISR Subgroup Lead  
Maj Ron Mahn, OSD  
Mr. Al Goldstain, Air Force CIT Rep

**25 Mar 05 TJCSG  
TJCSG Daily Teleconference  
AGENDA**

- **TECH 5 and 6 COBRA RUN status**
- **TECH 59 status**
- **ISG Actions – COI DeSalva Handout**
- **TECH 14**

DCN: 11488

Action #	Action	Related Actions	Current Status	Next Step	End Result	POC
3-18-1	NSWC Corona relocate to March ANGB		Package updated	Submit to OGC	Corona closure	Scrivette
3-18-1-1		a. Pull Corona components from scenario TECH-0005	Assembling package	Brief Principals	Rework scenario package	Mathes
3-18-1-2		b. Pull Corona components from scenario TECH-0006	Assembling package	Brief Principals	Rework scenario package	Mathes
3-18-1-3		c. Pull Corona components from scenario TECH-0018(DR)	Package updated	Submit to OGC	Rework scenario package	Higgins
3-18-1-4		d. Pull Corona components from scenario TECH-0042(AR)	Package updated	Submit to OGC	Rework scenario package	Miaziva
3-18-2	Monmouth relocate to APG		Pending results of ISG briefing	Obtain approval from IEC	Monmouth closure	Rohde/ Cahill
3-18-2-1		Obtain ISG approval for excursion	TECH 35R briefed to ISG	TBD	Restructure scenario	Sega/ Shaffer
3-18-3	Lakehurst relocate to PAX River		Resolve data issues - Mugu and Corona from PAX	COBRA run	Lakehurst closure	Mathes
3-18-4	Integration of MDA issue w/ H&SA (HSA-47)		HSA-47 COBRA run in process	Review results of H&SA COBRA run	Removal of TECH-0018C & integration w/H&SA 47	Higgins
3-18-5	LAAFB relocate to Peterson		COBRA runs for FFRDC/\$200 MilCon, no FFRDC, and no FFRDC/\$200MilCon complete	Brief Principals	LAAFB closure	Mathes
3-18-5-1		Combatant Cmd CAISR @ Lackland - TECH-0047 alternative (TECH-0061)	Run COBRA	COBRA run	Evaluate alternative site to Peterson	Miaziva
3-18-5-2		Combatant Cmd CAISR @ Offutt - TECH-0047 alternative (TECH-0062)	Run COBRA	COBRA run	Evaluate alternative site to Peterson	Miaziva
3-18-6	Indian Head Energetic Materials function to China Lake		Working data issues btwn receiver/donor sites	Brief Principals (3/24)	Indian Head closure	Higgins

Indicates change in status

COBRA runs: 25 March 2005

TECH-0005: 1 (below)

Payback

One-time cost:	\$92,969K
Net implementation cost:	\$66,686K
Annual recurring savings:	\$ 9,177K
Payback time:	12 years
NPV (savings):	\$21,705K

TECH-0005: 2 (below)

Payback

One-time cost:	\$78,489K
Net implementation cost:	\$62,191K
Annual recurring savings:	\$ 6,373K
Payback time:	16 years
NPV (savings):	\$ 71K

TECH-0005: 3 (below)

Payback

One-time cost:	\$76,489K
Net implementation cost:	\$60,373K
Annual recurring savings:	\$ 6,305K
Payback time:	16 yrs
NPV (savings):	\$1,163K

TECH-0006: 1 (below)

Payback

One-time cost:	\$33,318K
Net implementation cost:	\$ 6,305
Annual recurring savings:	\$ 7,582
Payback time:	5 years
NPV (savings):	\$63,737

TECH-0006: 2 (below)

Payback

One-time cost:	\$424.2M
Net implementation cost:	\$381.2M
Annual recurring savings:	\$ 16.6M
Payback time:	53 years
NPV (savings):	-\$194.7M

TECH-0006: 3 (below)

Payback

One-time cost:	\$ 8,237K
Net implementation cost:	-\$ 3,361K
Annual recurring savings:	\$ 3,198K
Payback time:	5 years
NPV (savings):	\$32,362K

**COBRA ASSUMPTIONS**

**TECH-0005**

**We need to develop and get on line our assumptions for the following COBRA runs:**

- 1. Part of Lakehurst moving to PAX (rotary minus ALRE), Corona removed, Ft. Eustis to Redstone, Ft. Rucker to Redstone, Robins to Redstone**
- 2. All of Lakehurst moving to PAX, Corona removed, Ft. Eustis to Redstone, Ft. Rucker to Redstone, Robins to Redstone**
- 3. None of Lakehurst moving to PAX, Corona removed, Ft. Eustis to Redstone, Ft. Rucker to Redstone, Robins to Redstone**

**TECH-0006**

**We need to develop and get on line our assumptions for the following COBRA runs**

- 1. Part of Lakehurst moving to PAX (fixed wing minus ALRE), Corona removed, PAX to WPAFB, Tinker to WPAFB, Robins to WPAFB, Hill to WPAFB, WPAFB to China Lake**
- 2. All of Lakehurst moving to PAX, Corona removed, PAX to WPAFB, Tinker to WPAFB, Robins to WPAFB, Hill to WPAFB, WPAFB to China Lake**
- 3. None of Lakehurst moving to PAX, Corona removed, PAX to WPAFB, Tinker to WPAFB, Robins to WPAFB, Hill to WPAFB, WPAFB to China Lake**

## **TECH-0005 ASSUMPTIONS**

Remove NRL from consideration. NRL reported 37.8 FTEs under air platforms. Their response to TECH-0006 data call indicated 26.1 supported fixed wing air platforms. Under the TJCSG rule of 30 they should be excluded from consideration.

Remove Pt. Mugu from consideration. Their certified response to TECH-0005 scenario data call states that they only do T&E OAR

Remove China Lake from consideration. Their certified response to TECH-0005 scenario data call continues to insist that they do no air platform R, D&A or T&E work.

Remove Ft. Rucker Aero Medical facility from consideration. This activity is more of a human systems function and is better placed at Ft. Rucker where they can directly interface with flight crews, especially those in the middle of the training environment. Their certified data has rebinned them under the BioMed DTAP.

Remove Adelphi from consideration. Adelphi reported rotary wing air platform research but these efforts were not included because the work is highly integrated with ground vehicle research and therefore is more suited to relocation to the Aberdeen Proving Ground under the Defense Research Laboratory scenario.

Lakehurst move to PAX to occur in 2010 because of the heavy construction.

Apply a 15 % personnel savings across the board.

Note: The Army 25 Feb 05 scenario data response was used and contained a 15% consolidation reduction of government personnel (civilian & military) if consolidating with like functions; a 15% consolidation reduction of contractor personnel if consolidating with like functions. This reduction was not applied to contractors from Rucker (ATTC) to Redstone (RTTC) since the contractors are primarily aircraft maintainers and this function does not exist currently at Redstone. A proportional 15% reduction in building space was also taken in conjunction with the 15% personnel reductions

## **TECH-0006 ASSUMPTIONS**

Remove NRL from consideration. NRL reported 37.8 FTEs under air platforms. Their certified response to TECH-0006 scenario data call indicated 11.7 supported fixed wing air platforms. Under the TJCSG rule of 30 they should be excluded from consideration.

Remove Pt. Mugu from consideration. Their certified response to TECH-0006 scenario data call states that they only do T&E OAR.

Remove AIRTEVRON Nine from consideration. Their certified response to TECH-0006 scenario data call, though their narrative states they do some air platform OT work, more closely aligns with the Naval Air Warfare Center (Weapons Division) workload.

Remove Redstone Arsenal from consideration. Their certified response to TECH-0006 scenario data call they reported that they do no fixed wing R, D&A or T&E work.

Remove China Lake from consideration. Their certified response to TECH-0006 scenario data call continues to insist that they do no air platform R, D&A or T&E work.

Remove Hanscom from consideration. The work Hanscom reported under Air Platform D&A is directly associated with Sensor and Communication/Computer integration into commercially developed and certified aircraft. In addition, they have an integration/development Center that would be prohibitively expensive to replicate at WPAFB.

Remove AFOTEC (Kirtland) from consideration. Kirtland constitutes AFOTEC's Hdqtrs and is principally administrative in function. The small numbers of Air Platform FTEs identified are detailed to test site detachments to engage in OT testing & analysis and use Kirtland as the base of operations for completing the reports and briefings required as part of their mission/charter. The Air Platform component constitutes less than 10% of the AFOTEC's resources assigned at Kirtland.

Remove 53WG (Eglin) from consideration. Their T&E is integrated with the other 53rd operations at Eglin and they rely on the over-water range for specific weapon testing as part of integration on Air Platforms. In addition they maintain/support an Electronics Warfare Integration Lab based at Eglin which is not targeted for re-alignment.

Remove Tucson ANG from consideration per TJCSG direction during their Thursday, 27 Jan 05 session because T&E is not a major mission for the ANG. This work is performed in conjunction with their training activities using ANG planes and people. Since the T&E work there totally uses ANG assets, and since the ANG is not moving, there are no assets(ie, people, planes, equipment, etc) to move with the workload.

Lakehurst move to PAX to occur in 2010 because of the heavy construction.

Apply a 15 % personnel savings across the board, except the ALC moves to Wright-Patterson where 15% is applied to contractors only.

ALCs: All identified resources are targeted to move as part of the scenario. No consolidation was assumed since the FTEs identified are directly associated D&A of specific platforms. No administrative support was included. No equipment was identified for realignment.