BRAC 2005
EDUCATION AND TRAINING JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP
MEETING MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2004

The Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (P&R), Mr. Abell, chaired the 26th meeting of the E&T JCSG. Attendee List is at Attachment 1. Mr. Howlett provided a brief overview of the meeting agenda and then reported the status of E&T JCSG Requests for Clarification (RFCs) by Service (and DOD Agencies). Services are continuing to clarify/correct capacity information for E&T JCSG Subgroups and have made progress. OSD BRAC is working with the JCSG and the Services to identify and correct incidences in which the Services have submitted data to OSD but process issues have delayed/prohibited getting the information to the JCSG (Attachment 2).

Mr Howlett then briefed the proposed E&T JCSG Scenario Development & Review process (Attachment 2). Changes to the proposed process included adding the step that OSD BRAC will review for content specificity once scenarios are entered into the ISG Tracking Tool. OSD BRAC was asked to provide instructions on types/examples of information needed so Subgroups would expedite entry of scenarios into the tool. The Subgroups were encouraged to interact with MilDeps during the Scenario Development and Review phase of the BRAC process. However, Principals were sensitive to the fact that most the Subgroups are minimally manned and pressed with critical deadlines to get proposals ready for E&T JCSG deliberative action and then begin scenario analysis. Subgroups were encouraged to provide copies of the E&T JCSG scenario tracking tool (spreadsheet) that provides details on working proposals and the status of approved scenarios. Subgroup (Service) representatives were also strongly encouraged to provide proposal information to their Service Principals prior to E&T JCSG meetings to facilitate discussion and deliberative action. Future E&T JCSG meetings will also be expanded to two and a half hours beginning with the October 7, 2004 meeting until further notice.

The final item on the agenda was preview of the E&T JCSG briefing to the ISG, scheduled for 8 October (Attachment 2). Subgroup strategies were summarized from briefings provided on 23 September. Service Principals provided feedback that individual Services were somewhat resistant to some of the E&T JCSG subgroup strategies.

However, the point was made that the strategies in the briefing supported the E&T JCSG Principles. No substantive changes to the briefing were recommended.

Approved: _____
Charles S. Abell
Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel & Readiness)
Chairman, Education & Training Joint Cross-Service Group

Attachments:
1. List of Attendees, September 30, 2004
2. Briefing Slides

Copies:
1. OSD BRAC Office
2. E&T JCSG Coordination Team
3. DoD IG

BRAC 2005
EDUCATION AND TRAINING JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP
September 30, 2004

Attendees

Members:

- Hon Charles S. Abell, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel & Readiness) Chair
- MG Buford Blount, USA, Deputy G-3
- BGen Thomas Conant, USMC, Deputy Director, Training and Education Command
- CAPT Bill Wilcox, USN, N1D
- CAPT Cathy Osman, USN, J7/JEDD/JEB, PDE Subgroup

Others:

- Col Mike Massoth, USMC, Deputy Director, Training and Education Command
- Brig Gen Hostage, USAF, AETC/XP, E&T JCSG Specialized Skill Training Subgroup
- Mr. Dan Gardner, Office of the Secretary of Defense (P&R)
- Col Joanna Shumaker, USAF, AF DPX
- Mr. Bob Howlett, E&T JCSG Coordination Team
- Col Nancy Weaver, USAF, E&T JCSG Coordination Team
- CAPT Gene Summerlin, USN, Navy BRAC, FT Subgroup
- Col James Briggs, USAF, AETC/DOO, SST Subgroup
- Mr. Thomas Macia, DAMO-TRS, E&T JCSG Ranges Subgroup
- Mr. Brian Buzzell, OSD BRAC Contract Support
- Ms. Beth Schaefer, DOD/IG
- Dr. John Foulkes, E&T JCSG Ranges, T&E Working group
- Lt Col Anne Fitch, USAF, Air Force BRAC
- Col Sam Walker, USAF, E&T JCSG, PDE Subgroup
- Mr. Bob Harrison, DAMO-TR
- CPT Richard Harrison, USA, DAMO-ZXG
- Mr. Steve Belcher, DON IAT Contract Support
- SSG Kevin Lipscomb, USA, E&T JCSG Coordination Team

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASEABLE UNDER FOIA

Education &Training Joint Cross Service Group

E&T JCSG Principals Meeting
30 September 2004

Mr. Charles S. Abell
Chair, E&T JCSG

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Agenda

- Update Previous Business/Issues
- Requests for Clarification Update by Service
- E&T JCSG Scenario Development and Review Process
- Preview ISG Briefing

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

RFCs Status by Service

E&T JCSG

ARMY

	RFCs TOTALS	RFCs CLOSED	RFCs OPEN	14 days or less	14 - 30 days	30+ days
FT	9	6	3	0	0	3
PDE	65	33	32	0	0	32
SST	290	258	32	0	0	32
RANGES TNG	116	116	0	0	0	0
RANGES T&E	0	0	0	0	0	0
ARMY TOTAL	480	413	67	0	0	67
ARMY SUPPLEMENTAL	277	75	202	0	0	202
NEW ARMY TOTAL	757	488	269	0	0	269

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

RFCs Status by Service

E&T JCSG

NAVY

	RFCs TOTALS	RFCs CLOSED	RFCs OPEN	14 days or less	14 - 30 days	30+ days
FT NAVY	83	79	4	0	0	4
PDE NAVY	39	38	1	1	0	0
SST NAVY	317	308	9	0	0	9
RANGES TNG	104	104	0	0	0	0
RANGES T&E	158	158	0	0	0	0
NAVY TOTAL	701	687	14	1	0	13

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

RFCs Status by Service

E&T JCSG

Air Force

	RFCs TOTALS	RFCs CLOSED	RFCs OPEN	14 days or less	14 - 30 days	30+ days
FT	58	57	1	0	0	1
PDE	29	27	2	0	0	1
SST	159	159	0	0	0	0
RANGES TNG	108	108	0	0	0	0
RANGES T&E	187	144	43		0	43
AF TOTAL	541	495	46	0	0	46

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

RFCs Status

E&T JCSG

Defense Agencies

	RFCs TOTALS	RFCs CLOSED	RFCs OPEN	14 days or less	14 - 30 days	30+ days
FT	0	0	0	0	0	0
PDE	16	14	2	0	2	0
SST	10	0	10	10	0	0
RANGES TNG	0	0	0	0	0	0
RANGES T&E	0	0	0	0	0	0
Def. Ag. TOTAL	26	14	12	10	2	0

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

E&T JCSG
Scenario Development
&
Review Process

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Timeline: Turning Ideas into Recommendations

E&T JCSG



DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Scenario Development & Review Process

E&T JCSG

- **Step 1: Develop "IDEAs"**
  - **Concept for realigning or consolidating functions**
    - Lacks the specificity of a ***proposal*** or ***scenario***
    - Reflects overarching strategy of the subgroup
    - Transformational Options are "IDEAs"
      - Proposals must be generated for every transformational option
  - **Ideas do not have to be registered and tracked beyond E&T JCSG**
    - Document Ideas on E&T JCSG tracking spreadsheet
    - Document proposals under the corresponding IDEAs
    - Transformational Options must be tracked
      - E&T JCSG Tracking Tool
      - ISG Tracking Tool

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Scenario Development & Review Process

E&T JCSG

- **Step 2: Translate "IDEAs" into "PROPOSALs"**
  - **Provides necessary specificity to become a potential realignment or consolidation action**
    - Derived from Transformational Options, Military Judgment or Optimization Tools
    - Can come from external sources (e.g., MilDeps, Principals, JCSGs or ISG)
      - External proposals must be provided in a "quad-chart" to the Subgroup for review prior to E&T JCSG review
      - Inputs should be from a deliberative body
    - Has not been declared a scenario by the E&T JCSG
    - Has not been declared for formal analysis by ISG

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Scenario Development & Review Process

E&T JCSG

- **Step 2: Translate "IDEAs" into "PROPOSALs" continued. . .**
  - **Subgroups generate proposals for E&T JCSG review and action in deliberative sessions** (e.g., defer, approve, disapprove, revise or remand)
  - **Register <u>all</u> proposals on the E&T JCSG tracking tool (spreadsheet)**
  - **Provide updates to E&T JCSG CT for consolidation**
  - **E&T JCSG Council of Cols/GS-15s reviews Proposals (in E&T JCSG tracking tool) and categorize**
  - **Scenarios fall into three categories:**
    1. Independent – No impact on other subgroups; **proceed**
    2. Enabling – Action complements another Service/JCSG; proceed
    3. Conflicting – Action competes with another subgroup

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Scenario Development & Review Process

E&T JCSG

- **Step 2: Translate "IDEAs" into "PROPOSALs" continued. .**
  - **De-conflict subgroup proposals**
    - E&T JCSG CT & Subgroup POCs meet weekly to review and recommend solutions to E&T JCSG
    - Methods for resolving conflicting:
      1. Recommend conflicting proposals advance to E&T JCSG
      2. Advise subgroups to generate additional Proposals to mitigate conflicts or provide broader option sets
      3. Advise subgroups to recommend disapproval of one or more of the conflicting proposals via following rules:
         - Outside their functional area
         - Nearly identical to another scenario (little benefit)
         - Assumption
  - **Document resolutions in E&T JCSG Tracking Tool**

Scenario Development & Review Process

E&T JCSG

- **Step 2: Translate "IDEAs" into "PROPOSALs" continued. . .**
  - **Subgroup Chairs recommend proposals for E&T JCSG deliberation**
    - Recommended proposals must align with ideas, strategy, military judgment and/or optimization tools
    - Document all rational for recommending <u>or</u> rejecting proposals to E&TJCSG
    - Brief E&T JCSG on recommended <u>and</u> rejected proposals
      - External "ideas/proposals" must be briefed with a recommendation to E&T JCSG for deliberative action
  - **MilDep and JCSG interaction is encouraged**

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Scenario Development & Review Process

E&T JCSG

- **Step 3: Declare "SCENARIOs"**
  - **Potential realignment or consolidation action (proposal) that has been declared for formal analysis by E&T JCSG**
    - E&T JCSG is the deliberative body and declares scenarios for all subgroups
      - Content of "Scenario" is same as content of a "Proposal"
      - Deferral, approval/disapproval, revision or remanding of a proposal is a deliberative action…approval generates a scenario
  - **Once declared by E&T JCSG, Scenarios are registered at ISG (via ISG Scenario Tracking Tool)**
    - Scenarios subsequently deleted during analysis must be identified
    - Subgroups update E&T JCGS Tracking Tool (spreadsheet) on all actions
  - **Scenarios may involve**
    - Multiple Services — Multiple JCSGs — Service, only
    - JCSG — Services and JCSGs

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Scenario Development & Review Process

E&T JCSG

- **Step 4: "Scenario" Conflict Review**
  - **DASs *(in the role of the ISG working group)* review Scenarios (in tracking tool) and categorize by consensus**
    - JCSG/MilDeps/OSD BRAC have access to scenarios in OSD Tracking Tool
  - **Scenarios fall into three categories:**
    1. Independent – No impact on Service/JCSG
       - DASs advise JCSG to proceed to Scenario Analysis
    2. Enabling – Action complements another Service/JCSG
       - DASs advise JCSG to proceed to Scenario Analysis
    3. Conflicting – Action competes with another Service/JCSG
       - Need formal review to resolve
         - E&T JCSG meets weekly with OSD BRAC, JCSG and DAS reps to review and help resolve
       - Proceed to Step 5

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Scenario Development & Review Process

E&T JCSG

- **Step 5: Resolving conflicts**
  - **DASs (ISG working group) propose resolutions for ISG**
    - JCSG provides input to working group
    - JCSG Chair attends ISG & can provide input
  - **Methods for resolving conflicting:**
    1. Allow conflicting scenarios to advance to scenario analysis
       - Wait until full analysis to resolve conflict
    2. Direct JCSG (or by consent, MilDep) to generate additional Scenarios to mitigate conflicts or provide broader option sets
    3. Direct JCSG (or by consent, MilDeps) to eliminate one or more of the conflicting scenarios via following rules:
       - Outside their functional area
       - Nearly identical to another scenario (little benefit)
       - Assumption

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Potential Scenario Conflicts (Examples)

- ***Doctrinal:*** **Close all Senior Service Colleges, transfer mission to NDU**
- ***Force Structure:*** **AF close Wright Patterson AFB & Technical JCSG wants to relocate the Navy and AF RDT&E mission to Wright Patterson**
- ***Facilities:*** **2 JCSGs & 1 MilDep have scenarios that use the same buildable acres for their new facility**
- ***Culture:*** **Close the military treatment facility at Pope AFB and receive medical care at Fort Bragg**
- ***Statutory:*** **Close all Depots, rely on private sector (conflicts with 50/50)**
- ***Other:*** **Close installation needed for START Treaty compliance**

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Format for Presenting Conflicts for ISG Approval

E&T JCSG

Scenarios Involved	Conflicts
■ Close NAS Meridian, MS (DoN) ■ Consolidate Air Force Technical Training at NTTC NAS Meridian (AF) (Notional)	■ Force Structure
Drivers/Assumptions	**Proposed Resolution**

■ Eliminate excess infrastructure (DoN)
■ Consolidated Technical Training Established Joint Training (AF)
■ Principles – Recruit and Train/Organize (AF)
	■ Generate Additional scenarios (Allows for a broader option set)
	  ■ DoN to analyze retaining NAS Meridian
	  ■ A/F to analysis consolidating at another locations

EXAMPLE

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Scenario Development & Review Process

E&T JCSG

- **Step 6: Scenario Analysis**
  - **Subgroups are responsible for analysis on respective functions (criteria 1-8)**
  - **Subgroups determine scenario data needs**
    - OSD BRAC working process for JCSG to query MilDeps
  - **MilDeps collect scenario specific data**
    - 48 hours from the field to the MilDep
  - **E&T JCSG evaluates Scenarios against all eight Selection Criteria**
    - Subgroup must document analysis of each scenario
    - Subgroups must justify and document termination of analysis
    - Subgroups must brief E&TJCSG on scenarios analysis
    - ISG will review E&T JCSG documentation
  - **May result in candidate recommendations**

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

BRAC 95 – Example of Scenario Analysis

- **Selection Criteria 1 – 4**
  - Ability to conduct fixed-wing jet training received most weight and emphasis - Flight training/airspace & airfield facilities attributes

- **MILVALUE rankings for DoN UPT Bases**
  - NAS Pensacola – 75.65
  - NAS Kingsville (Strike) – 75.65
  - NAS Corpus Christi – 74.09
  - NAS Meridian (Strike) – 71.07
  - NAS Whiting Field – 68.97

EXAMPLE

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

BRAC 95 – Example of Scenario Analysis

E&T JCSG

- **Criterion 5**
  - The return of on investment is immediate. The total estimated one time cost to implement is $83.4M. The net of all costs and savings is $158.8M . The annual recurring savings after implementation are $33.4M with an immediate payback. The net present value over 20 years is $471.2M
- **Criterion 6**
  - Assuming no economic recovery, the recommendation could result in a maximum potential reduction of 3324 jobs (2581 direct and 743 indirect) over the 1996-2001 period in the Lauderdale County, MS economic area, which is 8.0 percent of the economic area employment.
- **Criterion 7**
  - There is no community infrastructure impact at any receiving installation.
- **Criterion 8**
  - The closure of NAS Meridian will have a generally positive effect on the environment. UPT will be relocated to NAS Kingsville, which is in an air quality control district that is in attainment for CO, ozone, and PM-10. Clean-up at the six IR sites at NAS Meridian will continue. No impact was identified for threatened/endangered species, sensitive habitats and wetlands, cultural/historical resources, land/air space use, pollution control, and hazardous material waste requirements. Adequate capacity exists for all utilities at the receiving base, and there is sufficient space for rehabilitation or unrestricted acres available for expansion.

EXAMPLE

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Scenario Development & Review Process

E&T JCSG

- **Step 7: Candidate Recommendation**
  - **A "scenario" that a JCSG (or Military Department) has formally analyzed against all eight selection criteria <u>and</u> recommends to the ISG and IEC, respectively, for SecDef approval**
  - **E&T JCSG must submit candidate recommendations to ISG on or about *20 Dec 04***
    - E&T JCSG will determine date for subgroup submissions and notify subgroups through the E&T JCSG Coordination Team
    - Format will be provided by OSD BRAC
  - **ISG**
    - Reviews JCSG recommendations and advises IEC
    - Isolates JCSG and MilDep recommendation conflicts & develops position for IEC consideration
      - MilDeps candidate recommendations due 20 Jan 05

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

BRAC 95 - Example of Candidate Recommendation

E&T JCSG

- **Recommendation: Close NAS Meridian, MS, except retain Counterdrug Training Academy (non-DoD). Relocate Undergraduate Strike Pilot Training function and associated personnel, equipment, and support to NAS Kingsville, TX. Its major tenant, NTTC, will close, and its training functions will be relocated to other training activities, primarily the NSCS, Athens, GA., and NETC, Newport, RI.**

- **Candidate Recommendation will also include:**
  - **Justification**
  - **Payback (formerly Return of Investment)**
  - **Impacts**

EXAMPLE

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASEABLE UNDER FOIA

Education &Training Joint Cross Service Group

Principles → Strategy → Scenarios

Infrastructure Steering Group Meeting
October 8, 2004

Mr. Charles S. Abell
Chair, E&T JCSG

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Principles

1. Increase / Enhance “Jointness”
2. Improve Efficiency & Effectiveness
3. Preserve Service Core Competences
4. Reduce Infrastructure Footprint

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Strategies

- Flight Training Subgroup
  - Move to / toward common UFT platforms at fewer joint bases
  - Co-locate advanced UFT functions with FTU/FRS
  - Preserve Service & Joint combat training programs

- Professional Development Education Subgroup
  - Transfer appropriate functions to private sector
  - Create Joint "Centers of Excellence" for common functional specialties
  - Re-balance Joint with Service competencies across PME spectrum

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Strategies

- Specialize Skill Training Subgroup
  - Establish "Joint Centers of Excellence" for common functions
  - Rely on private sector for appropriate technical training
  - Preserve opportunities for continuing Service acculturation

- Ranges Subgroup (Two Functions: Tng & T&E)
  - For Training — do not propose losses and gains
  - Establish cross-functional/cross-service regional range complexes
    - Highest capability: ground-air-sea
  - Preserve irreplaceable "one-of-a-kinds"
  - Create new range capabilities for emerging Joint needs

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Privatize PDE Function at AFIT and NPS (*E&T-0003*)

E&T JCSG

Scenario

- Disestablish PDE Function at Naval Postgraduate School and Air Force Institute of Technology and privatize.
- Gaining Installation: None
- Losing Installations: Wright-Patterson AFB and NAVPGSCOL Monterey

Drivers/Assumptions

- Principle: Recruit and Train
- Principle: Organize
- Transformational Options: Privatize Graduate-Level Education

Justification/Impact

- Eliminates need of education program management at NPS and AFIT
- Realize savings through privatizing education function to civilian colleges & universities

Potential Conflicts

- Military Specific Graduate Degrees
- Military Specific Support Spaces (TS Level Spaces for example)
- Partnership for Peace Program at Monterey, CA
- Cost of Privatization

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Establish Joint Center of Excellence for Logistics/Supply Training (*E&T-0004*)

E&T JCSG

Scenario

- Establish Joint Center of Excellence for Logistics/Supply; Consolidate like courses and collocate similar schools
- Gaining installation: Fort Lee, VA
- Losing installations: Lackland AFB, TX; Athens, GA, NTTC Meridian, MS; Camp Lejeune, N.C.

Drivers/Assumptions

- Principles: Organize and Train
- Transformational Options: Establish Centers of Excellence for Joint or Inter-service education and training
- Establish "joint" officer and enlisted specialized skill training (initial skill, skill progression & functional)

Justification/Impact

- Uses Inter-service Training Review Organization as the baseline
- Eliminates redundancy, leased space/cost
- Train as we fight "jointly"
- Army Logistics Mgmt College & Combined Arms Support Command at Fort Lee

Potential Conflicts

- Unique service training standards and culture

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Consolidate Rotary Wing Training (*E&T-0006*)

E&T JCSG

Scenario

- Consolidate Rotary Wing Phase of Undergraduate Flight Training at Ft Rucker using a single platform
- Gain: Ft Rucker
- Lose: NAS Whiting South

Drivers/Assumptions

- BRAC guidance to exploit transformational options and reduce base/ infrastructure requirements
- Transformational Option: Exploit RW commonalities
- Joint program would not disrupt current training levels and preserves common skills within current programs

Justification/Impact

- Reduced cost of aircraft maintenance
- Optimize current asset utilization
- Exploits Joint Opportunity

Potential Conflicts

- Service culture
- Loss of redundancy
- Phase out current UHPT aircraft to single aircraft

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Consolidate Rotary Wing Training (*E&T-0007*)

E&T JCSG

Scenario

- Consolidate Rotary Wing Phase of Undergraduate Flight Training at Whiting using a single platform
- Gain: NAS Whiting North and South and NAS Corpus Christi
- Lose: Ft Rucker and NAS Whiting North (T-34)

Drivers/Assumptions

- BRAC guidance to exploit transformational options and reduce base/ infrastructure requirements
- Transformational Option: Exploit RW training commonalities
- Joint program would not disrupt current training levels and preserves common skills within current programs
- Corpus can accommodate T-34 program

Justification/Impact

- Reduced cost of aircraft maintenance
- Optimize current asset utilization
- Exploits Joint Opportunity

Potential Conflicts

- Service culture
- Loss of redundancy
- Phase out current UHPT aircraft to a single aircraft

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Disestablish and realign T-1 Training (*E&T-0008*)

E&T JCSG

Scenario

- Disestablish and realign Advanced Undergraduate Flight Training (T-1) at Heavy Lift/TACAMO FRS/FTU
- Gain: Little Rock, Altus, Tinker
- Lose: Columbus AFB, Laughlin AFB and Tinker AFB

Drivers/Assumptions

- BRAC guidance to exploit transformational options and reduce base/ infrastructure requirements
- Transformational Option: Exploit mission commonalities and consolidate Advanced UPT Multi-Engine Jet with FTU training
- Assumes program would not disrupt current training levels and preserves common skills within current programs

Justification/Impact

- Reduced cost of aircraft maintenance
- Optimize current asset utilization
- Exploits Joint Opportunity
- Quality of life improvement (reduces PCS)

Potential Conflicts

- Service culture
- May constrict Student track/re-track training opportunities
- Loss of redundancy
- Locates Advanced students with operational squadrons (Moody)

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Establish Western T&E OAR Complex (E&T 0009)

E&T JCSG

Scenario

- Consolidate T&E capabilities and workload requiring open-air ranges for T&E to a western U.S. complex of ranges for air, sea, land, space, armament/munitions, C4ISR, EW, and CB Defense.
- Gaining Activities: Edwards AFB, China Lake, Pt Mugu, Vandenberg AFB, Nellis AFB, UTTR, DPG, YPG, Ft. Huachuca, WSMR
- Losing Activities: Patuxent River NAS, Eglin AFB, Redstone Arsenal, Ft. Rucker, APG, Ellsworth AFB, Shaw AFB, McConnell AFB, Buckley AFB, Luke AFB, Selfridge ANGB, Tucson IAP AGS, Ft. A.P.Hill, Ft. Belvoir, Ft. Bragg, Ft. Eustis, Ft. Hood, Ft. Knox, Ft. Leonard Wood, and Ft. Sill

Drivers/Assumptions

- Service management and operation of Complex to ensure coordination and access as needed
- Promotes and supports systems "born joint."
- Supports "cross-Service utilization" and "joint management" transformation initiatives
- Retain difficult/expensive to replace/unique facilities at existing sites
- Associated technical activities should be collocated

Justification/Impact

- Eliminates duplication, fosters interoperability of systems, and provides capabilities for T&E of advanced systems, family of systems, system of systems, and weapons.

Potential Conflicts

- Coordination with training range sub-working group and TJCSG required.
- Specialty capabilities outside of Complex may need to be retained for special geographic or climatic features.
- Non-collocation of operational units for operational testing

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Establish a Joint Urban Ops Training Center of Excellence (*E&T-0010*)

E&T JCSG

Scenario

- Establish a Joint Urban Operations Training Center of Excellence at a suitable installation proposed for closure by one of the Services
- Privatize the management, operation and maintenance of the facility (GOCO)
- Provide a "turn key" facility meeting all Service and Joint Urban Operation live training requirements.
- Establish an OSD executive agent to coordinate use and oversee contractor

Drivers/Assumptions

- Transformation Option #40
- A suitable site meeting the following criteria will be proposed for closure:
  - Sufficient ground space for maneuver
  - Restricted airspace
  - Impact area for live-fire
  - Runway
  - Within 100 miles of coastline
  - Small cantonment area
  - Minimal encroachment

Justification/Impact

Justification

- Establishes urban ops training center with minimal construction
- Supports all Service and joint urban ops training tasks
- Provide urban ops training capability without degrading service's capability

Impact

- Full financial savings from closure of selected installation will not be realized

Potential Conflicts

- Service intent to fully close selected installation
- Installation will be closed from most perspectives – e.g., ability to support missions (other than live urban training), quality of life, military personnel support, etc; however, the installation would remain on DoD books with minimal DoD/Govt staff for oversight and QA/QC of contractor support operations

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Establish a Gulf Panhandle Range Complex (*E&T-0011*)

E&T JCSG

Scenario

- Establish a Gulf Panhandle Range Complex incorporating NAS Pensacola, Eglin AFB, Ft. Benning, Ft. Rucker, Moody AFB, Tyndall AFB, Coastal Systems Station Panama City, Gulfport CRTC and associated ground, sea and air maneuver space
- The proposal maintains current Service ownership and command & control of included installations and sites
- The proposal establishes an executive agent for DoD to coordinate joint use of the complex
- This proposal will utilize Camp Shelby ground maneuver space

Drivers/Assumptions

- Transformational Options #39/40
- Joint training environment with range space sufficient to support:
  - ESG with live fire capability.
  - CSG with live fire capability.
  - BCT/UA with live fire capability.
  - Joint SOF
  - AF Ready Aircrew Program (RAP) tasking
- Supersedes Sea and Sea-Air Combinations
- Will not disrupt current training or T&E missions
- Will not disrupt current or proposed Rotary Wing training at Ft Rucker

Justification/Impact

- Supports all Service and Joint training tasks
- Optimizes use of range capacity at all sites
- Expands on existing informal relationship
- Opportunity to achieve OSD T2 common range infrastructure goals
- Opportunity to train in diverse conditions

Potential Conflicts

- Servicisms (Cultural approach to scheduling/use)
- Mission expansion (T&E).
- Current training missions

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

Conclusion

- **Next regularly scheduled meeting — 7 Oct 04**
  - **Subgroup proposals for E&T JCSG review**
- **Additional and/or longer E&T JCSG Meetings**
  - **Scenarios due to ISG 1 Nov**
  - **4 weeks to deliberate all subgroup proposals**