BRAC 2005
EDUCATION AND TRAINING JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP
MEETING MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 2004

The Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (P&R), Mr. Abell, chaired the 34th meeting of the E&T JCSG. Attendee List is at Attachment 1. Mr. Howlett provided an overview of E&T JCSG activities and the status of scenario data calls. Scheduling for E&T JCSG meetings during the two week holiday period will be resurfaced during the December 9th meeting. Updated scenario status information will offer principals better insight on actions that can to be completed during this time frame and will provide chairmen clarified timelines for ongoing subgroup activities.

Subgroup Chairmen and/or their representatives (Mr Tom Macia and Dr. Foulkes, RADM George Mayer, Brig Gen Hostage and CAPT Cathy Osman) briefed Subgroup status (Attachment 2). The following is a summary of the discussions:

- Range capacity was developed based on two major functions carried out on ranges. These functions are training and open air testing. For training, capacity was defined in terms of ground, air, and sea domains and was stated in units of measure that capture both volume and time. There is no current excess capacity for ground and air domains; however, the sea domain does show excess capacity. Open Air Testing showed a small amount of excess capacity in open air ranges. Range scenarios will not reduce infrastructure but are transformational and maximize joint-ness. There is no advantage to reducing excess sea ranges since it is not tied to specific installations. The Ranges Subgroup anticipates the earliest they will be able to provide candidate recommendations for E&T JCSG approval is late-January 2005. Obstacles to completing recommendations include: scenarios de-confliction with TJCSG, turnaround time in submitting and receiving data from MilDeps, criteria 5-8 analyses and legal review. Only one proposal was briefed for E&T JCSG consideration. The E&T JCSG:
  - ***Approved the T&E proposal to "Consolidate Rotary Wing Air-Launched Munitions T&E OAR Workload to China Lake"***

- Flight Training Subgroup focused scenario development efforts toward realigning assets based on excess capacity to "uncover" installations and enhancing joint-ness. Current scenarios should "uncover" 1 to 4 installations (scenario dependent); while, seven of nine scenarios set the stage for joint/transformational opportunity. Like the other subgroups, the FT Subgroup anticipated similar obstacles that would deter their completion of candidate recommendations within the ISG timeline. The subgroup then briefed the revised military value rankings

for 15 installations being considered for the JSF initial training site. In addition to Randolph AFB, as per the 18 Nov tasking from the E&T JCSG, three additional installations had been identified as candidate bases. The subgroup then offered three proposals for consideration. The E&T JCSG:

- ***Approved proposal to "Realign Eglin AFB by establishing it as the JSF initial training site" and approved not developing an alternative proposal for a stand-alone JSF initial training site at any the 14 installations with lower Military Value scores.*** If another alternative becomes necessary, the subgroup will consider Cherry Point if the operational mission was to be moved to Beaufort.
- ***Approved deletion of E&T 0008 since it was included in E&T 0047 and 0048 which are more transformational and comprehensive; the existing conflict involving AF-0018 will remain for Little Rock AFB***
- ***Approved the UAV proposal to "Realign Ft Rucker by relocating and consolidating DoD undergraduate UAV training from Indian Springs AF Aux, NV, Ft. Huachuca, AZ, and NOLF Choctaw, FL."***
- ***Approved the UAV proposal to "Realign Indian Springs AF Aux, by relocating and consolidating DoD undergraduate UAV training from Ft. Huachuca, AZ, and NOLF Choctaw, FL."***
- ***Agreed with subgroup recommendation to not pursue two alternative proposals:***
  - ***Realign Ft Huachuca, AZ, by relocating and consolidating DoD Undergraduate Unmanned Aerial Vehicle training from Indian Springs AF Aux, NV, and NOLF Choctaw, FL***
  - ***Realign NOLF Choctaw, FL, by relocating and consolidating DoD Undergraduate Unmanned Aerial Vehicle training from Indian Springs AF Aux, NV, and Ft Huachuca, AZ***

- Specialized Skills Training Subgroup capacity analysis encompassed 70 installations. Capacity analysis across all installations (Services) indicates an excess in berthing and classrooms and a shortage in messing. Scenario development focused on reducing infrastructure, maximizing jointness, and transformation. Issues that could impact candidate recommendation delivery include: Services' response time to scenario data calls, COBRA training, and some SST personnel are tagged to work Service BRAC which impacts availability to work SST issues in a timely manner. The subgroup then presented seven Navy proposals for E&T JCSG consideration. ***The E&T JCSG approved Navy continuing analysis with the following scenarios but the imbedded E&T JCSG functions will be under the authority and over watch of the E&T JCSG.***
  - *Close SUBASE San Diego Pearl Harbor receives (IAT – 06, DON-06)*
  - *Close SUBASE San Diego NS San Diego receives (IAT – 06A, DON-07)*
  - *Close Naval Construction Battalion Center Gulfport (IAT-08, DON-08)*
  - *Close NAVSTA Everett CVN to NS Bremerton (IAT-05, DON-05)*
  - *Close NAVSTA Everett CVN to NAS North Island (IAT-05A, DON-35)*

- *Close NAVSTA Everett CVN to Pearle Harbor (IAT-05B, DON-036)*
- *Close NAVSTA Everett CVN to Guam (IAF-05C, DON-037)*

- The Professional Development Subgroup scenario development focused on reducing infrastructure, maximizing jointness, and transformation. Issues that could impact candidate recommendation delivery include: Services response time to scenario data calls, COBRA training. The subgroup also cautioned that hasty analysis increases the vulnerability of scenarios at later stages of the BRAC process.

The Army principal offered to work with the ARMY BRAC office (TABS) to provide COBRA training within the next couple of weeks since all subgroups expressed a need for either initial or refresher training.

The next scheduled meeting of the E&T JCSG is Thursday, December 9, 2004.

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

Attachments:
1. List of Attendees, December 2, 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
December 2, 2004

Attendees

Members:

- Hon Charles S. Abell, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel & Readiness) Chair
- Mr. Michael L. Dominguez, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Manpower and Reserve Affairs)
- Mr. James Gunlicks, Army G-3 Training (DAMO-TR)
- Col Mike Massoth, USMC, Deputy Director, Training and Education Command
- CAPT Bill Wilcox, USN, N1D

Others:

- RADM George Mayer, USN, Chairman, Flight Training Subgroup
- Brig Gen Hostage, USAF, Chairman, Specialized Skill Training Subgroup
- Mr. Dan Gardner, OUSD(P&R), Director, Readiness & Training
- Mr. Bob Howlett, E&T JCSG Coordination Team
- Ms. Nancy Weaver, E&T JCSG Coordination Team
- Col Jimmie Simmons, USAF, AETC/DOR, Flight Training Subgroup
- CAPT Catharine Osman, USN, J-7, PDE Subgroup
- Col Sam Walker, USAF, PDE Subgroup
- Col Joanna Shumaker, USAF, AF/DPX
- Col James Briggs, USAF, AETC/DOO, Specialized Skill Training Subgroup
- Mr. Thomas Macia, DAMO-TRS, Ranges Subgroup
- Dr. John Foulkes, Army TEMA, Ranges T&E Sub-Working Group chair
- Mr. Brian Simmons, Army TEMA, Ranges T&E Sub-Working Group
- Mr. Bob Harrison, DAMO-TR
- Mr. Brian Buzzell, OSD BRAC Contract Support
- Ms. Beth Schaefer, DoD/IG
- CPT William Taylor, USA, J-7, PDE Subgroup
- Ms. Marsha Warren, E&T JCSG Coordination Team
- Capt Ernest Wearren, USAF, AF-BRAC Office
- LT Greg Riels, USN, RADM Mayer Aide

E&T JCSG Principals Meeting

2 December 2004

Mr. Charles Abell
Chairman, E&T JCSG

Agenda

- Please "Sign-In"
- E&T JCSG Overview
  - E&T JCSG Activities
  - Scenario Data Call Status
- Subgroup Updates
  - Capacity and Military Value Data Issues
  - Capacity Analysis Summary
  - Proposals for E&T Deliberation
  - Issues Impacting 20 Dec Deadline
- Summary

E&T JCSG Schedule - December

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Sat	Sun
		1 *MV Interim Report*	2 **E&T JCSG 1300-1530**	3 ISG Mtg 1030-1200	4	5
6	7 E&T POC Mtg	8	9 **E&T JCSG 1300-1530**	10 ISG Mtg 1030-1200	11	12
13	14 E&T POC Mtg	15	16 **E&T JCSG 1300-1700+**	17 ISG Mtg 1030-1200	18	19
20 ***Candidate Recommendations Due***	21 E&T POC Mtg	22	23 ***E&T JCSG 1300-1530***	24 ***Christmas Eve***	25 ***Christmas Day***	26
27	28 E&T POC Mtg	29	30 ***E&T JCSG 1300-1530***	31 ***New Year's Eve***		

E&T JCSG Schedule – January

Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Sat	Sun
					1 *New Year's*	2
3	4 E&T POC Mtg	5	6 **E&T JCSG** **1300-1530**	7 ISG Mtg 1030-1200	8	9
10	11 E&T POC Mtg	12	13 **E&T JCSG** **1300-1530**	14 ISG Mtg 1030-1200	15	16
17	18 E&T POC Mtg	19	20 **E&T JCSG** **1300-1530**	21 ISG Mtg 1030-1200	22	23
24	25 E&T POC Mtg	26	27 **E&T JCSG** **1300-1530**	28 ISG Mtg 1030-1200	29	30
31	**February 1** **E&T POC Mtg**	2	3	4 ISG Mtg 1030-1200	5	6

E&T JCSG Scenario Data Call

Subgroup Scenario Data Call Overview					
	Active Scenarios	Pending Scenario Data Calls	*Army Submitted /Returned*	*Navy Submitted /Returned*	*Air Force Submitted /Returned*
FT	7	1	4/0	6/0	6/0
PDE	17*	0	15/0	17/0	17/0
SST	13	0	12/0	8/0	9/0
Ranges					
Training	3	3	0/0	0/0	0/0
T&E	1	1	0/0	0/0	0/0
TOTALS	*41*	*5*	*31/0*	*31/0*	*32/0*

* PDE shares 2 scenarios with SST

Ranges Subgroup

Topics:

- **Capacity Summary**
- **Obstacles to Completing Candidate Recommendation**
- **Scenarios – 1 New T&E Proposal**

Range Subgroup

Capacity Analysis Summary Definitions

Training:

- **Maximum potential capacity = theoretical maximum operational dimension for plants' capability to perform functions/ sub-functions (assumes weather, environmental and legislative restrictions but otherwise multiple shifts/ unconstrained).**
- **Current capacity = Standardized / peacetime operations for existing physical plants' capability to perform functions/sub-functions (normalized for comparability between Services' installations/range/OPAREAs)..**
- **Current usage = As reported, may be < or > "current capacity" as defined above and considers maintenance/equipment downtime, end strength (faculty, staff & students), personnel resources/accounts (pay/overtime pay), duty hours (e.g., days/year, hours/day for budgetary constraints), training policy/requirements.**
- **Surge capacity = Additional "Capability Hedge" in order to meet unanticipated increases for existing physical plants' capability to perform functions/sub-functions. Training Ranges = current usage plus 25%**
- **Excess capacity = Current capacity <u>minus</u> (surge capacity) (in other words) Current capacity (Standardized / peacetime operations in acre days minus Surge (in acre days) = Excess (in acre days). Percentage Excess = Excess capacity (in acre days) / Current (Standard) in acre days**

T&E:

- **Maximum Potential Capacity = Not used but which has been described as what each function is capable of doing, is, for ranges, interpreted to mean maximum potential availability, which is 24 hours per day, 365 days per year.** ***Cannot be calculated for T&E OAR.***
- **Current Capacity = Peak demonstrated workload in test hours for the OAR and function.**
- **Current Usage = Average workload in test hours computed from actual workload executed during FY 01, FY 02, and FY 03 based on our intent to measure capacity of a consistent and current OAR configuration baseline.**
- **Surge Capacity = 10% of Current Usage, where the "10%" is based on a general consensus of T&E subject matter experts for a sustained long-term surge effort**
- **Excess Capacity =** $\frac{[(\text{Current Capacity}) - (\text{Current Usage} + \text{Surge Capacity})]}{\text{Current Capacity}}$

Range Subgroup

Capacity Calculations

Training	Max Potential Capacity	Current Capacity (Standard)	Current Usage	Surge	Excess	Excess %
Ground (Acre/Acre Days)	6,187,604,009	4,136,370,899	3,798,063,331	4,747,579,164	-611,208,265	-15%
Air (NM3/Hours/Year)	109,165,673,918	51,874,677,323	51,303,136,027	64,128,920,034	-12,254,242,711	-24%
Sea (NM2/Hours/Year)	8,374,936,680	8,374,936,680	5,027,292,380	6,284,115,475	2,090,821,205	+25%
T&E	N/A	486,403.2	399,025.6	39,902.6	47,475.0	+9.8%

Range Subgroup

Capacity Analysis Summary

- **To what extent will the registered scenarios reduce the excess capacity identified in your capacity analysis report? None.**

- **Are these scenarios in each of the areas where excess capacity was identified? If not, why not? No…Not seeking efficiency, are seeking Cross-Service and Joint Use. No DoD advantage to reducing excess sea ranges – not tied to Navy Installations**

- **What performance measures have been established to determine if the OSD goals (reduce infrastructure, maximize joint-ness, and transformation) have been achieved? Proposals are Transformational and maximize joint-ness. MV attributes support this.**

Range Subgroup

Obstacles to Completing Candidate Recommendations

- Candidate Recommendation Milestone to E&T JCSG is: 16 DEC
- Training:
  - On 03 Dec OSD BRAC will assist in developing Scenario Datacall
  - Expect to submit Datacall 06 Dec
- T&E:
  - RW: 2 – site option is in OSD tracker #0021
  - Scenario datacall submission – 06 Dec
  - Deconfliction with TJCSG underway

Scenario Timeline

Candidate Approval Target Date 16 Dec

Potentially Iterative Process

Scenario Tracking Number	Scenarios	Datacall at Mildep	DC at Activity	Mildep Response to JCSG	Initial Cobra Review	JCSG Cobra Approval	Criteria 6 & 7	Criteria 8	Legal Review	JCSG Approval Candidate Recommendation
0021	RW to PAX and Redstone	12/06/04	12/13/04	12/17/04 **	12/23/04 *	12/30/04 *	01/06/05	01/13/05	01/20/05	01/27/05
0010	Joint Urban Ops Training Center	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?
0037	Joint Range East	12/06/04	12/13/04	12/17/04 **	12/23/04 *	12/30/04 *	01/06/05	01/13/05	01/20/05	01/27/05
0038	Joint Range West	12/06/04	12/13/04	12/17/04 **	12/23/04 *	12/30/04 *	01/06/05	01/13/05	01/20/05	01/27/05

*** Will require E&T JCSG meeting not currently scheduled**

**** Assumes Services will take maximum time allowed to respond**

Range Subgroup Scenarios

- 4 Range Scenarios Listed
  - 0021 T&E Realign and Consolidate Rotary Wing Air Vehicle T&E OAR Footprint
  - 0010 Tng Joint Urban Ops Training Center
  - 0037 Tng Joint Range East
  - 0038 Tng Joint Range West
- Refinement of wording for #0037 & #0038 (Joint Range East and West) need to clarify service C2 vs proposed coordination functions.
- One new T&E proposal to be proposed today….
- Tng and T&E Range Scenarios and final T&E proposal are compatible.

Consolidate Rotary Wing Air-Launched Munitions T&E OAR Workload to China Lake

Proposal

- Realign and consolidate T&E OAR capabilities and workload for RW air-to-surface and air-to-air guided and unguided weapons and associated seekers, warheads, guidance and control, propulsion and airframes to China Lake, with a retained specialty site.
- Gaining Location: China Lake
- Losing (Specialty) Locations: Yuma PG, Eglin AFB (climatic/terrain).

Drivers(D)/Assumptions(A)

- (D) Support "cross-Service utilization" and "joint management" transformation initiatives for T&E OARs.
- (A) RW air-launched munitions T&E OAR work would be jointly managed under service leadership.
- (A) Initial weapons integration remains at RW air vehicle locations.

Justification/Impact

- Increases available capacity at Yuma PG consistent with Army restationing plan.
- Technical JCSG scenarios have China Lake as a Weapons and Armaments hub.
- Maintains interoperability while providing joint capabilities required for RW air-launched munitions T&E.
- Adequate basing exists at China Lake for RW vehicles and ordnance handling.

Potential Conflicts

- None.

Excess Capacity: China Lake : +2%; Eglin AFB: -9%; YPG: +19%

Military Value: China Lake: 60; Eglin AFB: 68; YPG: 58

Approved__X___ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____

Flight Training Subgroup

JSF Initial Training Site (Stand Alone)
and
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Proposals
for
BRAC 2005

FT Subgroup Update

- **Capacity & MilVal Issues**

  Outstanding RFCs: 4 related to classroom space at Little Rock, Altus, & Tinker as well as weather attrition planning factor for Little Rock (NOT a show stopper)

- **FT Definitions:**

  Maximum Potential Capacity is a theoretical maximum (unconstrained/multiple shifts) operational dimension for an existing physical plants' capability to perform functions/ sub-functions over a period of 365 days X 24 hours per day minus restrictions (weather and statutory/legislative restrictions) measured against existing runways/airspace/et cetera.

  Current capacity is demonstrated based on the standardized/peacetime operations for existing physical plants' capability to perform functions/sub-functions (normalized for comparability between Services' installations). All measurements are in accordance with peacetime restrictions and constraints (e.g., environment/weather, encroachment, and legislation) based on 244 training days X 12 hours per day and existing runways/airspace/et cetera.

FT Subgroup Update

FT Definitions Continued:

Current usage is derived from the certified MilDep & Def Agency responses (and subsequent updates) to BRAC data calls. Current usage may be "current capacity" as defined above and considers maintenance/equipment downtime, end strength (faculty, staff, and students), personnel resources/accounts (pay/overtime pay), duty hours (e.g., days/year, hours/day for budgetary constraints), training policy/requirements, et cetera.

Surge capacity is an additional "capability hedge" to meet unanticipated increases within an existing physical plants' capability to perform functions/sub-functions. Surge capacity for Flight Training is defined as the current usage plus 20%.

Note: Surge capacity. There are no documented surge requirements for flight training.

Excess Capacity is an installations current capacity minus current usage plus surge capacity. For example, current capacity (standardized/peacetime operations) minus current usage (certified Data Call #1 responses) may be greater than Current Capacity minus Surge Capacity (20% of current usage).

FT Subgroup Capacity Analysis Summary

More Joint / Transformational

Scenario #	Scenario Title	Excess Rwy Capacity	
		Before	After
E&T 0044	"Status Quo" Consolidate USN UPT	59.93%	28.66%
E&T 0045	"Status Quo" Consolidate USAF UPT	46.87%	28.99%
E&T 0006	Consolidate Rotary wing Training	81.89%	77.36%
E&T TBD	JSF "Stand Alone" Initial Training Site		
E&T 0008	Consolidate Airlift/Tanker Training	59.93%	28.66%
E&T 0046	Cooperative; Realign & Consolidate DoD UPT, NAV, NFO, & CSO Training	52.90%	28.85%
E&T TBD	UAV Center of Excellence		
E&T 0047	Transformational; JSF to Columbus AFB	52.90%	37.94%
E&T 0048	Transformational; JSF To NAS Kingsville	52.90%	40.07%

- **FT Subgroup scenarios "uncover" from 1 base to 4 bases (scenario dependent)**
- **7 of 9 FT Subgroup scenarios set the stage for joint/transformational opportunity**

MilVal Scores: JSF Flight Training

BASE	Airfield Capacity (22.50)	Weather (11.00)	Environ-ment (15.55)	Quality of Life (11.10)	Managed Training Areas (27.05)	Ground Training Facilities (12.80)	Total (100)	Rank
Eglin AFB	8	7	6	9	1	6	74.49	1
Cherry Point MCAS	1	2	7	10	6	11	73.58	2
Laughlin AFB	12	9	1	3	4	5	72.27	3
Tyndall AFB	2	3	12	7	10	1	70.61	4
Pensacola NAS	14	4	5	1	9	8	70.06	5
Vance AFB	4	14	3	5	8	3	70.00	6
Columbus AFB	10	11	2	13	7	4	69.36	7
Kingsville NAS	11	6	9	11	2	13	68.76	8
Meridian NAS	6	10	13	6	3	14	67.59	9
Randolph AFB	13	13	14	8	5	2	66.43	10
Shaw AFB	5	5	4	12	14	7	66.15	11
Yuma MCAS	7	1	15	14	13	15	61.84	12
Beaufort MCAS	15	8	11	2	11	10	61.59	13
Moody AFB	3	15	10	15	12	9	60.90	14
Sheppard AFB	9	12	8	4	15	12	59.69	15

* Blue scores above median, red scores below

FT JSF "Stand alone" Option

Recommended

- **Realign Eglin AFB by establishing it as the Joint Strike Fighter Initial Training Site for a consolidated USN, USMC, and USAF Graduate-level Pilot Training Program**
  - **Complements other proposals FT advanced in the "Status Quo" and "Cooperative" business models**
  - **May require USAF to relocate assets presently assigned to 33rd Fighter Wing and 53rd Wing**

FT JSF "Stand alone" Option

Not Recommended

- **Realign the following bases by establishing one as the Joint Strike Fighter Initial Training Site for a consolidated USN, USMC, and USAF Graduate-level Pilot Training Program**

BASE	Mil Val	Rank	RATIONALE
Cherry Point MCAS	75.38	2	AV-8 & KC-130 FRS and Operational Mission preclude JSF selection
Laughlin AFB	72.27	3	T-6 infrastructure in place, role as transformational UFT location
Tyndall AFB	70.61	4	F/A-22 Initial Bed down
NAS Pensacola	70.06	5	NFO / NAV training base – Encroachment of Pensacola
Vance AFB	70.00	6	T-6 infrastructure (receiving 2005), role as transformational UFT location
Columbus AFB	69.36	7	Valid JSF Option – Proposed in Transformational Re-alignment Option #1
NAS Kingsville	68.76	8	Valid JSF Option – Proposed in Transformational Re-alignment Option #2
NAS Meridian	67.59	9	Military Value Scores and future missions make JSF bed down at these sites less feasible than bases named above.
Randolph AFB	66.43	10	
Shaw AFB	66.15	11	
Yuma MCAS	61.84	12	
MCAS Beaufort	61.59	13	
Moody AFB	60.90	14	
Sheppard AFB	59.69	15	

JSF Initial Training Site – "Stand Alone" Option

Proposal	Drivers/Assumptions

▪ Realign Eglin AFB by establishing Initial Joint Fleet Replacement Squadron/ Formal Training Unit (FRS/FTU) for USN, USMC, and USAF Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) graduate-level flight training
▪ Gain: Eglin AFB
▪ Lose: Eglin AFB
	▪ Principles: Organize and Train
	▪ Joint Transformational Options:
	  ▪ Adopts jet training "best" practices
	  ▪ Enhance JSF inter-operability
	  ▪ Standardize JSF skill sets
	▪ Establish "joint" officer training (initial skill, skill progression & functional)

Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**

▪ OSD Direction to nominate installation for JSF Initial Training Site
▪ Eglin #1 MilVal Score for JSF Mission
  ▪ Meets Service-endorsed requirements
  ▪ Follows services future roadmap
▪ Enhance personnel management of JSF Aviators
	▪ May preclude co-locating a consolidated maintenance training function on this campus
	▪ May require USAF to relocate assets for 33rd FW & 53 W
	▪ Requires MILCON (JSF Contract)
	  ▪ JSF Specific Facilities
	  ▪ Joint UFT Facilities

Approved___X___ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____

MilVal Rankings: UAV Center of Excellence

BASE	Airfield Capacity (20.45)	Weather (16.00)	Environ-ment (12.90)	Quality of Life (10.30)	Managed Training Areas (26.15)	Ground Training Facilities (14.20)	Total (100)	Rank
FT Rucker	1	2	1	1	1	1	81.57	1
Indian Springs	2	1	2	3	3	3	58.95	2
FT Huachuca	3	3	3	2	2	2	58.40	3
Choctaw NOLF	4	4	4	3	4	3	34.06	4

FT UAV Center of Excellence

Recommended

- **Option #1: Realign Ft. Rucker, AL by relocating and consolidating DoD Undergraduate Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Training from Ft. Huachuca, AZ, Indian Springs AF Aux, NV and NOLF Choctaw, FL**

- **Option #2: Realign Indian Springs AF Aux, NV by relocating and consolidating DoD Undergraduate Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Training from Ft. Huachuca, AZ and NOLF Choctaw, FL.**

Not Recommended

- **Realign Ft. Huachuca, AZ by relocating and consolidating DoD Undergraduate Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Training from Indian Springs AF Aux, NV and NOLF Choctaw, FL.**

- **Realign NOLF Choctaw, FL by relocating and consolidating DoD Undergraduate Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Training from Indian Springs AF Aux, NV and Ft. Huachuca, AZ.**

❖ **Note: US Army BRAC requested E&T JCSG consider Ft Rucker for Army only and Joint UAV Training.**

DoD/USG UAV Center of Excellence

Proposal

- Realign Ft Rucker by relocating and consolidating DoD Undergraduate Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Training from Indian Springs AF Aux, NV, Ft. Huachuca, AZ and NOLF Choctaw, FL.
- Gain: Ft Rucker
- Lose: Ft Huachuca, AZ
  Indian Springs AF Aux, NV
  NOLF Choctaw, FL

Drivers/Assumptions

- Principles: Organize and Train
- Transformational Options:
  - Establish Centers of Excellence for Joint or Inter-service education
  - Train by combining / co-locating like schools
- Establish "joint" training (initial skill, skill progression & functional)

Justification/Impact

- Reduces excess infrastructure.
- Postures for joint acquisition of UAV platforms.

Potential Conflicts

- Requires MILCON.
- Technology advancements setting pace for service requirements.

Approved__X____ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____

DoD/USG UAV Center of Excellence

Proposal	Drivers/Assumptions
▪ Realign Indian Springs AF Aux, NV by relocating and consolidating DoD Undergraduate Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Training from Ft. Huachuca, AZ and NOLF Choctaw, FL. ▪ Gain: Indian Springs AF Aux, NV ▪ Lose: Ft Huachuca, AZ NOLF Choctaw, FL	▪ Principles: Organize and Train ▪ Transformational Options: ▪ Establish Centers of Excellence for Joint or Inter-service education ▪ Train by combining / co-locating like schools ▪ Establish "joint" training (initial skill, skill progression & functional)
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
▪ Reduces excess infrastructure. ▪ Postures for joint acquisition of UAV platforms.	▪ Requires MILCON. ▪ Technology advancements setting pace for service requirements.

Approved__X____ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____

Specialized Skill Training

- **Navy Proposals**
- **Capacity Summary**
- **Subgroup Issues**

Close SUBASE San Diego
Pearl Harbor receives *(IAT-06, DON-06)*

Scenario	Drivers/Assumptions
▪ Close SUBASE San Diego ▪ Relocate SSNs to NAVSTA Pearl Harbor	▪ Principles: Consolidate bases yet retain flexible dispersal options.
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
▪ Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation	▪ Relocation of SSNs and CSG to Hawaii Coast will affect capacity for transient ships ▪ Requires IJCSG coordination (SIMA)

Recommendation: USN continue with scenario but with E&T function analyzed by USN under the authority and overwatch of E&T JCSG. *Submarine Training Center, Pacific (Pearl Harbor, HI) has a detachment at SUBASE San Diego for Functional Training of the 6 submarines based there. For this scenario, this detachment would no longer be required and would be absorbed into the parent activity in Pearl Harbor. No impact on any SST scenarios.*

Approved_X____ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____

Close SUBASE San Diego
NS San Diego Receives*(IAT-06A, DON-07)*

Scenario	Drivers/Assumptions
▪ Close SUBASE San Diego ▪ Relocate SSNs to NAVSTA San Diego	▪ Principles: Consolidate bases yet retain flexible dispersal options.
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
▪ Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation	▪ No submarine support capability at NAVSTA San Diego ($$) ▪ Nuclear ship berthing approval at NAVSTA San Diego by SEA 08 ▪ Requires IJCSG coordination (SIMA)

Recommendation: USN continue with scenario but with E&T function analyzed by USN under the authority and overwatch of E&T JCSG.

Submarine Training Center, Pacific (Pearl Harbor, HI) has a detachment at SUBASE San Diego for Functional Training of the 6 submarines based there. For this scenario, this detachment would follow the submarines and move to NAVSTA San Diego (< 10 miles away). No impact on any SST scenarios.

Approved__X___ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____

28

Close Naval Construction Battalion Center Gulfport *(IAT-08, DON-08)*

Scenario	Drivers/Assumptions
▪ **Close CBC Gulfport, MS** ▪ **Relocate 4 NMCBs, 22nd NCR, 20th SRG, NCTC and associated equipment/material to MCB Camp Lejeune, NC** ▪ **Reserve Center to remain in area**	▪ **Principle: Deploy and Employ** ▪ **DON Objective: Maximize use of capacity in fleet concentration areas while maintaining fleet dispersal and viable AT/FP capability**
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
▪ **Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation** ▪ **Collocates NMCB function with supported operational forces and maintains Ease/West coast distribution** ▪ **Increase training efficiencies**	▪ **Additional construction required** ▪ **Competing for space on Camp Lejeune with USMC force structure reshaping and potential JCSG scenarios** ▪ **Requires coordination with E&T JCSG** ▪ **Requires IJCSG coordination (SIMA)**

Recommendation: USN continue with scenario but with E&T function analyzed by USN under the authority and overwatch of E&T JCSG. *JCSG concurred with movement of construction training on 4 Nov 04. NAVMETOCPRODEVCEN GULFPORT MS is an SST activity at Gulfport, will move to COMNAVMETOCCCOM STENNIS SPACE CENTER MS. No impact on any SST scenarios.* **Approved__X___ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____**

Close NAVSTA Everett
CVN to NS Bremerton (*IAT-05, DON-05*)

Scenario	Drivers/Assumptions
▪ Close NAVSTA Everett ▪ Move forces to NAVSTA Bremerton (CVN, T-AE) and NAVSTA San Diego (DDG, FFG)	▪ Principle: Deploy and Employ ▪ DON Objective: Maximize use of capacity in fleet concentration areas while maintaining fleet dispersal and viable AT/FP capability
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
▪ Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation ▪ NAVSTA Bremerton can homeport additional CVN	▪ Loss of deep water nuclear port coupled with move of one East Coast CVN to Pacific Fleet ▪ NAVSTA Bremerton ability to homeport additional CVN (support infrastructure) ▪ USCG Ship ▪ Requires IJCSG coordination (SIMA)

Recommendation: USN continue with scenario but with E&T function analyzed by USN under the authority and overwatch of E&T JCSG. *One training activity will move with ships – Afloat Training Group PACNORWEST. Provides instructors that ride ships, no classroom training. No impact on any SST scenarios.*

Approved__X___ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____

Close NAVSTA Everett
CVN to NAS North Island (*IAT-05A, DON-35*)

Scenario	Drivers/Assumptions
▪ **Close NAVSTA Everett** ▪ **Move forces to NAS North Island (CVN), NAVSTA Bremerton (T-AE) and NAVSTA San Diego (DDG, FFG)**	▪ **Principles:** Deploy and Employ ▪ **DON Objective:** Maximize use of capacity in fleet concentration areas while maintaining fleet dispersal and viable AT/FP capability
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
▪ **Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation** ▪ **NAS North Island can homeport an additional CVN with pier modifications ($$$)**	▪ **Loss of deep water nuclear port** ▪ **Community impact of additional CVN in question** ▪ **Industrial Capacity to support CVN**

Recommendation: USN continue with scenario but with E&T function analyzed by USN under the authority and overwatch of E&T JCSG. *One training activity will move with ships – Afloat Training Group PACNORWEST. Provides instructors that ride ships, no classroom training. No impact on any SST scenarios.*

Approved__X___ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____

Close NAVSTA Everett CVN to Pearl Harbor (*IAT-05B, DON-36*)

Scenario	Drivers/Assumptions
▪ **Close NAVSTA Everett** ▪ **Move forces to NS Pearl Harbor (CVN), NS Bremerton (T-AE) and NS San Diego (DDG, FFG)** ▪ **Move T-AOE from Bremerton to NS Pearl Harbor** ▪ **Move CVW assets to Hawaii**	▪ **Principle:** Deploy and Employ ▪ **DON Objective:** Maximize use of capacity in fleet concentration areas while maintaining fleet dispersal and viable AT/FP capability
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
▪ **Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation** ▪ **Satisfies IGPBS Requirements**	▪ **Impacts to CVW training and readiness** ▪ **FCLP Training** ▪ **Air-to-Ground Training** ▪ **Increased Operational Costs for the CVW** ▪ **CVW siting** ▪ **Industrial Capacity to support CVN** ▪ **ESQD arcs for T-AOE in Hawaii**

Recommendation: USN continue with scenario but with E&T function analyzed by USN under the authority and overwatch of E&T JCSG. *One training activity will move with ships – Afloat Training Group PACNORWEST. Provides instructors that ride ships, no classroom training. No impact on any SST scenarios.*

Approved__X___ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____

Close NAVSTA Everett CVN to Guam (*IAT-05C, DON-37*)

Scenario	Drivers/Assumptions
▪ **Close NAVSTA Everett** ▪ **Move forces to NSA Guam (CVN, DDGs, FFGs), NAVSTA Bremerton (T-AE)** ▪ **Move CG(s) to Guam** ▪ **Move T-AOE from Bremerton to Guam** ▪ **Move CVW assets to Guam**	▪ **Principle:** Deploy and Employ ▪ **DON Objective:** Maximize use of capacity in fleet concentration areas while maintaining fleet dispersal and viable AT/FP capability
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
▪ **Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation** ▪ **Satisfies IGPBS Requirements**	▪ **Ability of Guam to absorb CSG assets** ▪ **Piers will require significant upgrade; dredging** ▪ **Impact of CSG on community** ▪ **CVW siting** ▪ **Industrial Capability to support CVN will need to be built**

Recommendation: USN continue with scenario but with E&T function analyzed by USN under the authority and overwatch of E&T JCSG. *One training activity will move with ships – Afloat Training Group PACNORWEST. Provides instructors that ride ships, no classroom training. No impact on any SST scenarios.*

Approved__X___ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____

33

SST Capacity Analysis Definitions

- **Maximum Potential Capacity**
  - * Throughput based on 365 training days per year using 8-hour shifts per day minus constraints and restrictions (measured by student population)
- **Current Capacity**
  - * Throughput based on 244 8- hour training days per year
- **Current Usage**
  - * Actual throughput reported in FY 03 certified data
- **Surge Capacity**
  - * Surge (hedge) defined as 20% of current usage
- **Excess Capacity**
  - * (current capacity) - (current usage + surge capacity)

SST Capacity Analysis Summary

	Berthing			Messing			Classrooms		
	Capacity	Usage	Excess	Capacity	Usage	Excess	Capacity	Usage	Excess
USAF	22,571	26,623	(9,378)	33,014	30,225	(3,255)	101,173	32,670	61,970
USA	72,803	54,671	7,201	113,082	108,125	(16,666)	113,603	52,427	50,707
USN	38,873	22,621	11,729	45,978	36,600	2,058	86,964	35,825	43,974
USMC	13,191	8,045	3,536	31,945	22,255	5,238	17,612	7,229	8,937
Total	147,438	111,960	13,088	224,019	197,205	(12,625)	319,352	128,151	165,588
	Excess of 9%			Shortage of 6%			Excess of 52%		

Scenario Analysis Example

Scenario

- **Realign Fort Lee, VA by establishing a Joint Center of Excellence for Supply/Logistics Training**
- **Realign Lackland AFB, TX and Camp Lejeune, NC by relocating Supply/Logistics courses currently taught there to Fort Lee, VA. Realign Navy Supply Corps School and Center for Service Support Athens, GA. Provide by disestablishing all supply training and consolidating at Fort Lee, VA. The intent of this scenario is to consolidate like courses while maintaining service unique capabilities.**

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, and Army Quartermaster School are located at Fort Lee**

Potential Conflicts

E&T0004	FY06 Requirements	% of Total Requirement	Excess Classroom Capacity (students)	Excess Berthing Capacity (students)	Excess Messing Capacity (students)	Mil Value Score Initial skills	Mil Value Score skills progression	Mil Value Score functional	Cobra	Recommendations
Lackland AFB	8949	16%	21220	-1059	494	52.37	41.21	41.58		Realigns 345th TRS in conjunction with E&T0005 & E&T0016
Camp Lejeune	3875	7%	7393	3576	1882	42.01	39.23	41.38		Disestablishes the USMC Ground Supply School
Meridian	5638	10%	777	1094	1301	35.71	35.84	31.57		Disestablishes NAVTECHTRACEN and Meridian in conjunction with E&T0017
Athens	2682	5%	526	-157	0	30.94	33.27	29.75		Disestablishes NAVSCSCOL and Athens
Fort Lee	34387	62%	3779	-301	4593	41.79	35.78	32.78		GAINING - Largest Service Requirement
TOTAL	55531									Transformational - Joint Supply Center of Excellence

SST Capacity Analysis Summary (Cont)

- **To what extent will registered scenarios reduce excess capacity?**

  **** SST registered scenarios uncover; NAVTECHTRACEN Meridian, NAVSCTRACEN Athens, NTTC Corry Station, Army Intel School Ft Huachuca, DLI Presidio of Monterey, NAVSTA Newport**

  **** Army and Navy scenarios (E&T over-watch) significantly reduce excess capacity**

- **Are there scenarios in each area where excess capacity was identified?**

  **** SST registered scenarios reduce excess capacity in initial skills, skill progression, and functional training areas.**

SST Capacity Analysis Summary (Cont)

- **What measures have been established to determine if OSD goals (reduce infrastructure, maximize jointness, and transformation) have been achieved?**
  - ** SST scenarios; 0004, 0014, 0015, 0016, 0017, 0018, 0030, 0031, 0039, 0040, 0041, 0042, and 0043 reduce infrastructure.
  - ** SST scenarios; 0004, 0014, 0015, 0016, 0017, 0018, and 0039 maximize jointness.
  - ** SST scenario 0030 privatizes DLI

- **Transformation Options**
  - ** Establish Joint Centers of Excellence
    - *** SST scenarios; 0004, 0014, 0015, 0016, 0017, 0018, and 0039 maximize joint-ness.
  - ** Establish Joint Officer/Enlisted SST
    - *** SST scenarios; 0005, 0041, 0042

Issues Impacting 20 December Deadline

- **Services must provide prompt scenario data call responses**
  **** SST put all scenario data calls in OSD portal 22-24 November. Will begin COBRA run upon receipt of service data call responses (Date unknown)**

- **SST personnel trained in COBRA, May 2004**
  **** Need experienced COBRA personnel**

- **Some SST personnel working service BRAC scenario data calls and unavailable for SST JSCG**

- **BRAC (Fog of War)**
  **** Don't know what we don't know**

Subgroup Updates: PDE

- **Capacity Analysis Summary**
- **Issues Impacting 20 Dec Deadline**

Capacity Analysis Summary: PDE

- **Overall, the PDE Subgroup has received 100% of the required capacity data. Army JAG school at Charlottesville, VA submitted data via "hard copy" along with a certification letter from DAS Army. Ft. Belvoir submitted data for the Defense Acquisition University (DAU) via "hard copy" along with the appropriate certification letter(s).**

- **Overall, the current analysis has show excess capacity for the following functions:**
  - **PME/JPME – Maxwell AFB, Carlisle Barracks, Ft. Leavenworth, JFSC at Norfolk, and Ft. McNair (ICAF and NWC)**
  - **Graduate Education – Naval Postgraduate School at Monterey, CA**
  - **OFTE – JAG and Chaplain Schools at Maxwell AFB and Naval Station Newport, RI, Army Management Staff College (AMSC) at Ft. Belvoir, and Defense Contract Auditing Institute (DCAI) at Memphis, TN.**

Capacity Analysis Summary

- **The registered scenarios have the potential to reduce excess capacity for all three functions, primarily by consolidating functions at one location.**

- **Scenarios have been provided for which excess capacity have been identified.**

- **Performance measures: classroom space required, administrative/support space required, instructors space required, and number of schools teaching similar curriculum.**

Professional Development Education Definitions

- **Maximum Potential Capacity**
  - **Theoretical maximum capacity operational dimension for existing physical plants capability to perform functions/sub-functions. Based on 20 hour day, 365 days a year. 4 hours are unavailable due to cleaning and maintenance and class rotation requirements.**
- **Current Capacity**
  - **Standardized/peacetime operations for existing physical plants' capability to perform functions/sub-functions. Based on a 6 hour day, 244 days a year. 6 hour day is based on 0900-1700 academic day with 2 hours unavailable due to lunch break and class rotation requirements.**
- **Excess Capacity**
  - **Current capacity minus current usage**

PDE: Graduate Education

	Classroom Based Current Capacity	Instructor Office Space Based Current Capacity	Limiting Factor
Wright-Patterson AFB - AFIT	105012.6	106882.8	Classroom
Monterey - NPS	137613.5	583578.6	Classroom

- **The lower, or limiting, factor will define the capacity of designated PDE facilities.**
- **The factor that results in the lowest number of classroom equivalent hours possible, determines the maximum and current capacity of designated PDE facilities**
- **Based on determination of the limiting factor, the capacity analysis produced the following results**

	Maximum Potential Capacity	Current Capacity	Current Usage (FY 03)	Excess Capacity
Wright-Patterson AFB - AFIT	523628.4	105012.6	115776	-10763.4
Monterey - NPS	686187.5	137613.5	98374.2	39239.3

PDE: JAG

	Classroom Based Current Capacity	Instructor Office Space Based Current Capacity	Limiting Factor
Maxwell AFB - JAG	36947.9	9976.9	Instructor
Charlottesville VA - Army JAG	109302	99868.7	Instructor
NS Newport - Navy JAG	30436.2	18782.6	Instructor

- **The lower, or limiting, factor will define the capacity of designated PDE facilities.**
- **The factor that results in the lowest number of classroom equivalent hours possible, determines the maximum and current capacity of designated PDE facilities**
- **Based on determination of the limiting factor, the capacity analysis produced the following results**

	Maximum Potential Capacity	Current Capacity	Current Usage (FY 03)	Excess Capacity
Maxwell AFB - JAG	49748.1	9976.9	1236.2	8740.7
Charlottesville VA - Army JAG	497979	99868.7	27042.3	72826.3
NS Newport - Navy JAG	93656.3	18782.6	3910.7	14871.9

PDE: Chaplains

	Classroom Based Current Capacity	Instructor Office Space Based Current Capacity	Limiting Factor
Maxwell AFB - Chaplains	4804.9	10644.9	Classroom
Fort Jackson - Chaplains	20646.2	8727.6	Instructor
NS Newport - Chaplains	19304.8	26460.4	Classroom

- **The lower, or limiting, factor will define the capacity of designated PDE facilities.**
- **The factor that results in the lowest number of classroom equivalent hours possible, determines the maximum and current capacity of designated PDE facilities**
- **Based on determination of the limiting factor, the capacity analysis produced the following results**

	Maximum Potential Capacity	Current Capacity	Current Usage (FY 03)	Excess Capacity
Maxwell AFB - Chaplains	23959	4806.9	153	4651.9
Fort Jackson - Chaplains	43518.8	8727.6	4731.9	3995.7
NS Newport - Chaplains	96260.2	19304.8	1592	17712.8

PDE: OFTE (Defense Schools)

	Classroom Based Current Capacity	Instructor Office Space Based Current Capacity	Limiting Factor
Patrick AFB - DEOMI	17137.6	23510.8	Classroom
Fort Belvoir - AMSC	124655.2	33552.7	Instructor
Fort Belvoir - DAU	53805.1	73742.2	Classroom
Memphis - DCAI	12783.1	5942.8	Instructor

- **The lower, or limiting, factor will define the capacity of designated PDE facilities.**
- **The factor that results in the lowest number of classroom equivalent hours possible, determines the maximum and current capacity of designated PDE facilities**
- **Based on determination of the limiting factor, the capacity analysis produced the following results**

	Maximum Potential Capacity	Current Capacity	Current Usage (FY 03)	Excess Capacity
Patrick AFB - DEOMI	85453.7	17137.6	9829.3	7308.2
Fort Belvoir - AMSC	167305.2	33552.7	10386	23166.7
Fort Belvoir - DAU	268290.6	53805.1	43733.3	10071.8
Memphis - DCAI	26932.6	5942.8	8467.2	-2524.4

PDE: PME/JPME

	Classroom Based Current Capacity	Instructor Office Space Based Current Capacity	Limiting Factor
Maxwell AFB - AWC	67416.6	148347.7	Classroom
Maxwell AFB - ACSC	46622.8	88234.7	Classroom
Carlisle Barracks	85893	121037	Classroom
Fort Leavenworth - USACGSC	351184.8	274579.6	Instructor
Fort McNair - ICAF	55506.9	56174.2	Classroom
Fort McNair - NWC	37413.3	39061.7	Classroom
NS Newport - USNWC	92244.5	17949.5	Classroom
NS Norfolk - JFSC	317099.9	480934.8	Classroom
MCB Quantico - MCWAR	2440	5344.1	Classroom
MCB Quantico - MCCSC	33972.3	25475.8	Instructor

- **The lower, or limiting, factor will define the capacity of designated PDE facilities.**
- **The factor that results in the lowest number of classroom equivalent hours possible, determines the maximum and current capacity of designated PDE facilities**
- **Based on determination of the limiting factor, the capacity analysis produced the following results**

	Maximum Potential Capacity	Current Capacity	Current Usage (FY 03)	Excess Capacity
Maxwell AFB - AWC	336161.9	67416.6	11192.6	56224
Maxwell AFB - ACSC	232476.9	46622.8	17206.3	29416.5
Carlisle Barracks	428291.6	85893	28672	57221
Fort Leavenworth - USACGSC	1369146.9	274579.6	121136	153443.6
Fort McNair - ICAF	276776.1	55506.9	21077.3	34429.5
Fort McNair - NWC	186555.6	37413.3	31109.3	6304
NS Newport - USNWC	459962.4	92244.5	63804.4	28440.1
NS Norfolk - JFSC	1581167.5	317099.9	34474.7	282625.2
MCB Quantico - MCWAR	12166.7	2440	1841.6	598.4
MCB Quantico - MCCSC	127030.8	25475.8	19404.8	6071

Issues Impacting 20 DEC Deadline: PDE

- **Hasty analysis increases the vulnerability of scenarios at later stages of the BRAC process**
- **Timeline to receive data and complete data clarification requests**
- **Date when complete scenario data received impacts ability to provide effective analysis (earliest expected date for reception of data is 14 DEC 04)**
- **Sequential nature of data analysis required to define the consolidated organizational structure**
- **Legal review requires 4 working days**

DoD/USG UAV Center of Excellence #3

Proposal	Drivers/Assumptions
▪ Realign Redstone Arsenal, AL by relocating and consolidating DoD Undergraduate Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Training from Indian Springs AF Aux, NV, NOLF Choctaw, FL, and Ft. Huachuca, AZ. ▪ Gain: Redstone Arsenal, AL. ▪ Lose: Indian Springs AF Aux, NV, NOLF Choctaw, FL, and Ft. Huachuca, AZ.	▪ Principles: Organize and Train ▪ Transformational Options: Establish Centers of Excellence for Joint or Inter-service education and training by combining or co-locating like schools ▪ Establish "joint" training (initial skill, skill progression & functional)
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
▪ Reduces excess infrastructure ▪ Postures for joint acquisition of UAV platforms.	▪ Requires MILCON ▪ Technology advancements setting pace for service requirements.

Approved_____ Disapproved_____ Revised_____ Deferred_____