



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PROGRAM EXECUTIVE OFFICER
LITTORAL COMBAT SHIPS
1333 ISAAC HULL AVE, SE
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, DC 20376-7003

IN REPLY REFER TO

12410

Ser LCS/6016

██████████
Director

The Government Affairs Institute (GAI) at Georgetown University
3333 K St NW, Suite 112
Washington, D.C. 20007

SUBJECT: ENDORSEMENT OF ██████████ FOR THE CAPITOL HILL
FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

I highly endorse ██████████ as a candidate for the
Capitol Hill Fellowship Program. Technically competent, as well
as poised and appropriately commanding, ██████████ exemplifies
the type of professional the Government should develop as a
future leader.

██████████ manages the in-service requirements of the Navy's
Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Class, and excels in all facets of
Program Office engineering, business, and leadership. Executing
a variety of tasks and solving problems along the way, ██████████
██████████ has proved her personal mettle and technical competence
repeatedly during her six years in the LCS Program Offices.
Most recently, she managed the start-up of a five-year, 100-
million dollar, level-of-effort contract, which provides
engineering design services for all ships in the Class.

██████████ excels in her work - across the spectrum of
Government acquisition. She prepares and briefs programmatic
technical and budget requirements through the layers of the
Command and Pentagon echelons. ██████████ career interests
directly relate to her desire to participate in the Capitol Hill
Fellowship Program; her abilities, motivation, and leadership
skills make her the perfect candidate.

Sincerely,

██████████
██████████
Executive Director



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
PROGRAM MANAGER
FLEET INTRODUCTION AND SUSTAINMENT (PMS 505)
614 SICARD ST. SE
WASHINGTON NAVY YARD, DC 20376-7003

IN REPLY REFER TO
12410
Ser PMS505/0384

Director
The Government Affairs Institute (GAI) at Georgetown University
3333 K St NW, Suite 112
Washington, D.C. 20007

SUBJECT: NOMINATION OF [REDACTED] FOR THE CAPITOL HILL
FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

This letter serves as a nomination of [REDACTED] a senior engineer in the Navy's Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) Fleet Introduction and Sustainment Program Office, to the Capitol Hill Fellowship Program.

Although an engineer by degree and function, [REDACTED] continually reaches beyond her immediate responsibilities to understand the policy, budget, and contracts that affect her daily decision making. Participation in the Fellowship Program will help close the gap in her understanding of the rules and requirements that form Department of Defense programs, and the LCS Class priorities and functional envelope, in particular. [REDACTED] also recognizes the importance of her participation in this Program so she may impart her knowledge and experience, and perhaps offer counsel to those she supports as a Fellow.

The LCS ship class is a forward leaning surface combatant with a high degree of automation and foreign vendor supplied systems, which present new and unique technical and management challenges. [REDACTED] has met these challenges and solved the issues they may present. She is adept at solving problems quickly with a skill and insight of a far more experienced subject matter expert. She interacts with senior officers and civilians in the LCS community - inside and outside of the Naval Sea Systems Command. [REDACTED] has earned the respect of Fleet Commanders at international bases not only for her technical knowledge, but for her exceptional poise and ability to concisely explain the most complex of subjects. With minimum guidance and direction, she can develop solutions, task actions, and make well developed and accurate recommendations.

SUBJECT: NOMINATION OF [REDACTED] FOR CAPITOL HILL FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

As a senior engineer on the Program's staff, [REDACTED] is responsible for planning changes and upgrades to LCS Class ships. To accomplish this, she must be familiar with the Program's current and future budgets, associated contracts, and be able to describe to senior leadership the impact Congressional, Defense, and Navy rules and regulations affect her ability to do her job successfully. Conversely, she must be able to succinctly articulate the decisions she makes to effect reasonable change to future rules and regulations that affect Navy programs.

[REDACTED] has worked with me for three years. She has proved herself a consummate professional. Senior military and civilian leaders have repeatedly acknowledged her ability and potential. Without question, I expect to see her as a leader within this Command in the near term. What she needs is career rounding opportunities, like this Fellowship, to ensure she moves forward with a full understanding of the impetus and influence of the other Government branches that affect her chosen profession. [REDACTED] engaging character, high ethical standards, and technical credentials make her an ideal candidate for the Fellowship Program. I am confident she will bring this invaluable level of competence and expertise to the Congressional Staffs or Committees to which she is assigned. The benefit of her participation in this Fellowship Program will not only make her a better leader, but return tremendous dividends to the Legislative and Executive Branches within which she operates.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Deputy Program Manager, Littoral
Combat Ship Fleet Introduction and
Sustainment Program Office

Copy to: Program Manager, PMS 505
Program Executive Officer, Littoral Combat Ships

[REDACTED]
Work

Washington, DC 20376

Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]

Home

Work

Experience:

Naval Sea Systems Command

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Washington, DC 20376 United States

Dates: [REDACTED]

Series: [REDACTED]

Pay Plan/Grade: [REDACTED]

Title: In-Service Engineering Manager

Duties, Accomplishments and Related Skills:

Oversee planning for LCS Modernization/Backfit and Life Cycle requirements for LCS Fleet Introduction and Sustainment program office (PMS 505), an ACAT 1D program within PEO LCS.

Lead efforts to define, plan and defend upgrades for LCS Modernization/Backfit for Life Cycle programs. Drive comprehensive Ship Change Document (SCD) technical reviews and approval for SCDs. Proactively manage and monitor all facets of deployment critical modernization efforts to support fleet requirements. Direct responsibility for technical direction and programmatic oversight of the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) budgeting and configuration management effort to develop new LCS modernization planning tool. Established controls to ensure modernization efforts are accurately reflected for descriptions of change, fielding plans, and technical implementation.

Acting Planning Yard Manager after award of LCS Planning Yard (PY) while maintaining regular duties. Established and carried out efforts to stand up the PY, and developed communication lines between the PY, SUPSHIP, Program Office and NAVSEA. Instituted a process for collecting and compiling award fee testimony from all government contributors. Identified assumptions required for the development of obligation plans and worked closely with PY management to refine the base year and option year 1 obligation plans based on contract ceiling and funding levels.

Maximize effective use of all available resources to staff and support responses to emergent Fleet technical issues. Organize and lead multiple diverse teams including PMS 505, 501, NAVSEA05, In Service Engineering Agents (ISEAs), industry and Fleet in investigating and resolving multiple technical issues to improve LCS operational availability

and maintainability. Initiated incorporating lessons learned from LCS 1's deployment and developed an electric plant groom for LCS 3 prior to her deployment that optimized the deployed performance of the electric plant.

Continually and proactively cultivate strong relationships and teaming environments at peer levels with PMS 501 and 420, NAVSEA 05, PEO IWS, LCSRON, SWRMC, CNSP and field activities to resolve numerous programmatic issues. Set up clear lines of communication and create a work environment that embraces decision making at the appropriate level and empower subordinates to maximize their contributions to fleet readiness.

Naval Sea Systems Command
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Washington, DC 20376 United States

Dates: 11/2009 – 11/2012

Series: [REDACTED]

Pay Plan/Grade: [REDACTED]

Title: Test and Evaluation Manager

Duties, Accomplishments and Related Skills:

Facilitated planning and execution of Post Delivery Test and Trials (PDT&T) events to include working with team members from PMS 501 Production, Technical and Post-Delivery teams, Naval Surface Warfare Center field activities, LCS Squadron (LCSRON) ONE, Commander, Operational Test and Evaluation Force (COTF), certification authorities, other program offices, and ship's force from each LCS seaframe.

Successfully created and maintained complex test schedules including in port and underway test events that needed to be properly integrated with each other and other planned shipboard events. Worked with the test directors, project officers, project engineers and individual test leads to ensure that test events accommodated continually changing seaframe readiness and availability. Organized preparation of Test and Range Readiness Review briefings and chaired Test Readiness Reviews.

Personally interfaced with technical and production teams to make certain testing needs were incorporated into the PDT&T schedule. Interacted with hull managers to ensure that equipment for upcoming tests was in operational status and maintenance for upcoming testing was scheduled in order to support events, and worked with LCSRON maintenance officers on maintenance availabilities to ensure both emergent and planned fleet maintenance was executed in a timely manner.

Responded to emergent OPNAV schedule questions regarding impacts to LCS seaframes from proposed courses of action. Participated in T&E WIPT discussions of proposed T&E strategy in support of the Test and Evaluation

Master Plan (TEMP) update and assisted in document preparation as well as review of draft TEMP updates. Interacted with individuals from Director, Operational Test and Evaluation (DOT&E), Director, Developmental Test and Evaluation (DDT&E), OPNAV N96 and N84 to facilitate moving the LCS test program forward in both execution and document development and review (TEMP, SEP, DAES reports, DOT&E annual report etc.)

Developed annual budget and resource requirements to support scheduled test execution and planning. Monitored annual budget execution and adjusted spending plans based on fact-of-life changes in schedules.

Alion Science and Technology

Washington, DC United States

Dates: 09/2003 - 10/2009

Title: Lead Test Engineer

Duties, Accomplishments and Related Skills:

Supported the LCS Test and Evaluation (T&E) Manager by reviewing and updating the Operational Test Readiness Review (OTRR) database, assisting LCS Risk Management with T&E related risks, interacting with the Mission Systems Ship Integration Team (MSSIT) as T&E representative, provided technical support in the development, update, review, and approval of T&E documentation and plans, including updates to the T&E Master Plan (TEMP), Integrated Test Plan, Developmental Test (DT) / Operational Test (OT) Test Plans, Live Fire Test and Evaluation (LFT&E) Management Plans.

Served as Lead Human Factors Engineer for US Navy's Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System (EMALS) program. Also worked as the human factors engineer for Canada's Joint Support Ship program in the Project Definition Phase, led a team to develop models to perform manpower estimations for the transformation US Army's personnel office, applied Human Systems Integration (HSI) concepts for the US Army's Future Force Warrior program, developed and performed human performance evaluations, managed development and evaluation of a multi-modal system for the US Army's Future Force Warrior program.

Exponent, Inc

Alexandria, VA United States

Dates: 01/2002 - 09/2003

Title: Engineer

Duties, Accomplishments and Related Skills:

Created and carried out Human Systems Integration (HSI) evaluations for projects with the US Army, collected data and performed task analysis for time and motion studies, created technical presentations and reports. Worked on projects in multiple engineering disciplines including industrial, mechanical, and civil.

University at Buffalo, Rehabilitation Engineering Research Center
Buffalo, NY United States

Dates:

Title: Research Assistant

Duties, Accomplishments and Related Skills:

Worked on development of research protocol and data collection in the areas of structural and functional anthropometry of people in wheelchairs.

Education: **University at Buffalo** Buffalo, NY United States

Major: Industrial Engineering

Syracuse University Syracuse, NY United States

Major: Bioengineering

State University of New York at Morrisville Morrisville, NY United States

Major: Engineering Science

Job Related Training: DAWIA Level III Engineering – 2014
DAWIA Level III Test and Evaluation – 2011
Operational Test Director's Course – 2007
MANPRINT Applications Training Course – 2003

Activities and Awards: NAVSEA Individual Excellence Award. March
NAVSEA Meritorious Unit Commendation. October
PEO SHIPS Special Act Award for exceptional performance in scheduling of the Littoral Combat Ship Post Delivery Test and Trials. August
NAVSEA Team Excellence Award as part of the USS FREEDOM Early Deployment Team. January

Professional Publications:

Statement of Interest

After eight challenging years working in Program Executive Office (PEO) Littoral Combat Ships (LCS), I have seen and experienced the impacts of Congressional oversight and legislation on major Navy program. Often selected as the lead for providing detailed responses to oversight inquiries on various aspects of the program, I was exposed to the constant interaction between the Congressional offices and the program. With the budget limitations faced by the Department of Defense and the resulting impact on LCS, I have learned how to succeed within reduced funding parameters to accomplish high priority work. This experience has inspired me to learn more about the legislative process.

As Senior Engineer in the LCS Program Office, I experience unique challenges on a daily basis. Among these experiences, I was the oversight manager for overseas repair operations in Singapore ensuring immediate repairs were made to a forward deployed warship that suffered a catastrophic failure. While returning the ship to an operational readiness condition, I saw firsthand the far reaching effects that statutory requirements had on the LCS maintenance and repair strategy. Later, when I was selected to manage the LCS Planning Yard, for planning maintenance and modernization efforts, the large number of congressional districts vested in the success of the LCS program was immediately evident. This experience proved how important congressional actions affect the program, but also how those same actions impact communities nationwide. Learning the elements that factor into congressional decision-making will make me a more effective advocate for the Navy's needs as an Acquisition Professional and future Program Manager in the Department of Defense.

As I continue to grow and accept more responsibility within the Navy, my breadth of knowledge across disciplines will become even more essential. I have continually sought opportunities to develop my abilities beyond strictly engineering by taking on work in other fields. My ability to understand what it takes to bridge the gap between the interests of Congress and the needs of the Navy will ensure I am able to implement the best strategies to advance the Navy's goals. This fellowship will give me an unparalleled opportunity to cultivate relationships with policy makers and develop a broad perspective that will serve me well as I take on expanded responsibilities and leadership positions.

My primary areas of interest would be to work for either the Appropriations or the Armed Services Committees or for an individual member that sits on either of those Congressional Committees. Experience with the Appropriations Committee will allow me to better understand how the annual appropriation bill is crafted and its corresponding impacts on the Navy. If I am assigned to the Armed Services Committee, my program management expertise will be enhanced by a greater appreciation of how Congress exercises legislative oversight of the Department of Defense.

The insight gained into the interactions between Congress and the Executive Branch will enhance my ability to support and manage Navy acquisition programs by learning to effectively communicate and interact with legislative personnel. Experience with policy makers and observing the legislative process will enable me to establish lasting relationships and gain a broader perspective enhancing my career and provide an opportunity to better represent the Navy and our nation's interests.

Writing Sample

**Modernization Lessons Learned from USS FREEDOM
(LCS 1) FY15 Selected Restricted Availability (SRA)**



Introduction

The first Selected Restricted Availability (SRA)(d) CNO Availability for a Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) was executed on LCS 1 starting in Fiscal Year (FY) 15. The purpose of documenting the lessons learned from both positive and negative aspect is to drive continuous improvement across the Planning, Programming, Budgeting and Execution of LCS CNO availabilities.

Background

LCS is a unique class in several ways, including the aspect that there is no planned mid-life modernization but rather SRAs (d)/DSRAs scheduled approximately every 36 months. The ships are also paired in order to execute a 3-2-1 manning concept with three crews rotating between two ships with one forward deployed. With ship pairs, it is important to keep the pairs as close as possible in functionality as crews are training on one hull and then picking up the other while forward deployed. During the SRA (d)/DSRAs, modernization will be executed in addition to scheduled maintenance tasks.

Traditionally modernization is executed under its own funding line(s) that are established years in advance of the CNO availabilities. Planning for execution of modernization on a specific hull begins two years prior to the actual scheduled availability to accomplish the necessary planning for the alterations. During this period of time, modernization requirements are finalized, Ship Change Documents (SCDs) are developed and approved, ship checks are executed, Long Lead Time Material (LLTM) is identified and ordered, and Ship Installation Drawings (SIDs) are developed. The Joint Fleet Maintenance Manual (JFMM) drives the timeline for execution of these events.

The LCS Planning Yard contract and Sustainment Execution Contract (SEC) had not been awarded in time to begin planning for LCS 1's first SRA so a bridge contract was extended for the prime ship builder to continue to execute and plan maintenance and modernization needed to support the availability. However, the bridge contract with the prime contractor was awarded well after the start of the 2 year planning window for the FY15 SRA.

LCS 1 FY15 SRA Planning

No funding in support of required modernization for LCS 1's FY15 SRA was included in the approved FY13-FY15 budgets and funding lines under Program Executive Office (PEO) LCS PMS 505 (Fleet Introduction and Sustainment Program Office). Lack of modernization funding, specifically Design Service Allocation (DSA) services, severely impacted the capability to plan mandatory and priority modifications that could be executed in LCS 1's FY15 SRA. In order to minimize the impact and support execution of mandatory/priority changes, PMS 505 reallocated existing program funding at the In Service Engineering Agents (ISEAs) to develop SCDs. Because existing program funding was received incrementally, the allocated amount was insufficient to fund the identified requirements resulting in availability planning efforts that

Writing Sample

could not be started or sustained and often fell behind schedule. Many of the required changes have been executed on future hulls so there was engineering and design information available to assist and leverage in developing these SCDs. This mitigated some of the time required for the development of SCDs. Prioritization of SCDs for execution was provided by the Program Office to focus the ISEAs and associated resources on the alterations that needed to be fully developed first.

As mentioned previously, being able to utilize existing engineering efforts reduced some of the impact of late planning and ship checks, but the impact could not be completely mitigated. All Ship Installation Drawings (SIDs) were delivered late impacting the award of contracts for executing work and integrated schedule planning. Integrated Logistics Certifications were also incomplete at the beginning of the SRA resulting in interim certifications being pursued in order to begin work at the start of the availability. Additionally, many of the SCDs were not mature at the necessary milestone which resulted in the need to develop risk messages for acceptance by Commander Naval Surface Force, Pacific (CNSP) or Commander, U.S. Pacific Fleet (PACFLT).

LCS 1 FY15 SRA Execution

As a result of operational needs, late contract awards and extreme LLTM for some of the maintenance efforts, the SRA start was shifted to the right approximately ten weeks. This shift benefited the modernization efforts in providing extra time for maturing SCDs, development of SIDs and ordering of material. Fortunately, none of the planned modernization efforts had extreme LLTM that impacted the start of work. This also allowed for better integration of the modernization efforts into the master Integrated Master Schedule (IMS) for the SRA resulting in better coordination of the maintenance and modernization efforts.

There were a number of modernization late additions to the SRA due to late planning which had a significant impact towards the end of the SRA. Some of the efforts were late due to poor planning and lack of funding, while others became late priorities of the PEO. Additional Letters of Authorization (LOAs) had to be updated and released in order for Job Sequence Numbers (JSNs) to be created for contracting of the work. Modernization efforts that were late required routing and approval through CNSP. Each of these steps required time and effort to walk them through and provide explanation on why they were late and required. Furthermore, while all of the late additions benefited from the SRA being extended due to emergent maintenance actions, some of the efforts ended up getting pushed from the SRA and into a future maintenance window due to conflict with critical path items.

Successes

Several high priority modernization items were completed resulting in improvements to cybersecurity, performance, and reliability of the ship. Minimal Condition Found Reports (CFRs) were generated as a result of inaccurate SIDs allowing work to progress in a timely

Writing Sample

manner. Communication flowed openly between Alteration Installation Teams (AITs) and the prime contractor during execution of alterations improving work flow and deconfliction of potential trouble spots early. Onsite representation by the ISEAs allowed for faster response to CFRs that did come in. Utilization of the electronic Liaison Action Record (eLAR) system allowed for faster response time to administrative requests on drawings or installations. Overall, several procedures were used for the first time that were successful in streamlining processes during the execution of the SRA.

Areas to Improve

The area of improvement where the biggest impact will be felt is funding of the LCS Modernization Budget Line Items (BLIs) that supports the required/planned installs across the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). This will allow for required planning efforts of the modernization alterations to be tasked and accomplished in support of the JFMM milestones. As a result, there will be a decrease in missed JFMM milestones resulting in at reduced effort to process late additions to the SRAs and any subsequent adverse impacts to the availability. Developing SCDs in a timely manner will allow for the refinement of individual alteration costs, improve modernization budgeting, planning, and prioritization for the out year availabilities across the FYDP.

Also refining the planning milestones to work within the LCS Concept of Operations (CONOPS) will improve planning and reduce cost. Advancing some of the planning milestones such as the Advance Planning Letter (APL) and ship checks is where we will see the biggest improvement towards reaching the JFMM milestones on time. Providing the APL two years in advance of the SRA allows the Planning Yard and AITs to identify the alterations, begin planning for ship checks, and identifying any LLTM. By executing ship checks of planned modernization prior to the ships deploying, cost and time savings will be realized. These improvements will result in a less challenging effort in meeting the JFMM milestones.

Conclusion

For future SRAs, we have been working diligently to develop SCDs for known modernization efforts, again working in priority order, so that they are mature prior to the planning window in order not to delay design, engineering, ship checks and development of SIDs. We have also been collaborating with the resource sponsor in order to receive modernization funding in order to execute necessary changes. The contract for the LCS Planning Yard was awarded in August of 2014 enabling us to task modernization efforts to the Planning Yard for development in anticipation of future SRAs. The LCS SEC contract was awarded April 2015 for the execution of planned modernization during upcoming SRAs. Future SRAs will benefit from both of these contracts being in place prior to the planning windows.