
Letter to Musk, DOGE, Subj: F-35 Idiots are the Taxpayers, not the Builders, Rev. 1

From Paul Solomon <Paul_solomon@msn.com>

Date Sun 12/1/2024 9:17 PM

To Paul Solomon <Paul_solomon@msn.com>

Sent: Sunday, December 1, 2024

Subject: Fw: Letter to Musk, DOGE, Subj: F-35 Idiots are the Taxpayers, not the Builders, Rev. 1

The email below with the subject letter was sent to Mr. Musk and others in the HASC, SASC, and DoD. It was responsive to Mr. Musk's post on X.



Meanwhile, some idiots are still building manned fighter jets like the F-35 🗑️ 😊

Mr. Musk targets manned fighter jets like the F-35 as being obsolete. I argue that cost plus award fee contracts should be sent to the airplane boneyard along with the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulations Supplement (DFARS) that require contractors to be compliant with the earned value management system (EVMS) guidelines in the EVMS Standard, EIA-748. These contractors may earn award fees (profits) based on subjective criteria even though the weapon system being developed is over budget, behind schedule, and is failing to achieve the capabilities needed by the warfighters.

From: paul solomon <paul.solomon@pb-ev.com>

Sent: Saturday, November 30, 2024

Subject: Fw: Letter to Musk, DOGE, Subj: F-35 Idiots are the Taxpayers, not the Builders, Rev. 1

The attached letter to Musk is responsive to his post on X.

Excerpts from my letter:

- The idiots are not the F-35 builders; the taxpayers are. The contractors are smart enough to grab profits while building and selling a weapon system that fails to perform.
- Contractors have statutory and regulatory green lights to profit from cost plus contracts without delivering needed capabilities. It is a corrupt system. My recommendations to fix it have been ignored by legislators and DoD officials since 2007. Please get your DOGE team to change the rules and the related regulation for project management. This regulation favors the traditional defense suppliers and is a barrier to entry to smaller, more innovative players.
- Here are excerpts from a sample of my letters that cite the F-35 and other programs: [Waxman letter, June 22, 2007](#), Subject: Award Fees and Contract Oversight

Don't wait for the transition

- We can continue to develop new technologies and transfer technical/financial risk to non-traditional bidders by using the new contract types. Provide incentives to develop a prototype that works (needed capability). Subsequently, with lower technical risk and knowledge of needed capabilities, we can get bidders for the weapon system using fixed price plus incentives contract types, not cost plus subjective award fees. Hold the program managers and contractors accountable for results and monitor progress by verifying schedule progress with outcome-based metrics.
- "We don't need no stinking earned value." Four HASC members stated that we are "hamstrung by a focus on the process and rigid requirements rather than fielding a capability and achieving results."

- You don't have to wait for the transition. Get started now to eliminate DFARS regulations and statutes that are barriers to entry. Use common sense project management and hold program managers and contractors accountable for results. Monitor progress by verifying schedule progress with outcome-based metrics.

Excerpts from a sample of cited letters :

- Contractors have statutory and regulatory green lights to profit from cost plus contracts without delivering needed capabilities. It is a corrupt system. My recommendations to fix it have been ignored by legislators and DoD officials since 2007. Please get your DOGE team to change the rules and the related regulation for project management. This regulation favors the traditional defense suppliers and is a barrier to entry to smaller, more innovative players.
- The acquisition regulations and process enable contractors to submit invalid, misleading information to the Government on all capital asset acquisitions, not just weapon systems.
- Third, by covering up their cost overruns, presenting a misleadingly rosy picture of their performance on measures of cost control, and setting performance goals which they knew all along they would not be able to meet, LM and NG were able to secure larger profits in the form of higher performance-based Award Fees than were warranted based on their actual contract performance.
- ...award or incentive fees were being paid on such contracts based on subjective assessments of technical performance and not on real achievements and pre-determined objective criteria.
- ...utilization of Agile Methods has provided contractors with increased opportunities and incentives to submit unreliable information, “make the number,” and receive undeserved award fees. The status quo is a toxic triad of EIA-748, Agile methods, and subjective award fees. In concert, they enable, not deter, fraud, waste, and abuse.

DFARS Boneyard - Here Lie Regulations that Increase Costs and Enrich Contractors that Fail to Perform



The referenced letters may be downloaded from www.pb-ev.com at the DOGE tab.

Paul Solomon