[redacted]

BRAC 2005
Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group

Meeting Minutes of September 22, 2004

The Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Counterintelligence and Security), Chair, Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group (IJCSG), Ms. Carol Haave led this meeting. The list of attendees is attached. The IJCSG Principals Meeting Brief dated September 22, 2004 (Attachment 2) is referenced by slide numbers.

Ms. Haave opened the seventeenth meeting of the IJCSG by noting that at the last meeting it was agreed that three scenarios were to be finalized to address consolidation of specific National Geospatial Intelligence Agency (NGA) facilities in the National Capital Region (NCR). She then asked Ms. Dunie to proceed with the briefing.

Ms. Dunie stated that the initial discussion would be held at the [redacted] level. She provided a current status overview summary of where the IJCSG was in the BRAC process. Upon the conclusion of her remarks, the National Security Agency (NSA) representative specifically asked about the status of the force structure effort. She responded that a template had been developed and a tiger team established to develop appropriate ratios for contractors located on government facilities. When complete, she informed the IJCSG that a package would be sent out to each of the organizations for their review and comments. The NGA representative asked when it was anticipated that this package would be ready for review. Ms. Dunie estimated that she hoped that this effort would be wrapped up early-to-mid next week. The Marine Corps wanted to know if military value data for Counterintelligence Field Activity (CIFA) and Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence - USD(I), was going to be collected. They were informed that these organizations military value data would be collected. Ms. Dunie noted that at this time the IJCSG currently did not have an analytical framework that specifically addressed the Pentagon.

Ms. Dunie stated that the meeting classification level would be raised to [redacted] to allow for free and open IJCSG discussion. At this point [redacted] was asked to leave the meeting and he departed the room.

[redacted]

Ms. Dunie noted that she would now discuss the two analytical frameworks that the IJCSG did not discuss at the last meeting. Mr. Wayne Howard, the Core Team Facilitator noted that at the last OSD BRAC 0-6 Meeting the other JCSGs provided copies of their proposed scenarios and that these have been archived at the IJCSG SCIF for reference. The National Security Agency (NSA) representative asked whether it was her intent to brief the three candidate scenarios when the IJCSG briefed the Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG). Ms. Dunie responded that it was. The Chair noted that it was likely that the ISG scheduled these JCSG briefs in an attempt to get an idea of what the various groups were considering.

Ms. Dunie noted that the analytical frameworks to be discussed today were more challenging and complex than those that were discussed at the September 15, 2004 IJCSG meeting. For the "Information Flow & Mission Synergy" analytical framework (slide 3) she opined that there could be potential equities of scale between separate organizations that could be achieved without changes in authority, direction and control. A specific example Ms. Dunie offered up for discussion was whether there were geographic areas where collocating on common footprints would enable synergy and enhance force protection which would result in reduced cost. The Chair suggested that we look at specific geographic regions to determine if this made sense or not. The Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) representative noted that he was willing to look at facilities in Hawaii as a geographic area. Ms. Dunie asked whether the Tampa and Norfolk geographic should be considered. After discussion about the various geographic area identified for consideration, the IJCSG agreed that the Core Team should use the capacity data to identify whether there were opportunities to close or realign facilities in order to collocate intelligence facilities in Hawaii.

The next part of the IJCSG discussion focused on the mission synergy portion of the analytical framework. The Chair opened this conversation by offering up that it was her perspective that the IJCSG should consider how all-source analysis (ASAS) fusion takes place. Specifically, she opined whether collocation of analysis would be beneficial to ASAS mission performance. For discussion purposes she noted that the Military Services (MILDEPs) and DIA have people collocated at NSA facilities since this was the only way they could gain access to the data. The NGA representative noted that collocation in many cases was not required due to emerging net-centric capabilities that enabled virtual collaboration. The Chair noted that intelligence had a plethora of fusion centers

and questioned whether this was the way we collectively see the future of intelligence. She added that intelligence reform was being actively considered by many external bodies and she challenged the IJCSG to identify whether there were opportunities to reform using the BRAC process. Ms. Dunie noted that the value of collocation was the potential for synergy for those parts of analysis where we know where issues have been identified. The NGA representative noted that it was his perspective that BRAC was not the right forum for such potential reform due to pending intelligence legislation. The CMS representative opined that ASAS - from a topical basis involving different intelligence disciplines - would be consistent with what the 9/11 panel recommended. He noted that one would have to identify and prioritize what would be considered and define the "slice" of the intelligence community to be looked at. Ms. Dunie noted that from her perspective it was not the totality that should be looked at within BRAC but rather enhancing those forward leaning initiatives within defense intelligence and analyze whether collocation would better support ASAS information flow and information sharing to generate capabilities that don't exist today. She also noted that these potential ideas came out of Reforming Defense Intelligence (RDI). The Marine Corps representative noted that each of the Services has an ASAS charter as a function of General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP) funding. The DIA representative stated that he considered the existing fusion centers as processing stations. In conclusion, the Chair stated that we should consider the BRAC process to enable a certain amount of defense intelligence reform. She agreed that her folks would develop a potential proposal for the IJCSG to discuss at a future meeting to further enable this conversation.

For the "Education and Training" analytical framework (slides 4-5), Ms. Dunie stated that the Education and Training JCSG was looking at equities across the Department of Defense (DoD). She noted that some of the ideas to be presented here were a reflection of this approach. Specifically, she pointed out that there was the potential to look at these many education and training equities to analyze whether there were economies of scale that could be addressed within the NCR. She opined that this could be a potential steppingstone to a National Intelligence University (NIU) if/when such legislation would direct this. The NRO representative noted that another option could be consolidation of defense intelligence administrative education and training functions exclusively. The DIA representative stated that it was his perspective that the Joint Military Intelligence College (JMIC) was working and operated in a Sensitive Compartmentalized Information (SCI) environment. He also noted that it allowed people to take

advantage of courses at/near where their place of work. The Chair opined that there may be some goodness of a single provost for defense intelligence that would ensure standards while consolidating management and administrative activities. She also noted that there was an opportunity to look at additional opportunities for joint intelligence training. The DIA representative stated that Education and Training are two different things since Education requires a formal accreditation. He noted that the JMIC would be reaccredited in 2005. In summary, he wondered whether this was an appropriate issue for BRAC. The CMS representative informed the IJCSG that there was an Executive Order (EO) that required it to report on Intelligence Community-wide standards within 120 days. In conclusion, the Chair tasked the Core Team to look at the potential for a proposal that addressed a "Chancellor" for defense intelligence training that would ensure standards while consolidating management and administrative activities.

Ms. Dunie next discussed the "Facility Condition/Vulnerability/Security" analytical framework (slides 6-9) from the context of the proposed scenarios to declare to the Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG). The Chair asked if there were any objections by the IJCSG to forwarding these three and there was none. Ms. Dunie also noted that there was a placeholder proposal to examine facilities identified as "Category 3" in the military value data call once the data was available.

The CMS representative next provided an update on its COOP and Mission Assurance activities (slide 11). He discussed the Intelligence-President's Budget Submission (IPBS) efforts as it related to mission assurance and COOP initiatives. He encouraged the Core Team members to talk with their organizations resource people to understand these activities before discussing this in further detail with the IJCSG. Ms. Dunie noted that it was important for CMS to identify what facilities issues did not make the overguidance request as part of a future discussion. The CMS representative also informed the IJCSG that there was a COOP facility effort being addressed by USD(I) and CMS jointly.

Ms. Dunie next discussed the "Joint Reserve Intelligence Center" analytical framework (slide 12). The DIA representative informed the IJCSG that there would be some personnel increases in the upcoming budget year which would be allocated to the JRICs and he wanted to know if there was any analysis under consideration that would impact this. Ms. Dunie noted that this was being looked at to determine if proposals would be developed or not.

In summary, the Chair stated that the purpose on these meetings is to start a dialog to understand the boundaries of the BRAC process and see if there is an opportunity to make a fundamental difference. She recognized the fact that the overall Intelligence Community was in a state of "flux" but that the IJCSG needed to continue moving forward. Upon conclusion of her remarks, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved: _____
Carol A. Haave
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense,
(Counterintelligence and Security)
Chair, Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group

Attachments:
1. List of Attendees
2. IJCSG Principals Meeting Brief dated September 22, 2004

Intelligence JCSG Meeting
September 22, 2004

Attendees

Members:

- Ms. Carol Haave, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Counterintelligence and Security, Chair)
- Mr. Terrance Ford, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence (G2), United States Army
- Ms. Karin Dolan, Assistant Director for Intelligence Support, United States Marine Corps

Alternates:

- Mr. Dean Yount, Air Force
- Mr. Mark Ewing, Defense Intelligence Agency for the Director
- Mr. Tom Ferguson, National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency
- Mr. Larry Burgess, National Reconnaissance Office for the Director

Others:

- Ms. Deb Dunie, DUSD(I), CI&S, Director, Plans and Analysis
- Mr. Wayne Howard, DUSD(I), Core Team Facilitator

Intelligence JCSG Meeting
September 22, 2004

Attendees

Others: (Continued)

DCN: 11316

IJCSG Principals Meeting

September 22, 2004

[redacted]

Copy ____ of ____ 1

Agenda

- Status Overview
- Analytical Frameworks 4 & 5: Potential Ideas and Proposals (Continued from 15 Sep Meeting)
- Scenarios: Facility Condition/Vulnerability/Security Submission to ISG
- Proposal-Placeholder: Facility Condition/ Vulnerability/Security
- Analytical Frameworks 1, 2 & 3: Update
- IJCSG Meeting Schedule

[redacted]

Analytical Framework – Information Flow & Mission Synergy

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Provide infrastructure to facilitate robust information flow between analysts, collectors and operators at all echelons and achieve mission synergism. As appropriate, collocate JICs, FOBs, RSOC analytical and requirements/collection functions, CI analytic and requirements/tasking elements, organic ISR analytical and requirements/collection functions to enhance force protection, reduce infrastructure requirements and allow for synergy between missions to be realized.

Pros

- Potential cost savings
- Better fusion of intelligence analysis
- Improved requirements management - integration and information flow
- Increased responsiveness to COCOMs

Cons

- Difficult to complete by 15 Nov 04 (major complexity)
- Limited data collected
- Potential impacts to authority, direction, control
- High risk of additional costs not covered by BRAC
- Requires extensive coordination w/those impacted e.g. COCOMs

Potential Ideas

- Geographic Consolidation: Collocate diverse intelligence organizations into a common facility to enhance mission effectiveness
  - Realign analysis, collection and operations into regional integrated facilities within the COCOM footprint (JICs; RSOCs; FOBs…)
  - Collocate NCR analytical equities to develop synergies of scale
- COOP: Leverage JIC facilities, as appropriate, to support COOP requirements of Defense Intelligence Agencies in support of both the National and Warfighter Capabilities

[redacted]

Analytical Framework – Education and Training (Notional)

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Consider consolidating selected Intelligence Education and Training functions

Pros

- Potential cost savings
- Potential increase in efficiency and effectiveness
- Reduced footprint
- Provides opportunity to professionalize intelligence career development
- Stepping-stone to National Intelligence University

Cons

- Difficult to complete by 15 Nov 04 (major complexity)
- Insufficient data collected at an aggregate level
- Requires extensive coordination of training objectives
- High risk of additional costs not covered by BRAC
- Interagency considerations

Potential Ideas

- Privatize Training: Close and privatize graduate and undergraduate degree-granting curriculum
- Undergraduate/Graduate Degree-Granting: Consolidate Defense Intelligence Agencies' undergraduate and graduate degree-granting education activities into a single campus to foster a joint curriculum, efficiencies of scale, and opportunities for synergy.
- Certificate-Level Training: Consolidate Defense Intelligence certificate granting programs into a single campus.
- Language Training: TBD if other opportunities beyond Defense Language Institute
- Consolidated Training: Consolidate/relocate intelligence training

[redacted]

Education and Training
- IJCSG Proposal AF5-001 (Notional)

Proposal	Drivers
(Note: Proposal notional until analysis of data calls) ■ Consolidate Education & Training: Realign Undergraduate & Graduate Degree-Granting and/or Certificate-Level Training at the Joint Military Intelligence Center, Bolling AFB, DC; Defense Language Institute, Monterey, CA; Joint Counter-Intelligence Training Agency, Elkridge, MD; NRO facility in Chantilly/Reston VA; NSA facility in FANX 2, MD; NGA facility Fort Belvoir, VA (NGA College); NGA facilities at Reston, VA, Bethesda, MD, St Louis, MO; and Service education and training activities (TBD locations) and consolidate to establish a Defense Intelligence University at TBD location (example receiving locations could include Fort Belvoir, VA; Fort McNair, DC (under National Defense University); Reston, VA facilities named 1, 2 and 3 (to be vacated by NGA); or the Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA (near Defense Language Institute))	■ Principle: Reference approved DoD Intelligence Principle ■ Analytical Framework: Education and Training ■ Other: Consolidate Education & Training - Combination of two ideas (Undergraduate/Graduate Degree-Granting and Certificate-Level Training
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
■ Reduces managerial overhead and instructors ■ Potential long-term cost savings (personnel and space) ■ Potential to free-up physical space for mission purposes	■ De-confliction as appropriate with E&T JCSG that is analyzing initial skills intelligence and cryptologic training

[redacted]

Analytical Framework – Facility Condition/Vulnerability/Security

1

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Locate/Upgrade facilities on protected installations as appropriate and reduce vulnerable commercial leased space (Examine bottom tier of the Military Value analysis)

Pros

- Doable by 15 Nov 04 (High degree of data availability)
- Minor complexity
- Potential for significant long-term O&M cost savings
- Minor current mission impacts
- Addresses Infrastructure/Force Protection

Cons

- Collocation of multi-int capability may have major impact to current mission and high cost risk outside of BRAC

Potential Ideas

- Outdated/Un-Maintainable Facilities: Close government owned facilities that have infrastructure limitations (e.g. insufficient Space, IT/Comms, utilities, etc.) and relocate/collocate activities to a military installation or government owned facility.

  Close government owned facilities that have outdated or unmaintainable facilities (e.g. Condition Code 3) and relocate/collocate activities to a military installation or government owned facility.
- Vulnerable Commercial Leased Space: Close leased facilities and relocate their activities to a military installation or government owned facility
- Excessive Security/Force Protection Issues: Close government owned facilities that have insufficient security, safety, force protection (e.g. security and survivability) and relocate/collocate activities to a military installation or government owned facility.
- Collocation of Multi-Int Capability: Relocate/collocate multi-int activities to a military installation or government owned facility to allow for efficiencies of scale across mission areas.

[redacted]

Facility Condition/Vulnerability/Security - IJCSG Scenario AF1-001

Scenario	Drivers
Consolidate NGA NCR functions, personnel, equipment into a new facility at Fort Belvoir, VA, Proving Grounds ■ Close NGA facilities at Reston, VA, named 1 and 2; Newington, VA, facilities named 1, 2 and 3; Dulles, VA facility named Dulles North (or its successor, Reston 3); Bethesda, MD facility and Delaclaria site; Fort Belvoir, VA (NGA College); and Bldg 213 at Washington Navy Yard, DC ■ Realign NGA activities at NRO facility, Westfields, VA ■ Relocate and consolidate all NGA functions, personnel and equipment associated with the two above actions to a new facility (150 Acres) at Ft Belvoir Proving Grounds	■ Principle: Reference approved DoD Intelligence Principle ■ Transformational Option: Minimize leased space across the US and movement of organizations residing in leased space to DoD-owned spaces ■ Analytical Framework: Facility Condition/Vulnerability/ Security ■ Other: Outdated/un-maintainable facilities; reference CMS study of US intelligence facilities
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
■ Relocate activities within existing facilities in close proximity of each other or build new facilities to better enable mission performance (align w/existing NGA intelligence equities at Fort Belvoir, VA) ■ Reduce O&M costs associated with decrepit or inefficient infrastructure; potential to improve ROI ■ Enable enhanced productivity of the workforce; increase recruitment/retention ■ Enhance force protection by consolidating on a military installation	■ Army and other JCSG actions

Copy ____ of ____

Facility Condition/Vulnerability/Security - IJCSG Scenario AF1-002

Scenario	Drivers
Consolidate NGA NCR functions, personnel, equipment into a new facility at Fort Belvoir, VA, North Post ■ Close NGA facilities at Reston, VA, named 1 and 2; Newington, VA, facilities named 1, 2 and 3; Dulles, VA facility named Dulles North (or its successor, Reston 3); Bethesda, MD facility and Delaclaria site; Fort Belvoir, VA (NGA College); and Bldg 213 at Washington Navy Yard, DC ■ Realign NGA activities at NRO facility, Westfields, VA ■ Relocate and consolidate all NGA functions, personnel and equipment associated with the two above actions to a new facility (150 Acres) at Ft Belvoir North Post	■ Principle: Reference approved DoD Intelligence Principle ■ Transformational Option: Minimize leased space across the US and movement of organizations residing in leased space to DoD-owned spaces ■ Analytical Framework: Facility Condition/Vulnerability/ Security ■ Other: Outdated/un-maintainable facilities; reference CMS study of US intelligence facilities
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
■ Relocate activities within existing facilities in close proximity of each other or build new facilities to better enable mission performance (align w/existing NGA intelligence equities at Fort Belvoir, VA) ■ Reduce O&M costs associated with decrepit or inefficient infrastructure; potential to improve ROI ■ Enable enhanced productivity of the workforce; increase recruitment/retention ■ Enhance force protection by consolidating on a military installation	■ Army and other JCSG actions

[redacted]

Facility Condition/Vulnerability/Security - IJCSG Scenario AF1-003

Scenario	Drivers
Consolidate NGA NCR functions, personnel, equipment in land/facility to be purchased at Chantilly/Westfields, VA ■ Close NGA facilities at Reston, VA, named 1 and 2; Newington, VA, facilities named 1, 2 and 3; Dulles, VA facility named Dulles North (or its successor, Reston 3); Bethesda, MD facility and Delaclaria site; Fort Belvoir, VA (NGA College); and Bldg 213 at Washington Navy Yard, DC ■ Realign NGA activities at NRO facility, Westfields, VA ■ Relocate and consolidate all NGA functions, personnel and equipment associated with the two above actions in land/facility to be purchased (150 Acres) at Chantilly/Westfields, VA	■ Principle: Reference approved DoD Intelligence Principle ■ Transformational Option: Minimize leased space across the US and movement of organizations residing in leased space to DoD-owned spaces ■ Analytical Framework: Facility Condition/Vulnerability/ Security ■ Other: Outdated/un-maintainable facilities; reference CMS study of US intelligence facilities
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
■ Relocate activities within existing facilities in close proximity of each other or build new facilities to better enable mission performance ■ Reduce O&M costs associated with decrepit or inefficient infrastructure; potential to improve ROI ■ Enable enhanced productivity of the workforce; increase recruitment/retention ■ Reduce vulnerability	■ None

[redacted]

Facility Condition/Vulnerability/Security - IJCSG Proposal AF1-004 (Notional)

Proposal	Drivers
(Note: Proposal notional until analysis of data calls) ■ PLACEHOLDER ■ Examine facilities identified as Category 3 in Military Value Question 19.a (Facility Condition)	■ Principle: Reference approved DoD Intelligence Principle ■ Transformational Option: None ■ Analytical Framework: Facility Condition/Vulnerability/ Security ■ Other: Outdated/un-maintainable facilities; reference CMS study of US intelligence facilities
Justification/Impact	**Potential Conflicts**
■ Reduce O&M costs associated with decrepit or inefficient infrastructure; potential to improve ROI	■ TBD

[redacted]

Analytical Framework
- COOP and Mission Assurance

- **CMS Update on COOP and Mission Assurance**
  - Scoping Issue

[redacted]

Analytical Framework
- Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers (JRIC)

- **USD(I) Debrief**
  - Research on hold until 15 Nov 2004

[redacted]