OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
5000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-5000

INTELLIGENCE

AUG 19 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL GEOSPATIAL-INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY
DIRECTOR, NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF, J2
ASSISTANT DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INTELLIGENCE, G2, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
DIRECTOR, NAVAL INTELLIGENCE, DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR, INTELLIGENCE, DIRECTORATE OF INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE AND RECONNAISSANCE, DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF INTELLIGENCE SUPPORT, HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS
DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM ASSESSMENTS AND EVALUATION OFFICE, COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT STAFF

Subject: Candidate Scenarios for evaluation by the FY'05 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Intelligence Joint Cross Service Group (IJCSG)

(U) The IJCSG has been tasked with the responsibility of conducting a comprehensive review of the Defense Intelligence functions in order to recommend supporting facilities and associated infrastructure realignment and closure options. The evaluation of Department of Defense sites for base realignment and closure determinations will involve locations that provide support to both departmental and National intelligence community activities. In many cases, the significance of National intelligence activities located at

DoD sites is not overtly apparent.

(U) The O/DDCI/CM has assisted us by aggregating a list of DCI NFIP footprint considerations. This information may be used to provide guidance to the BRAC process by identifying DCI equities that may be affected by the realignment proposals for consideration in our analysis.

(U) The task of defining what intelligence functions, and how much of those functions should be evaluated in the BRAC process is a difficult one. The relationships and interdependencies between functions as they relate to the locations in which they reside are complex, and in some cases undefined. The challenge is to provide a successful footprint alignment that optimizes, and/or enhances our intelligence posture, and provide a foundation to build upon for future intelligence missions.

(U) Whether we use the terms Transformational Options, Analytic Frameworks, or Candidate Scenarios – we are talking about the specific footprint realignment opportunities that the IJCSG analysis will vet. At most, the analysis may lead to specific recommendations of functions to realign, with proper justification of why it is a good idea to do. As a minimum, we may gain insights into the pros and cons of specific realignment alternatives that would prove beneficial input to intelligence restructuring outside the BRAC process. The opportunity in any case, is one that provides a means to highlight intelligence facility and infrastructure needs, and hopefully make appropriate use of BRAC funding in support of the intelligence mission.

(U) The BRAC process has defined guidelines for Transformational Options that are defined as follows:

- (U) Is overarching and notional, without identifying specific installations for analysis
- (U) Has a general and identifiable effect on infrastructure
- (U) Is actionable within the BRAC 2005 process

(U) To move within the BRAC process from Transformation Options to Scenarios, these options would be decomposed to identify the specific footprint installations for analysis. The ISG has requested that each JCSG

provide candidate scenarios to begin the process of defining scenario formats to support the deconfliction process that will be performed later in the BRAC effort. As such, I am requesting that your Core Team representative work with you to identify the specific installations that would be analyzed in support of the candidate transformation options. This information would come from both the data received in the Capacity Data Call, Military Value Data Call, and other insights of specific intelligence components initiatives and constructs.

(U) The attached list of candidate Transformation Options/Analytical Frameworks are for your consideration. They have been derived from direct inputs from the Defense intelligence components, and other constructs such as the National Intelligence Priorities Framework, Remodeling Defense Intelligence (RDI), Strategy for Strengthening Intelligence/PBD 339, and the DoD Strategic Planning Guidance. These have been coordinated and agreed upon by the O/DDCI/CM and OUSD (I). I invite you to submit additional recommendations and comments in preparation for our deliberative principals meeting on August 24, 2004. As the intelligence reform process continues to evolve, we may modify and/or add to these Transformation Options/Analytical Frameworks for consideration in the BRAC process. Please forward your inputs/comments to Ms. Deborah Dunie through your Core Team representative, or via the appropriate classification e-mail system.

(U) To support the deliberative process we plan to initiate weekly meetings starting in September. We will discuss the schedule at the August 24 meeting. Should you have additional questions, contact Ms. Deborah Dunie at 703-614-5942.

Carol A. Haave
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense
(Counterintelligence and Security)
Chair, IJCSG

Attachment:
As stated