DCN: 12034

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 SOUTH CLARK STREET, SUITE 600
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22202
TELEPHONE: 703-699-2950
FAX: 703-699-2975

Faxed
JM
May 9/05

May 9, 2005

Chairman:
The Honorable Anthony J. Principi

Commissioners:
The Honorable James H. Bilbray
The Honorable Philip E. Coyle III
Admirable Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.)
The Honorable James V. Hansen
General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.)
General Lloyd W. Newton, USAF (Ret.)
The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner
Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)

Executive Director:
Charles Battaglia

The Honorable Donald Rumsfeld
Secretary of Defense
1000 Defense Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-1000

Dear Mr. Secretary:

As a result of the hearing on May 4, 2005, the BRAC Commission is submitting the attached questions for the record.

We would greatly appreciate it if responses are provided to Chairman Principi no later than Thursday, May 12, 2005.

Sincerely,

Charles Battaglia
Executive Director

Questions for the Record
9:30 AM, May 4, 2005 Hearing
Force Structure Plan, Global Posture Review, Quadrennial Review
(Testimony from the Office Secretary of Defense and Office of the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff)

1. Both the integrated Global Posture and Basing Strategy released in September 2004, and the Quadrennial Defense Review requirements and resources for our military forces to move around the world. The Joint Chiefs are now engaged in a Mobility Capabilities Study that will shift to an Analysis of Alternatives this summer as we attempt to determine what mix of land, air and sea mobility assets we need to meet operational requirements. Does the force structure report, and specifically the analysis of excess capacity, account for potential new requirements for transportation hubs and new ports of embarkment for our military forces?

   How would you recommend the Commission address the issue of the infrastructure required to support future force structure if the Defense Department is still in the process of determining what is needed for mobility capabilities?

2. It would seem counterintuitive that in an era where the Department of Defense is stressing capabilities-based planning and the increased flexibility of our force posture world-wide by establishing dozens of new forward operating installations, we would want to constrict our basing and infrastructure in the United States, effectively limiting our flexibility and ability to respond. How will the BRAC process actually contribute to the goals set forth in the force structure plan to transform the Armed Forces to meet the threats to our national security?

   In what ways will the BRAC process result in realignments that contribute to an increase in the flexibility of our force?

3. One of the BRAC criteria refers to the ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and surge requirements. Where in the force structure report is an estimate of the numbers of forces or major force units that would be considered a surge requirement? If not specifically cited in the force structure report, how do you recommend this

Commission take into consideration the planning for, and the physical plans required to support surge requirements?

4. Secretary Rumsfeld told the SASC, 'We do not expect our forces to fight where they are stationed. We know that our forces will need to move to the fight wherever it is." How has the Department integrated analysis and findings from the on-going Mobility Capabilities Study (MCS) to ensure our mobility forces can get our troops to the fight, given that posture decisions are seemingly already made?

5. The Commission is very interested in how has the Department will prepare for the returning troops and their families in such areas as military family housing and schools? How is the Department ensuring that overseas-based troops do not rotate to the CONUS until the receiving bases and communities are ready for them? What oversight efforts are in place? How will the appropriate construction be provided in a timely manner given the current MILCON cycle?

6. No list of overseas bases to be closed has been released to date, although we anticipate an interim list will soon be available. How will the Department coordinate this with the BRAC recommendation?

7. What is the state of planning for the redeployment of troops from overseas to the United States? Have the specific units been identified and a schedule developed? Can the schedule be made available to the BRAC Commission? Will these units be brought home individually as whole divisions, as whole brigades, or at some lower level of command?

8. How will the movement of these troops be funded? Do you expect the BRAC account to pay for this movement, or will funds come out of the defense appropriation? What is the magnitude and timing of the associated costs?

9. Given that the Air Force level of Air Expeditionary Forces remains constant over at least the next six years, does that indicate a great level of success with that number over the last five years.

10. With the development of the AEFs, the Air Force CONUS basing approach has changed measurably since the last round of BRAC. Does this arrangement increase or decrease your basing requirements. Does this arrangement give the Department of Defense more or less Joint Cross Service options?

11. Will a greater emphasis on Joint Service assignment allow the Department to reduce previously independent infrastructure like training, research and logistics?

12. In response to a question during testimony regarding the Commission's concerns regarding the timing of BRAC with the Quadrennial Review, Mr. Henry mentioned that since this particular QDR is based more on determining capabilities rather than forces, the Department's BRAC process has a baseline with which to make the recommendations to the Commission. He further stated that the final QDR recommendations would be adjusted to the final BRAC directed basing structure prior to submittal to the Congress in next year's budget cycle. Does this imply that the Commission's recommendations could play a role in the Department's Force Structure and stationing plan for the next twenty years? If so, is this appropriate?

DCN: 12034

Summary of Basic Documents and Related Materials Being Returned

OSD-Legislative Affairs:	Classification:	OSDLA-Control No:	Date Received:
Document Control Record	Unclassified	20050076	May 9, 2005

Committee Number:	Hearing Dates:
0	May 4, 2005

Committee:
BRAC Commission

Subject:
Force Structure Plan, Global Posture Review, Quadrennial Review

Witness
No

OPR:	Committee Suspense Date:	Close Out Date:
OSD/LA	July 18, 2005	August 22, 2005

Document Type:	Page Inventory:	Document Description:
Questions for the Record		08/22/05 - Sent VADM Chanik QFRs 1,2,3, Mr. Ryan Henry 5,8, OSD #11 to cmte.

BRAC Commission
Attention: Battaglia Charles
Location: 2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Receiving Officer Signature:_____ Date:_____

Hearing Date: 4 May 2005
Committee: BRAC Commission
Member:
Witness: VADM Chanik
Question: #1

Question: Both the Integrated Global Posture and Basing Strategy released in September 2004, and the Quadrennial Defense Review requirements and resources for our military forces to move around the world. The Joint Chiefs are now engaged in a Mobility Capabilities Study that will shift to an Analysis of Alternatives this summer as we attempt to determine what mix of land, air and sea mobility assets we need to meet operational requirements. Does the force structure report, and specifically the analysis of excess capacity, account for potential new requirements for transportation hubs and new ports of embarkment for our military forces?

How would you recommend the Commission Address the issue of the infrastructure required to support future force structure if the Defense Department is still in the process of determining what is needed for mobility capabilities?

Answer: Over the past 2 years, the Department of Defense has orchestrated four major efforts that work in concert with each other: Global Posture, Mobility Capabilities Study, Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and Quadrennial Defense Review. No effort is being conducted in isolation and the same strategic environment and the National Defense Strategy, which formed the basis for the 20-year Force Structure Plan, influence them all. Due to this linkage we do not anticipate wholesale changes in strategy or force structure as a result of the Mobility Capabilities Study or any other effort.

Our analysis of excess capacity was a key part of our surge analysis. Surge was considered in all three stages of the BRAC process: capacity analysis, military value analysis, and scenario analysis. The Department of Defense ensured surge capability by retaining assets that would be difficult and expensive to reconstitute. In addition, each Service retained sufficient infrastructure to both support the 20-year Force Structure Plan and meet foreseeable surge requirements.

Each of the Military Departments examined surge capacity as part of the BRAC analysis. With regards to mobility capabilities and transportation hubs, the Air Force has sufficient surge capacity to deal with variations in the future force structure. The Air Force looked at surge from three perspectives: local, regional, and strategic. Local surge accommodates requirements at individual bases such as operational peaks in local training and mobilization operations. Regional surge accommodates inter-base surge needs such as runway closures and hurricane evacuations. Strategic surge accommodates uncertainties such as those you describe. For instance, we have run the worldwide AF force structure against the BRAC-recommended combination of bases and it can be easily accommodated.

Hearing Date: 4 May 2005
Committee: BRAC Commission
Member:
Witness: VADM Chanik
Question: #2

Question: It would seem counterintuitive that in an era where the DOD is stressing capabilities-based planning and the increased flexibility of our force posture world-wide by establishing dozens of new forward operating installations, we would want to constrict our basing and infrastructure in the United States, effectively limiting our flexibility and ability to respond. How will the BRAC process actually contribute to the goals set forth in the force structure plan to transform the Armed Forces to meet the threats to our national security?

In what ways will the BRAC process result in realignments that contribute to an increase in the flexibility of our force?

Answer: BRAC matches infrastructure to the needs of the future force providing a foundation of transformation. BRAC facilitates the transformation of the Department of Defense by melding like operations of separate Services, accommodating a redeploying force structure, and anticipating tomorrow's uncertainties by providing surge capacity in operations, training, and logistics. In addition, BRAC allowed the Department of Defense to enhance combat effectiveness by implementing opportunities for greater joint activity and improving joint operations by co-locating and combining training, technology, laboratory, depot maintenance, and supply chain management operations of the separate Services.

Hearing Date: 4 May 2005
Committee: BRAC Commission
Member:
Witness: VADM Chanik
Question: #3

Question: One of the BRAC criteria refers to the ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and surge requirements. Where in the force structure report is an estimate of the numbers of forces or major force units that would be considered a surge requirement?

If not specifically cited in the force structure report, how do you recommend this Commission take into consideration the planning for, and the physical plans required to support surge requirements?

Answer: In considering surge we recommend the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission model their analysis along the lines of the structured approach used by the Services and the Joint Cross Service Groups. The deliberative analysis process is outlined below. Surge was considered in all three stages of the process:

Capacity Analysis. Identified excess capacity and allowed the Military Departments and Joint Cross Service Groups (JCSGs) to assess available surge capacity.

Military Value Analysis. DOD infrastructure was evaluated using the approved and published selection criteria. Two of eight BRAC selection criteria relate to surge capacity and were key in DOD decision-making processes. Criteria 1 requires the Department of Defense to consider "current and future" mission capabilities. Criteria 3 assesses the "ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization and future total force requirements." The Ronald Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005 amended the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, to specify the selection criteria. The amendment revised the previously published SecDef approved criteria by adding the word "surge" to criterion 3. By appropriately weighting criteria attributes and metrics, Military Departments and JCSGs ensured surge was appropriately reflected in military value analysis.

Scenario Analysis. The Department analyzed alternative configurations against the 20-year Force Structure Plan and selection criteria to reach the final recommendations. In its analysis, the Department of Defense ensured surge capability by retaining assets that would be difficult and expensive to reconstitute (e.g., infrastructure that is not readily or commercially available for military use, such as maneuver land).

Hearing Date: May 4, 2005
Committee: BRAC Commission
Witness: Mr. Ryan Henry
Question # 5

Global Posture Review

Question: The Commission is very interested in how the Department will prepare for returning troops and their families in such areas as military family housing and schools? How is the Department ensuring that overseas-based troops do not rotate to the CONUS until the receiving bases and communities are ready for them? What oversight efforts are in place? How will the appropriate considerations be provided in a timely manner given the current MILCON cycle?

Answer: For the Integrated Global Presence Basing Strategy (IGPBS) actions occurring at installation affected by the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) process, the Army will fully integrate the IGPBS component of the recommendation into the BRAC implementation plans. The Army will plan for all functional components of the requirement to include the support facilities. The completion of the facilities and the ability of the Army to support the incoming soldiers and their families are integral to the planning process. For BRAC implementation, the Army must plan and present the entire six year implementation plan in the initial budget justification book. The Army Installation Management Agency and the property-holding major commands (MACOMs) will formulate the BRAC implementation plans that will be reviewed and staffed by the Army BRAC Division and approved by the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Housing (DASA(IH)).

Hearing Date: May 4, 2005
Committee: BRAC Commission
Witness: Mr. Ryan Henry
Question # 8

Global Posture Review

Question: How will the movement of these troops be funded? Do you expect the BRAC account to pay for this movement, or will funds come out of the defense appropriation? What is the magnitude and timing of the associated costs?

Answer: BRAC funds will be used to move those CONUS-based troops affected by the BRAC recommendations. The movement of Army units and troops from OCONUS locations will be funded from Army operating accounts. The Army can not estimate costs and timing until the implementation plans are complete.

Hearing Date: May 4, 2005
Committee: BRAC Commission
Member: Chairman Principi
Witness: OSD
Question # 11

Question: Will a greater emphasis on Joint Service assignment allow the Department to reduce previously independent infrastructure like training, research and logistics?

Answer: Yes. The BRAC 2005 Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group (E&T JCSG) provided 13 candidate recommendations for consolidation or closure which were ultimately approved and forwarded - nine under the aegis of the E&T JCSG and four wrapped into military department recommendations. The Secretary of Defense list included the recommended establishment of joint centers of excellence for several functional education and training areas (e.g., religion, culinary, transportation management, combat service support, aviation logistics, and air defense artillery). Should these recommendations be approved, there will be future reductions in independent Service infrastructure. These savings are factored into the overall BRAC 2005 program. Details on all E&T JCSG recommendations are available via the BRAC website on the DefenseLink.