

Draft Deliberative Document - For Discussion Purposes Only – Do Not Release Under FOIA

**HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE**
WASHINGTON DC

08 JUL 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR CHAIRMAN, INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING GROUP

SUBJECT: Transformational Options For BRAC 2005 (Yr Memo, 21 Jun 04)

Attached for your use are our comments on the proposed set of transformational options. We understand that our response will be integrated with the views of the other ISG members and form the basis for discussion at a future ISG meeting.

Detailed comments on the "Transformational Options that Can Be Translated Into Scenarios" are at attachment 1. We concur with the deletion of all options listed in the "Transformational Options that Can Not Be Translated Into Scenarios."

We look forward to working closely with you as we shape these transformational options. Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on these options. Our POC for this effort in Col Thomas Fleming, DSN 222-9515.

Handwritten signature of Ronald L. Orr in black ink.

RONALD L. ORR
Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary
of the Air Force
(Installations, Environment & Logistics)

Handwritten signature of T. Michael Moseley in black ink.

T. MICHAEL MOSELEY
General, USAF
Vice Chief of Staff

Attachments as stated

Draft Deliberative Document—For Discussion Purposes Only
Do Not Release Under FOIA

Attachment 1
Transformational Options That Can Be Translated Into Scenarios

1. Delete and replace with #17 and #30. As a minimum, delete the second sentence.

Rationale: 1) Redundant, 2) 2nd sentence is an advertisement rather than a TO.

2. Non-concur as an imperative...okay as JSF TO, but need to specify both the options to examine.

Rationale: Balanced approach. AF trains its maintenance folks in a controlled environment that fosters both learning and military discipline/professional growth.

3. We believe there are actually three TOs here. Recommend 1) separate the three TOs in this paragraph, 2) delete first TO (first sentence) unless we can make a tie to military value and 3) remove reference to 'overseas' in the second one.

Rationale: 1) Clarity, 2) conflicts with imperative, and 3) overseas not germane to BRAC.

4. Recommend delete.

Rationale: Too broad to be accomplished within BRAC, beyond the capability of the TJCSG.

5. Recommend 1) this be separated into three TOs, 2) remove ref to consolidating commissioning sources, and 3) delete the third TO.

Rationale: 1) Too complicated as written, 2) outside scope of JCSGs, and 3) not within with the scope of BRAC.

6. Change to read as follows: "Examine the redistribution of strategic airlift assets to facilitate rapid deployment to the war fight from both east and west coasts."

Rationale: No issues, but other Services would like this to be air only.

7. Change to read as follows: "Co-locate federal DoD, joint, and military department facilities to produce efficiencies in force protection and quality of life services. ~~Opportunities for co-location will most likely present themselves in municipal settings where federal installations already exist, and sufficient adjacent infrastructure is available. If no permanent installations exist then collocation could occur entirely through a leasing agreement. Critical Infrastructure Protection (CIP) must remain a key consideration when evaluating alternatives to relocate/co-locate various facilities. It is imperative that we balance the benefits and risks associated with any effort to transform DoD infrastructure/bases.~~"

Rationale: Consolidating agencies like Dept of Labor and Dept of the Treasury are not within the scope of BRAC. Brevity—removes extraneous words.

8. Recommend 1) War colleges should be exceptions not inclusions and 2) remove last sentence.

Rationale: 1) Violates imperative, 2) extraneous.

11. Change 'combine' to 'collocate' and remove the last sentence.

Rationale: Issue is collocation and last sentence is extraneous.

13. Delete. **Rationale:** Agree with Navy.

14. Delete. **Rationale:** If taken on by JCSG, will tread on Service OT&E responsibilities.

15. Recommend change to read as follows: "Determine alternative facility alignments to execute Reserve Component (RC) headquarters administrative missions and functions. ~~Consider all seven elements of the RC structure. The focus of the analysis will be on the requirements for and capabilities of facilities and installations supporting Reserve and National Guard administrative and headquarters functions, excluding~~

~~state owned and/or controlled facilities of the National Guard. Alternatives should include consideration of combining headquarters and/or moving headquarters to operational bases.~~

Rationale: Clarity and removes extraneous words.

17. Shorten and combine with #18. Rationale: Too long and redundant.

Rationale: #17 and #18 overlap.

18. Shorten and combine with #17. Use "minimize, vice "eliminate" to describe actions outside the NCR.

Rationale: #17 and #18 overlap. There are good reasons to lease in some cases.

~~20. Either delete or remove the extraneous words, for example: "Identify the potential to reduce installation operating costs through inter-service agreements, and consolidations, and elimination of duplicate support services where military bases are located close to one another or where similar functions are performed at multiple locations. Examples: ~~of these services are MWR, public works, public safety, childcare services, housing services, and buildings/grounds/roads maintenance. (GAO Report High Risk Series—Defense Infrastructure, February 1997.)~~ Assess the potential for the increased sharing of bases on an inter-service or intra-service basis to maximize the use of available training ranges and other facilities. The analysis would determine the feasibility of consolidating contracting for services. DoD spending in service contracts approaches \$1B annually, but according to GAO, DoD's management of services' procurement is inefficient and ineffective and the dollars are not well spent. GAO recommended that DoD's approach should provide for an agency-wide view of service contract spending and promote collaboration to leverage buying power across multiple organizations. Possible impact would be a reduction in personnel and office space through possible consolidation of function.~~

Rationale: Brevity, clarity.

21. Either delete or add an option (4) as follows: "(4) Consolidation of military and civilian personnel within Service."

Rationale: Balanced approach to options

~~22. AF: Greatly shorten and offer a finite set of Service and joint options to evaluate, such as: "Evaluate Eestablishing a single inventory control point (ICP) within each Service or consolidating into joint ICPs. While the Navy has a single inventory control point located at two sites, there is an opportunity for significant consolidation of ICPs by all Services. For example, the Air Force has three independent ICPs, each located at their Air Logistics Centers. Consolidating them to a single ICP would permit reduced overhead and headquarters staffing as well streamlining of business practices. However, such a course of action may also include some costs and loss of efficiencies, including union issues, loss of skilled workforce, and the loss of direct interface with customers located at/near ICPs that will no longer exist.~~

Rationale: Readability, clarity

23. Defer to Intel JCSG, but this option may be OBE. If kept, simplify the statement and take out the advertisement as shown, such as follows: "Realign Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) Exploitation & Production Centers. This option focuses on the co-location/basing of ground and signals intelligence systems. ~~Combatant Commanders require Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) as a key component of a multi-source intelligence picture. The joint Regional Security Operations Centers (RSOCs) and service airborne Intelligence Surveillance & Reconnaissance (ISR) systems represent two of the primary SIGINT assets that meet the Combatant Commander's varied intelligence needs. Under the current force alignment, the RSOCs and remoting-capable airborne ISR assets are not located together; the two asset types maintain completely independent exploitation & production centers, maintenance support, and management staff, even when remoting technologies would enable consolidation of such resources. By consolidating the ground systems and staff for the airborne ISR resources with the RSOCs, the Department of Defense can improve the intelligence support to the war fighter while achieving notable efficiencies in infrastructure and personnel resources. These changes will advance the Department toward the goals of achieving information superiority and providing integrated, globally available, and persistent reconnaissance capabilities, as directed in the National Security Strategy, Quadrennial Defense Review, and Joint Vision 2020.~~"

Rationale: Issue may be moot. Clarity.

24. AF: Defer to Intel JCSG, but this option may be OBE. If kept, simplify the statement and take out the advertisement as follows: ~~“Realign Intelligence Support Capabilities. This option focuses on the co-location/basing of ground and airborne intelligence systems. Enabling decision superiority through timely intelligence relies on more than advanced reconnaissance technology. Skilled people are the secret ingredient. The eCollected data can only be transformed into meaningful intelligence when people with world-class linguistic and analytic skills have access to the reconnaissance systems. Accurate forecasts of sensor deployments to different geographic regions are required if each ISR system must maintain an independent analysis and production center. Such forecasting has proven difficult. Furthermore, the current force alignment dilutes mission-critical skills between several geographic locations, creates potential operational discontinuities as intelligence support requirements change, and results in greater overall manpower needs and infrastructure costs. C~~For instance, consolidating ISR ground system operations for the U-2 and RC-12 platforms with the RSOCs not only mitigates these drawbacks of the current posture but also gains new capabilities in providing global, persistent surveillance.

Rationale: Issue may be moot. Clarity.

25. Shorten as follows and combine with #26 if possible: ~~“Evaluate the Defense, Accounting and Finance Service (DFAS) operations. This option seeks to leverage BRAC 2005 to recognize additional workload consolidation, infrastructure reduction, and reductions in the number of DFAS operating locations at which specific functions are performed. While A-76 competitive sourcing is one of the options currently under investigation and implementation is not directly affected by BRAC 2005, implementation of other options such as a High Performing Organization or a Public-Private Partnership could benefit from the opportunities provided under BRAC 2005. Implementation of a High Performing Organization, for example, could result in shifting workload and functions to a location that is currently performing significantly better than other locations and closing the poorer performing sites. Centralization of specific functions at a major site and embedding a small number of DFAS personnel at customer locations is another possibility that results in a reduced infrastructure and facility requirements.”~~

Rationale: Brevity, clarity.

26. Shorten as follows and combine with #25 if possible: ~~“Evaluate security and continuity of operations at Defense Accounting and Finance Service (DFAS) activities. The events of 9/11 highlight security and safety concerns for both DFAS personnel and the financial and accounting data. A number of DFAS’ 26 current operating locations are not located on military installations. Safety and security are in most cases provided by public services (fire, police, etc). Security of each DFAS location should be evaluated and if significant risks are determined to exist and relocation to military installations or DFAS site consolidation considered. With the migration to fewer sites, provisions need to incorporate the requirement to have backup equipment systems, and facility plans that replicate functions in the event of an incident or disaster.”~~

Rationale: Brevity, clarity.

27. Make this AF-only, shorten the text, and include specific examples as follows: “Air Force expand the integration of Guard and Reserve forces with the Active force. of Total Force Units —Examples:

(1) Blended organizations.

(2) /Reserve Associate, Guard Associate, and /Active Associate/

(3) Sponsored Reserve.

(4) Blending of Guard units across state lines to unify mission areas, reduce infrastructure, and improve readiness, while preserving home station control. One idea would be blending across Active/RC and service boundaries to provide regional entities more useful for homeland defense (e.g. one that includes air defense, Army Guard state responders, and interagency links in a single location)

Rationale: Deferred as an imperative per OSD—shifted to TO. Understand this does not apply to other Services. Brevity. Clarity.

28. Combine with #17. **Rationale:** redundancy.

29. Delete. **Rationale:** not within scope of BRAC

31. First choice is to delete. If not, incorporate the following words that apply this TO to the Air Force:

- AF retain the key capabilities for design, development, and testing (DD&T) of air and space armaments/munitions
- AF retain the key capabilities for design, development, and testing (DD&T) of manned and unmanned air and space weapons systems, with the exception of systems that are solely carrier based
- AF retain the key capabilities for design, development, and testing (DD&T) of C4ISR networks required for predictive battlespace awareness, and full spectrum C2 of air and space forces
- **AF retain the key capabilities for S&T related to air and space vehicles and materials, sensors, air and space propulsion, directed energy, and air munitions**

Rationale: Assigning executive agency is not within the scope of BRAC, balanced application to other Services

32. Express as two specific options. **Rationale:** executability.

35. Delete. **Rationale:** outside scope of BRAC.

36. Delete. **Rationale:** duplicates #21

37. Delete. **Rationale:** we already do this.

39. Add a new TO as follows: "Air Force use optimum squadron sizes and crew ratios to maximize effectiveness of weapon systems."

Rationale: Moving this from an imperative to a TO—required for BRAC in AF.

40. Add a new TO as follows: "Establish a "space test range" for satellite ground testing, threat assessment, and tactics development. Elements of the "range" should be networked using a minimum number of ground facilities to virtually simulate on-orbit operations."

Rationale: Transformation option to accommodate 2025 space forces.

41. Add as a TO or imperative: "Consolidate or integrate Service facilities to the minimum required to support the Force Structure Plan, retain Services' core competencies, and capitalize on emerging technologies and warfighting capabilities."

Rationale: combination of several imperatives that needed to be clarified.

Attachment 2, Transformational Options That Cannot Be Translated Into Scenarios

The Air Force concurs with the deletion of all proposed options at Atch 2.

Draft Deliberative Document—For Discussion Purposes Only
Do Not Release Under FOIA