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

DCN: 8994

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,
TECHNOLOGY

DEC 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING GROUP MEMBERS
CHAIRMEN, JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUPS

SUBJECT: Submittal of BRAC 2005 Candidate Recommendations

This memorandum provides guidance on submitting and documenting BRAC 2005 candidate recommendations. As we discussed at the November 19, 2004, Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG) meeting, Joint Cross-Service Groups (JCSGs) and the Military Departments should provide their candidate recommendations by December 20, 2004, and January 20, 2005, respectively.

In order to ensure consistency of submissions across the Department, I have attached two templates and a set of definitions for your use in preparing candidate recommendation packages. Attachment 1 provides the overall structure for writing a candidate recommendation and lists the supporting documentation that must accompany it. This summary report will be provided to the ISG as a read ahead for each candidate recommendation, prior to its consideration by the ISG. Attachment 2 is the quad chart template previously briefed at the October 1, 2004, ISG meeting. This format will be used for presenting the candidate recommendations to the ISG and will also be included in the read ahead preceding consideration. Attachment 3 provides a list of definitions to use when writing candidate recommendations.

Each candidate recommendation must be declared legally sufficient by counsel prior to its submission to the ISG. For the JCSGs, please ensure that your process to approve candidate recommendations includes this legal review by the ISG/JCSG legal counsel, Mrs. Nicole Bayert, Office of General Counsel, (703) 693-4842. For the Military Departments, please have your legal counsel attest to the legal sufficiency of your candidate recommendations.

To allow for a less encumbered review process, I encourage you to submit your candidate recommendations as soon as they are ready, rather than waiting until the due date or until you have completed all that you intend to submit. Using the "Plan for Submission of Candidate Recommendations" slide at attachment 4, please forward to me, by December 2, 2004, the dates on which you anticipate submitting candidate recommendations and the estimated total number you plan to submit on each date.

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

Finally, if you have any concerns that may jeopardize your ability to provide candidate recommendations by these due dates, please identify those concerns to me by memorandum. If you have any questions, please contact Peter Potochney, Director, BRAC, at (703) 614-5356.

Michael W. Wynne
Acting USD (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics)
Chairmen, Infrastructure Steering Group

Attachments:
As stated

Candidate Recommendation #_____

(Use number from scenario tracking tool)

Candidate Recommendation: Fully describe the candidate closure or realignment. Specify the functions, activities, units, or organizations that will be eliminated or relocated. Identify the receiving locations, if applicable. Describe any functions, activities, units, or organizations that will remain on the installation.

Justification: Explain the reasons for the candidate recommendation (i.e., force structure reductions; mission consolidation, collocation or elimination; excess capacity; jointness; etc).

Payback: In accordance with the guidance and narrative format contained in the Policy Memo on selection criteria 5, describe the COBRA payback projections. Include total estimated one-time cost to implement; net of all costs and savings during the implementation period; annual recurring savings after implementation (including number of years for payback); and the net present value of the costs and savings over 20 years. If a candidate recommendation affects another Federal agency, include the statement that describes how the Department has taken into account the effect on the costs of this agency when making this recommendation, as required by Section 2913(d) of the BRAC statute.

Impacts: In accordance with the applicable Policy Memoranda, describe the criteria 6-8 (economic, community, and environmental) results.

Supporting Information (Provide as an attachment to the above):

- Specify, using scenario tracking tool numbers, any potential or known competing recommendations. Include any information you think would be relevant to the ISG in determining which candidate it should recommend for approval.
- Force Structure Capabilities. Describe how this candidate recommendation ensures the Department has the capabilities necessary to support the force structure plan. Explain the correlation between the units, probable end-strength, and anticipated funding levels listed in the force structure plan and the configuration of facilities supporting your functional areas that result from all your candidate recommendations.
- Military Value Analysis Results. Array the military value scores for all facilities performing the function that is the subject of the recommendation. Describe the effect of this candidate on the overall military value of the function and the role of military judgment.
- Capacity Analysis Results. Array the initial capacity analysis results for all facilities performing the function that is the subject of the recommendation.

Attachm

Candidate # (Use # from Scenario Tracking Tool)

Candidate Recommendation: Fully describe the candidate closure or realignment.

Justification	Military Value
✓ Explain the reasons for the candidate recommendation (i.e., force structure reductions; mission consolidation, collocation, or elimination; excess capacity; jointness; etc)	✓ Overall effect on military value ✓ Relative military value against its peers ✓ Military judgment
Payback	**Impacts**
✓ Criterion 5 (COBRA) results	✓ Criteria 6-8 (Economic, Community and Environmental)

✓ Strategy
❑ COBRA
❑ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
❑ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
❑ JCSG/MilDep Recommended
❑ Criteria 6-8 Analysis
❑ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
❑ De-conflicted w/MilDeps

Attachment # 2

BRAC 2005
DEFINITIONS

Candidate Recommendation: A scenario that a JCSG or Military Department has formally analyzed against all eight selection criteria and which it recommends to the ISG and IEC respectively for SecDef approval. A JCSG Candidate Recommendation must be approved by the ISG, IEC, and SecDef before it becomes a Recommendation. A Military Department Candidate Recommendation must be approved by the IEC and SecDef before it becomes a Recommendation.

Close: Any action that ceases or relocates all current missions of an installation and eliminates or relocates all current personnel positions (military, civilian and contractor), except for personnel required for caretaking, conducting any ongoing environmental cleanup, or property disposal. Retention of a small enclave, not associated with the main mission of the base, is still a closure.

Co-locate: A description of an action that implements a closure or realignment action that stations functions and/or activities at the same site where they will share existing assets.

Consolidate: A description of an action that implements a closure or realignment action that combines one or more functions or activities. Normally includes a decrease of civilian or military personnel.

Disestablish: Any action that ceases a mission, function, or activity of an installation.

Establish: Any action that creates a mission, function, or activity on an installation

Idea: A concept for stationing and supporting forces and functions that lacks the specificity of a proposal. A transformational option is an idea.

Leaseback: A property conveyance authority under which the Department of Defense may transfer non-surplus BRAC property, by deed or through a lease in furtherance of conveyance, to a Local Redevelopment Authority who then leases the property back to the Federal Department or Agency for its continued use. The property conveyed may be entire parcels and/or individual buildings or structures. The transfer requires that the leaseback must be for no rent to satisfy a Federal need for the property. Leaseback may be used in conjunction with a closure or realignment.

Attachment 3

Losing Installation: An installation from which missions, units or activities have ceased or been relocated pursuant to a closure or realignment recommendation. An installation can be a losing installation for one recommendation and a receiving installation for a different recommendation.

Military Installation: A base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport facility for any ship, or other activity under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, including any leased facility. Such term does not include any facility used primarily for civil works, rivers and harbors projects, flood control, or other projects not under the primary jurisdiction or control of the Department of Defense.

Privatize: A method of closure or realignment that ceases government performance of a mission in favor of reliance on the private sector to perform that mission. When privatizing, the government disposes of associated assets and resources independent of the privatization action. Privatize does not include Outsourcing.

Privatize-in-place: A method of closure or realignment that ceases government performance of a mission in favor of reliance on the private sector to perform that mission at the former military installation. When privatizing-in-place, the government disposes of associated assets and resources to the private sector entity that agrees to perform the mission at the privatized location.

Proposal: A description of one or more potential closure or realignment actions that have not been declared as a scenario for formal analysis by either a JCSG or a Military Department. Normally includes detail on the transfer of units, missions or other work activity; facilities or locations that would close or lose such effort; facilities or locations that would gain from the losing locations; tenants or other missions or functions that would be affected by the action. A proposal can come from Ideas or options derived from Optimization Tools. Proposals must be catalogued at the JCSG or MilDep level for tracking

Realignment: Includes any action that both reduces and relocates functions and civilian personnel positions, but does not include a reduction in force resulting from workload adjustments, reduced personnel or funding levels, or skill imbalances.

Receiving Installation: An installation to which missions, units or activities have been relocated pursuant to a closure or realignment recommendation. An installation can be a receiving installation for one recommendation and a losing installation for a different recommendation.

Recommendation: A Candidate Recommendation approved by the SecDef.

Relocate: A description of an action that moves functions, missions, units, activities, or personnel positions from one location to another.

Scenario: A proposal that has been declared for formal analysis by a Military Department/JCSG deliberative body. The content of a scenario is the same as the content of a proposal. The only difference is that it has been declared for analysis by a deliberative body. Once declared, a scenario is registered at the ISG by inputting it into the ISG BRAC Scenario Tracking Tool.

Scenario Analysis: The process to formally evaluate a scenario against all eight selection criteria.

Plan for Submission of Candidate Recommendations

JCSG	Dates to ISG	# of Candidate Recommendations on each date
Army		
Navy		
Air Force		
E&T		
H&SA		
IND		
INT		
MED		
S&S		
TECH		

Attachment 4