DCN: 9251

Staff Summary Sheet

	To	Action	Signature (Surname), Grade, Date		To	Action	Signature (Surname), Grade, Date
1	SAF/IE	COORD	3 Dec 03	4	AF/CC	APPR	
2	AF/CVA	COORD	Brown Lt Gen, 3 Dec 03	5	SAF/US	COORD	12/3/03
3	AF/CV	COORD		6	SAF/OS	APPR	12/4

Grade and Surname of Action Officer	Symbol	Phone	Suspense Date
Lt Col Kapellas	SAF/IEBB	692-9510 697-2524	4 December 2003

Subject	SSS Date
Package (RED) Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Selection Criteria	2 December 2003

Summary

1. Purpose. To seek SecAF and CSAF approval on the Action Memo at Tab 1, as transmitted by DepSecDef memo at Tab 2.

2. Background. The BRAC 2005 Infrastructure Executive Group (IEC) is requested to approve proposed BRAC 2005 selection criteria (Tab 2). Both the SecAF and CSAF are members of the IEC, along with their counterparts in the other Military Departments. By law, the SecDef is required to publish draft criteria in the Federal Register not later than 31 Dec 03, then after a public comment period, publish final BRAC 2005 selection criteria NLT 16 Feb 04. The AF members of the Infrastructure Steering Group – AF/CV and SAF/IE level -- reviewed an earlier draft of these selection criteria and requested significant changes (Tabs 3 and 4). Their concerns have been resolved, and concur with this version of the draft selection criteria as presented in Tab 2.

3. Recommendation. SecAF and CSAF approve BRAC 2005 draft selection criteria by initialing at Tab 1.

Michael A. Aimone
MICHAEL A. AIMONE, P.E.
Deputy Assistant Secretary
(Basing & Infrastructure Analysis)

Tabs

1. DepSecDef Action Memo, Selection Criteria, 1 Dec 03
2. DepSecDef Memo, Selection Criteria, 1 Dec 03
3. SAF/IE Memo, Selection Criteria, 4 Nov 03
4. AF/CVA Memo, Selection Criteria, 20 Nov 03

ACTION MEMO

TO: SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

FROM: Honorable Paul Wolfowitz, Deputy Secretary of Defense

SUBJECT: Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Selection Criteria

- The BRAC statute requires the use of public selection criteria in the analytical process. Selection criteria are important because they, along with the force structure plan, are the basis on which the Commission judges DoD recommendations.

- DoD must publish draft criteria in the *Federal Register* by December 31, 2003, for a thirty day comment period. DoD has until February 16, 2004 to review public comments, and publish and provide the criteria to Congress. Unless disapproved by an Act of Congress, the criteria become final on March 15, 2004.

- The BRAC statute specifies that the selection criteria must make military value the primary consideration. It also lists specific considerations that military value must include and special considerations that the selection criteria must address (TAB B).

- The draft selection criteria (TAB C) comply with statutory requirements and build on the construct used successfully in past rounds – broad, flexible statements that provide structure without restricting creativity. The eight criteria that were proven and accepted in past rounds have only been changed to incorporate legislative direction and to stress the Department's capabilities based approach to performing missions.

  - Using the previous criteria as the baseline maintains a broad framework for the BRAC 2005 analysis and avoids raising questions about how we will conduct the analysis or suspicions of predetermined results.

- The way these criteria will be used in the analysis will be addressed through policy to be issued by the Infrastructure Steering Group, chaired by the Acting AT&L.

- I recommend you approve these criteria for publication in the Federal Register and use in BRAC 2005.

COORD: IEC Members and GC

RECOMMENDATION: _____Approve_____Disapprove _____Other

Attachments: As stated

SECAF

CSAF

DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

1010 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1010

DEC 1 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR INFRASTRUCTURE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEMBERS
GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SUBJECT: Base Realignment and Closure Selection Criteria

The Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) statute requires the Department to develop selection criteria to use in its analytical process. The selection criteria are important because they, along with the force structure plan, are the basis on which the Commission judges the Department's recommendations. Not later than December 31, 2003, the Department must publish draft selection criteria in the *Federal Register* for a thirty day public comment period. After the public comment period the Department must submit the final criteria to the congressional defense committees, and publish them in the *Federal Register*, by February 16, 2004. Unless the criteria are disapproved by an Act of Congress, they become final on March 15, 2004.

The Infrastructure Steering Group recommends the attached draft selection criteria. I believe these criteria comply with all statutory requirements and are broad enough to support the Department's BRAC analysis. I request that you review and coordinate on both the attached action memorandum to the Secretary of Defense and the draft selection criteria.

Please provide your coordination and any comments to the OSD BRAC Office by December 5, 2003.

Paul Wolfowitz

Attachments:
As Stated

U19580 /03

Draft Selection Criteria

Military Value

1. The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the Department of Defense's total force, including impacts on joint warfighting, training, and readiness.

2. The availability and condition of land, facilities and associated airspace, including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions, at both existing and potential receiving locations.

3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations and training.

4. The cost of operations and manpower implications.

Other Considerations

5. The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.

6. The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.

7. The ability of both the existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions and personnel.

8. The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities.

DCN: 9251

Deliberative Document-For Discussion Pruposes Only-Do Not Release Under FOIA

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON DC

0 4 NOV 2003

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

MEMORANDUM FOR UNDERSECRETARY OF DEFENSE
(ACQUISITION, TECHNOLOGY & LOGISTICS)

FROM: SAF/IE

SUBJECT: Coordination of Draft Selection Criteria (Yr Memo, 22 Oct 03)

Non-concur with subject draft selection criteria. My discussions with Staff and Members of Congress as they debated the BRAC 2005 legislation and subsequently, along with personal research, convince me that the Congress expects the Department to approach BRAC 2005 in a fundamentally different way from previous BRAC rounds. Secretary Rumsfeld's position is equally clear, stating in his kick off memo, Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure, that "BRAC 2005 can make an even more profound contribution to transforming the Department by rationalizing our infrastructure with defense strategy." The "Selection Criteria" is the first public document mandated by Congress in BRAC 2005 and it's critical that we get it right. Congress expected change, not adoption of the past processes and procedures. I offer two specific comments regarding the draft selection criteria.

First, I believe eliminating Criterion 4 would reduce the ambiguity and uncertainty in measuring cost and manpower implications. Cost and manpower considerations are already embedded in Military Value--specifically in Criteria 1 and 3--and development of metrics for measuring Criteria 1 and 3 will, by its very nature, include cost and manpower implications. At a minimum, I believe that Criterion 4 should be rewritten to limit its scope to manpower implications. The rewritten criterion would be: Criterion 4: The manpower implications associated with current and future mission requirements.

Second, the general category Return on Investment should be changed to Other Considerations, and Criteria 5, 6, 7 and 8 should all be included within this heading. This makes the selection criteria more consistent with §2913. Additionally, Criterion 5 must be rewritten to ensure we consider both the concept of cost, savings and payback, as outlined in §2913, as well as accepted economic principles that incorporate the time value of money, specifically the use of Net Present Value analysis in the decision-making process. I suggest: Criterion 5: The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment actions, for the savings to exceed cost, using accepted Net Present Value analytic techniques.

Congress specifically added language (§2913) outlining their views on selection criteria. The subject draft, by merely appending §2913 language to each selection criterion used in the

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

past BRAC round, does not in my view meet the Congressional intent for a fundamentally transformational approach to BRAC 2005.

I am available to discuss this issue at your convenience.

NELSON F. GIBBS
Assistant Secretary
(Installations, Environment & Logistics)

cc:
ISG Members

DCN: 9251

DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT-FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF

WASHINGTON, DC

20 November 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR UNDERSECRETRY OF DEFENSE (AT&L)

FROM: AF/CVA

SUBJECT: Coordination of Draft Selection Criteria (Your Memo, 22 Oct 03)

Concur, with two substantive comments, on the subject draft selection criteria.

First, we believe cost and manpower considerations are already embedded in Military Value and that development of metrics for measuring Criteria 1 and 3 will include cost and manpower implications. You should rewrite Criterion 4 to properly limit it to the manpower implications and/or move it from Military Value to the next section of the criteria. An alternative Criterion could be: Criterion 4: The manpower implications associated with current and future mission requirements.

Second, we suggest that the general category Return on Investment, be changed to Special Considerations, and that Criteria 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 be included within this new heading. This makes the selection criteria more consistent with §2913. Additionally, Criterion 5 must be rewritten to ensure we consider both the concept of cost, savings, and payback, as outlined in §2913, as well as accepted economic principles that incorporate the time value of money (e.g., the use of Net Present Value calculations). We suggest: Criterion 5: The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment alternatives, for the savings to exceed cost, using accepted Net Present Value economic considerations.

FOR THE CHIEF OF STAFF

Richard E. Brown III

RICHARD E. BROWN III
Lieutenant General, USAF
Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel

cc:
SAF/IE
ISG Members

DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT-FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY
NOT RELEASABLE UNDER FOIA

DCN: 9251

RED Not To Exceed 10 Day Action **RED**

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
OF THE AIR FORCE

SECAF TASKER

DATE: 2 Dec 03 SUSPENSE: 4 Dec 03

TO: HAF/ES SECAF POC: Lt Col Beierle

OPR: IE OCR:

SUBJECT: Base Realignment and Closure Selection Criteria

☐ Memo for SECAF Signature

☐ Direct Reply

☐ Email directly to SECAF w/copy to CC, CV and CVA

☐ Appropriate Action

☐ Recommendation on SAF/OS attendance

☐ Provide Event Brief directly to _____

☐ Provide Read Ahead or Talking Points to _____

☐ Information Only

☒ Other (SEE BELOW)

Comments: IE is preparing a single Air Force response for SECAF to send to DEPSECDEF on behalf of SECAF and CSAF, the Air Force members of the Infrastructure Executive Council. No supporting documents are attached to this task sheet due to sensitivity of BRAC documents.

RED Not To Exceed 10 Day Action **RED**