

DCN: 2176

31 March 2005

**Headquarters and Support Activities JCSG 2<sup>nd</sup> Briefing Notes**

**Date:** Monday, March 28, 2005

**Time:** 16:00-18:00

**Place:** 3E808

**JCSG Chairman:** Mr. Don Tison, Deputy G-8, US Army

**JCSG Executive Secretary:** COL Carla Coulson, US Army

**JCSG Key Attendees:**

- Mr. Don Tison (SES), Chairman & USA Member
- Mr. Bill Davidson (SES), USAF Member
- Mr. Howard Becker (SES), OSD Member
- Mr. Mike Rhodes (SES), USMC Member
- RDML Jan Gaudio, USN Member
- Col Dan Woodward, (USAF) Joint Staff Member
- COL Carla Coulson (USA), Deputy to Mr. Tison
- CAPT Mike Langohr (USN), Deputy to RDML Gaudio
- Mr. Doug McCoy (USAF), Deputy to Mr. Davidson
- Col Steve Snipes (USAF), Deputy to Mr. Rhodes
- COL Charlie Sachs HSA JCSG
- LTC Ty Brown HSA JCSG
- LTC Chris Hill (USA), OIC-Analytical Team
- Ms. Elisa Turner HSA JCSG
- Ms. Deborah Culp IG

**Red Team Attendees:**

- Honorable H.T. Johnson
- Mr. John Turnquist

**Subject:** *Second* Candidate Recommendation Briefing by Headquarters and Support Activities JCSG to BRAC Red Team

**Presenters:** Mr. Don Tison, LTC Chris Hill, and COL Carla Coulson

**Items of Import:**

- The guiding principles were a point of discussion in all reports.
- As of right now, 48 candidate recommendations have been approved by ISG.
- Memorandum in approximately November of 2003 stresses the need to move out of the NCR or outside of 100 mile radius of the Pentagon.
- The requirement that leased space be AT/FP compliant by 2009 was a consideration for recommendations concerning the NCR.
- All data issues have been resolved.
- With Mobilization data excess capacity is 26.65%. Without Mobilization data, which is highly variable (MOB excess equals 87.16%), excess capacity is 26.61%
- Military Value runs hopefully will be completed the first week of April.

**Questions that arose:**

- Are there any reductions in people? *Technical JCSG has some responsibility for people reductions.*
- Does everyone support this (HSA-0047)? *Yes, we had conversations with MDA and SMDC.*
- Has the database been closed? *No, as a group finishes, we close that group. So closing as you go rather than in total? Yes.*
- What does it mean that the “Navy will assume responsibility for the execution of” BOS and SRM? Is that true for all? *No, for example Pope is closing so that will be real estate transfer.*
- Is that a first – to move Military personnel to Federal Bureau of Prisons? *No, we have previous instances of this.*
- Support to CoCom in contingencies? *Yes.*
- Is there any synergism between this (HSA-0131) and the FBI? *We believe so; they will all be located on the part of Quantico that is on the west side of 95.*
- That’s going to be where (HSA-0099)? *At Ft. Meade.*
- What makes up Ventura? *Point Mugu and Port Hueneme.* What else is at Port Hueneme? *Seabee support.*
- You call this joint, but isn’t it really just the Army (HSA-0133)? *Yes. But the Marines mobilize after training? Yes, but this doesn’t preclude that.*
- Will that be part of STRATCOM? *No, co-located, and there are concerns as to whether Omaha can support the move to Offutt.*
- Who are you co-locating with in this recommendation (HSA-0071)? *AFIS – American Forces Information Service.*
- Isn’t there still an AT/FP problem at Patuxent River (HSA-0077)?
- So IMA will be at 2 locations? *Yes, Ft. Sam Houston and Ft. Eustis.* And contracting will be co-located? *Yes.*
- But some of MSC is not part of TRANSCOM? *Correct, in fact the largest part is not.*
- How are you going to put this into BRAC terms (HSA-0114)?
- For which function is this military value? To what function do these quantitative military value scores refer (HSA-0130)?

**Informal Observations provided at briefing:**

- Should really start with your strategy and fold in guiding principles and “transformational options”.
- Rename the 5<sup>th</sup> slide currently titled “Eliminate Redundancy, Duplication, and Excess Capacity” – this is really your Strategy.
- The term “4<sup>th</sup> estate” is unclear. Re-word HSA-0106. Justification for vacating leased space needs to be stronger and any directives to do so should be clearly documented.
- Verify that the BRAC statute recognizes leased space as an installation.
- Put HSA-0069 in BRAC format. For example, “Realign Ft. Belvoir...” as opposed to “Realign 15 leased installations...”.
- In the Military Value block of quad chart, “favored” is a poor choice of words in the military judgment sentence for HSA-0130. Re-word this sentence.
- Have to be careful how you define your success? If getting out of leased space and getting outside 100 mile radius of Pentagon are your goals, then with Anacostia or

Andrews you only meet one condition. Tie this slide back to your strategy and show how you succeeded and followed strategy.

- There is a typographical error in the Red Team’s advanced copy of the briefing on the “How do we define success” slide – last bullet point said “About 3 of 48 ...” as opposed to “About 32 of 48...”
- Integration of the story will be difficult and you need to make sure the facts are presented, properly caveated, and avoid giving the commission the ability to say, “You substantially deviated from the force structure plan and/or the final selection criteria.”

**Additional observations to consider:**

- Almost all candidate recommendations are not in the correct format for submission. Ensure that all candidate recommendations are in the following format:

BRAC Action	where	by what	to where	and retaining what
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Close</li> <li>• Realign</li> <li>• Inactivate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• losing installation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• moving</li> <li>• relocating</li> <li>• consolidating</li> <li>• privatizing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• gaining installation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• enclaves</li> <li>• functions</li> <li>• activities</li> </ul>

- Justification phrases should be removed from candidate recommendation statements.
- Actions that are independent of each other should not be lumped together into the same candidate recommendation.
- During the integration process, need to add retained actions (if any) at each losing installation.
- Since transformation is not one of the final selection criteria, transformational justifications have no legal basis and should be removed. These candidate recommendations should be justified in terms of military value or the force structure plan.
- Candidate recommendations should be organized in presentation in the following order:
  - Tier I: Traditional BRAC – Military value applied, net savings, capacity reduction.
  - Tier II: Strategy Driven – Military judgment applied, net savings, capacity reduction.
  - Tier III: Operationally Driven – Military judgment overrides, net savings.
  - Tier IV: Transformationally Driven – No military value justification, military judgment sole rationale, not cost effective, long paybacks.