

DCN: 2178

10 February 2005

**Industrial JCSG Briefing Notes**

**Date:** Friday, February 4, 2005

**Time:** 15:00-16:00

**Place:** 3E1019

**JCSG Chairman:** Acting USD (AT&L) Honorable Michael Wynne

**JCSG Executive Secretary:** Mr. Jay Berry

**JCSG Key Attendees:**

- RADM Bill Klemm, Naval Sea Systems Command, Logistics, Maintenance and Industrial Operations Directorate
- Mr. Allen Beckett, Associate Director for Maintenance, USAF
- Ms. Willie Smith

**Red Team Attendees:**

- Honorable H.T. Johnson
- Honorable Robin Pirie
- General Leon Salomon
- Mr. John Turnquist

**Subject:** Candidate Recommendation Briefing by Industrial JCSG to BRAC Red Team

**Presenter:** Honorable Michael Wynne

**Items of import:**

- Functional breakout: munitions, maintenance, ship overhaul and repair
- Utilized tools: optimization model, IVT, COBRA
- Be aware there are some negative paybacks
- Contingencies/followers/enablers are exist and are clearly noted

**Questions that arose:**

- Data Security (Johnson and Salomon)
  - One individual gate-keeper
  - Data will be available to Commission and Congress
  - Updates were made to a copy, to double check for mistakes, then originals were changed
- Specific data question: Labor Rates (Salomon)
  - Not often similar estimates across services, how were these reconciled/verified?
    - Suggestion made to make chart to explain how labor rates were made comparable across depots/installations/services
- Combat field support – new terminology (Salomon)
  - Included all non-deployable intermediate
    - Suggestion made to not use this term, as it is unclear what it means
- Did 50-50 play into recommendations? (Salomon)
- Does intermediate follow the fleet? *Yes.* (Johnson)
- How did you ensure you accounted for all IM activity, the universe?
  - Depot work done at non-depot centers

- How did you handle special repair activities? Is this depot repair? (Salomon)
- What are the time limits on CDM closure/missions completeness?
  - RE: does this follow the BRAC rule for being completed in 6 year time frame?
  - Furthermore, how do these closures fit into strategy?

**Informal observations provided at briefing:**

- Refrain from using new terminology like combat field support
- BRAC goals should be your strategy while stated strategy should be your approach
- Strategy is what you want to keep as it falls in line with the FSP

**Additional observations to consider:**

- IND – 0024: Does not seem to be consistent with strategy. There is a stated strategy to consolidate depots with intermediate-level ship maintenance activities. Relationship of working capital fund accounting conversion and application of criteria 1-4 is very unclear.
- IND – 0030: Criteria 7 indicates increased housing cost in San Diego. By policy, criteria 7 examines “the availability if both the existing and potential receiving communities infrastructure to support the force, missions, and personnel.” BAH allowance adjust for differing cost of housing expenses, does it not?
- IND – 0096: Should strengthen ties to strategy justification to better explain why a realignment of \$15K NPV and 18 year payback is worthwhile.
- IND – 0108: Relocation to a receiving site which has lower military value. Explanation is military judgment due to readiness support, accessibility and out-loading ease, however, none of these are mentioned in the strategy. Should strengthen argument by using strategy to augment military judgment in overriding military value.
- IND – 0118, IND – 0119, IND – 0120: Chemical demilitarization mission extends past BRAC completion date; may be considered disestablishments rather than closures. Should strengthen justification and strategy argument to explain inclusion in institutions not yet built with on-going missions past 6 years.
- IND – 0121: Please indicate to what PBX and Zuni refer.