

DCN: 2192

01 April 2005

Supply and Storage JCSG 2nd Briefing Notes

Date: Wednesday, March 30, 2005

Time: 1300-1445

Place: 2C836

JCSG Chairman: VADM Keith W. Lippert, USN, Director DLA

JCSG Executive Secretary: COL Louis Neeley, USAF

JCSG Attendees:

- LTG Claude V. Christianson, USA/G-4, Army Principal
- RDML Alan S. Thompson, USN/N41, Navy Principal
- Lt Gen Donald J. Wetekam, USAF/IL, Air Force S&S JCSG Principal
- William Neal, CIV/SES USA, Army Alternate
- CAPT Walter F. Wright, USN, Navy Alternate
- Susan C. Kinney, CIV/15 USMC, Marine Corps Alternate
- CDR Goodwin, USN XO
- Mr. Williams, CTR, Army Team
- CAPT Coderre, USN, Navy Team
- Col King, USAF, Air Force Team,
- Lt Col Truba, Marine Corps Team
- Capt Rivera, USMC, Marine Corps Team
- Lt Col Nalepa, USMC, Data Team
- LCDR Stark, USN, Data Team
- Major Champagne, USAF, Data Team

Red Team Attendees:

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

Subject: *Second Candidate Recommendation Briefing by Supply and Storage JCSG to BRAC Red Team*

Presenter: VADM Keith W. Lippert

Items of Import:

- Supply and storage is a follower activity and therefore the S&S JCSG had to adjust scenarios and candidate recommendations as military departments or other JCSGs were putting forward their own scenarios and candidate recommendations.

Questions that arose:

- Do the services agree with the need for a “more expeditionary aspect”? *Yes. I have not seen a case made for expeditionary in your briefing or candidate recommendation justifications. Okay. We will come back to it in the course of the briefing. (Salomon)*
- I’m not getting your point (Slide 6). Which one did you use? *The bottom one. Where’s the military judgment on the bottom one? It is included in the Military Value and Capacity analysis and Force Structure Capabilities surrounding the scenario analysis. Okay, you may want to indicate that on the chart. (Salomon)*

- And the services agree (S&S-0035)? ^{DCN: 2192} Yes. (Johnson)
- And that's what's tied to "related support functions" (S&S-0035)? *Yes, it is the expertise needed to give DLA the procurement function.* (Salomon)
- Is there excess capacity in the 16 ICPs? *Yes, we ranked them from 1 to 16 and determined that we could draw a line after 11. We could close or give back to the appropriate service the bottom 5 and the assumption was that the workload could be moved to meet surge requirements.*
- Why are you doing this under BRAC? *It is a Transformational Option.* But that is not a BRAC reason and you can do this without BRAC. (Salomon)
- Have you really made your case for moving out of Red River (S&S-0048)? *Red River no longer will have a maintenance activity, so supply and storage activities should also move. Susquehanna doesn't have a maintenance activity either. But that is a different type of supply and storage function.* (Salomon/Johnson)

Informal observations provided at briefing:

- Military judgment is an application of military expertise and should not be used to explain or rationalize business re-engineering.
- Transformational options are not one of the final selection criteria and should be incorporated into your strategy as opposed to being left as stand-alone entities. In the absence of official DoD policy on transformational options, you may want to avoid citing specific "Transformation Option" numbers (i.e. – TO #20). Consider re-naming the "Transformational Options" and use the fact that transformation is part of the Force Structure plan, so these options support the Force Structure Plan, which has a legal basis.
- Your argument for DRMOs is fine, except you need to be careful how you tell the story. The statute says that everything must be looked at and so instead of saying DRMOs were not included, make sure your story indicates that you looked at DRMOs, determined them to be inappropriate for BRAC, but, by the way, they are being competed under A-76.
- Be prepared to make a well-supported and documented case for what is generating the savings. You cannot just assume that this action will automatically save 20%. What is your reference?
- Statement in Military Value part of quad chart is a disclaimer and needs to be changed (S&S-0035).
- Strengthen Slide 16 (list of DLRs and Consumables) by indicating what pieces of DLR stay with the services.
- Strengthen Slide 18 (S&S-0035R - map) by indicating what goes where, either on the map or in a separate table.
- Make sure that S&S-0035 is in BRAC language.
- May want to create a follower argument for S&S-0048 – this candidate recommendation needs to stand on its own despite the linkage to the Army's plans for Red River.

DCN: 2192

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"> • Close • Realign • Inactivate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • losing installation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • moving • relocating • consolidating • privatizing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • gaining installation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enclaves • functions • activities

- 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.
- S&S-0043, S&S-0044, and S&S-0045: Justification on quad chart says "supports transformation by privatizing..." which is vague and should be re-worded or removed. Also, reduction in excess capacity is listed last, and since this is the purpose of BRAC, it should be the first justification. (The justification in the write-up is in the correct order.)
- S&S-0048: Candidate recommendation write-up justification needs to be re-written in BRAC terms. As it reads now, it seems like this recommendation is more business re-engineering than BRAC. The elimination of excess and redundancies to save money should be mentioned first, not last, as it is now. Should strengthen the argument for why military judgment was used to override military value based on "optimizing support to customers" and to minimize MILCON.