

DCN: 2193

24 March 2005

**Technical JCSG Briefing Notes**

**Date:** Tuesday, March 22, 2005

**Time:** 14:30-16:30

**Place:** 3E808

**JCSG Chairman:** Dr. Ronald Sega, Director DR&E, Mr. Al Shaffer, Executive Director

**JCSG Executive Secretary:** COL Buckstad, Ms. Felix

**JCSG Key Attendees:**

- Mr. Matt Mleziva, Air Force
- Mr. Brian Simmons, Army
- Dr. Barry Dillon, Marines
- RADM Jay Cohen
- Mr. Jay Erb, JCS
- Mr. Al Shaffer, CIT Chairman
- Mr. Gary Strack, OSD
- Mr. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC
- Mr. Jerry Schiefer, OSD BRAC
- COL Robert Buckstad, OSD
- Mr. Roger Florence, DoD IG
- Dr. Stewart, Air Force
- Dr. Rohde, Army
- Ms. Felix, OSD
- Mr. Ryan, Navy
- Dr. Higgins, Navy

**Red Team Attendees:**

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

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

**Presenter:** Mr. Al Shaffer

**Items of Import:**

- Three main functions: Research, Development and Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation with a purview of roughly 650 facilities corresponding to about 144 installations and 157K FTEs.
- Two principles and four strategies drove the development of candidate recommendations.
- Competition of ideas is key and so where possible single-threads were avoided.
- Developed eight technical capability measures. In the end, only three (Work Years, Building Use, and Test Resource Workload) were used for capacity calculations, however, the other 5 provided insight.
- Military Value is a combination of quantitative factors (such as facility size and function) and qualitative factors (i.e. - military judgment).
- Acquisition function is included in review process.

- Combined research laboratories are actually co-locating – it is less about real estate and more about reducing overhead and people.

**Questions that arose:**

- What is the hierarchy of your principles and strategies? *Principles drive the strategy.* Are the 4 strategies in order of importance? *No.* (Salomon)
- How did you define surge? *Ten percent of current capacity.* (Johnson)
- Your military value analysis is different from the rest of the groups then? *Yes, and we normalized military value within bins. We cannot compare tank builders to space system builders.* (Salomon)
- You use military judgment as a subset of military value? *Yes.* (Salomon)
- So you are not looking at contracting? *No, we are looking at the management structure, but not at the contracting plant representatives.* (Salomon)
- You did nothing with the engineers? *No.* Did they participate? *No.* *We talked with the Army and brought in the Office of General Counsel. Army said that they are not covered by Title 10. That is, that “Civil Works” are excluded so the Corps of Engineers is outside of Title 10.* (Johnson)
- What is the status of Los Angeles AFB? *We have a candidate recommendation that takes all technical functions out to enable closure and a companion recommendation that evaluates closure. We inactivated our scenario and were asked to reactivate it, so we did. It is now our understanding that the Air Force was asked to reactive their scenario also.* (Johnson)
- If Indian Head is closed, do the other three sites have capacity to handle energetic materials? *Yes, we have a candidate recommendation coming through to allow for this possibility.* (Johnson)
- Is there a problem with moving/creating the C4ISR center at Peterson AFB? *Yes, the Joint Staff asked us to move it to Offutt AFB because DISA Proper is moving there. And STRATCOM disagrees with Peterson? Yes, they want to move to Offutt also . Is Peterson the highest military value? No, but we think it is the right move.* (Johnson)
- Is SOCOM supporting the move out of Ft. Eustis? *Yes, SOCOM said let it go.* (Johnson)
- Facilities with less than 30 people were not looked at? *Fewer than 30 was used as an initial filter, but we then circled back to double check that we eliminated excesses where we could.* (Johnson)
- What is left at Lakehurst (Tech-0005)? *700 people to support catapult function. There was no other way to do this to achieve this end.* (Pirie)
- Is DTRA on board (TECH-0018A)? *Yes, they are moving to 3 locations.* (Salomon)
- In all your recommendations, are there reductions in people? *We assumed a 15% reduction across the board.*
- Did you look at Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC)?
- Is the military value of King’s Bay higher than Cape Canaveral (TECH-0018E)? *Not really as Naval Ordnance Test Unit Cape Canaveral is the sole functional representative in that ranking.*
- So the Army has no responsibility for this joint facility (TECH-0020)? *No, co-location on NASA permitted property.*

**Informal observations provided at briefing:**

- On your TJCSG “Principles and Strategies” Slide (Slide 3) use bullet points instead of numbers. You should have one overarching strategy as opposed to four. Hierarchy of principles and strategies is unclear now – be careful how you tell the story.
- TJCSG Principle 2 should not be a simple assertion. It needs to be supported with examples and evidence that the private sector does not supply sufficient competition of ideas.
- Be careful with how you talk about surge. You cannot just say it is “hard to define surge” and pick a number. Give an example, from a time of war or from a particular mission, that demonstrates that technical facilities increased output, work hours, or test hours by 10%.
- Military judgment cannot be “I believe this.” Judgment has to have a supported rationale.
- Change title on “Combined Research Laboratories” Slide (Slide 11). Say co-located. When you are telling the TJCSG story be careful with the words combined, consolidate, joint, co-locate, etc.
- Make sure the Commission understands what Research, Development, Acquisition, Test and Evaluation are. Add a chart to explain these or add color coding to Slide 4.
- Argument for a joint center at Peterson AFB needs to be clearly articulated. Alternatives have to be systematically eliminated to show how and why Peterson is the best choice.
- Make sure commission knows what is defined as a Test and Evaluation facility.
- Reduction in number of facilities is a good measure, but the story has got to be told just right.
- It is hard to track candidate recommendations back to your strategy versus the desired end state of your scenario families.
- You should promote and/or take credit for jointness whenever you can.
- Commission will question long paybacks and recommendations that just build new facilities.
- On quad charts: “Military value not highest for all” is problematic without an actual listing of installations ranked by military value.
- Be careful with daisy chain connections. Your recommendations need to be able to stand on their own.
- Seems like military judgment overruled military value in about half of these recommendations. Make sure that your application of military judgment is consistent and well supported.
- Review all costs, savings, and paybacks.
- Review TECH-0018B to make sure you are not rebuilding facilities to house outdated functions.

**Additional observations to consider:**

- Should ensure that candidate recommendations are in the correct format:

<b>BRAC Action</b>	<b>where</b>	<b>by what</b>	<b>to where</b>	<b>and retaining what</b>
<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>

- 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 using BRAC terms as found in the final selection criteria 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.
- Actions that are independent of each other should not be lumped together into the same candidate recommendation.
- TECH-0005: JFCOM concern for "Centers of Excellence" critical infrastructure protection. Justification bullets are true but weak support for the candidate recommendation. Does not mention real strategy of three full life-cycle rotary wing support activities. Title of joint centers is somewhat misleading as three rotary wing air platform centers (one for each service) does not seem very joint. Should tie strategy into justification better. Should be more than just Army strategy for override of Redstone Arsenal functional military value.
- TECH-006: JFCOM concern for "Centers of Excellence" critical infrastructure protection. Should tie strategy of consolidating full life-cycle support activities into two fixed wing air platform centers into justification.
- TECH-0009A: Justification should talk more to what will be operationally gained by consolidation and closure of some Air Force Research Laboratory operating locations. Appears on surface to shift divisions within AFRL and recapitalize the command with \$259M of MILCON. While it pays back in 7 years, the up-front investment is very high.
- TECH-0018A: Should indicate what installation closure is facilitated. Should discuss strategy in justification which appears to be to create through consolidation a full spectrum weapons/armaments "Center of Excellence" for the Air Force to complement China Lake, CA and Redstone Arsenal, AL.
- TECH-0018B: Should clarify where 5 closures are facilitated and to what extent (i.e. % of installation freed up).
- TECH-0020: Since the gaining site is not DoD property, should indicate that NASA has concurred with providing additional permitted space.
- TECH-0032: What aspect of military judgment was used to decide on consolidation at Aberdeen and Fort Detrick?
- TECH-0040: Since ONR and DARPA are in leased space currently, there is no need to justify installation military value decisions as compared to Anacostia. Suggest dropping research manager discussion which is confusing and focusing on force protection and joint office synergy in co-location.
- TECH-0042A: Should include military value and name of fourth retained technical facility.
- TECH-0047: STRATCOM concern as to consolidation site and requested alternate scenario of Offutt AFB, Omaha, NE be considered. Peterson AFB has lowest MV of all consolidated sites. Need to expand on military judgment issue for benefits of co-location with a CoCom.