

DCN: 2195

02 March 2005

Department of the Navy Briefing Notes

Date: Wednesday, March 2, 2005

Time: 09:00-11:00

Place: 3E808

Chairman: Ms. Anne Davis

Executive Secretary: CDR Beth Hartmann

DON Key Attendees:

- Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff Infrastructure Analysis Team (IAT)
- Mr. Dave LaCroix, Counsel for IAT
- CAPT Chris Nichols, IAT Team Lead Operational Branch
- CAPT Matt Beebe, IAT Team Lead HSA Branch
- CAPT Gene Summerlin, IAT Team Lead E&T Branch

Red Team Attendees:

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

Subject: Candidate Recommendation Briefing by the Department of the Navy to BRAC Red Team

Presenter: Ms. Anne Davis

Items of Import:

- Considered presentation to BRAC Red Team as rehearsal for Commission
- Continuing to refine the data
- DoD Principles drive service considerations (formerly called imperatives) and DON strategy
- Keeping costs at or below current levels was a major driver
- Balancing consolidation and maintaining presence was also major consideration
- Set out at the beginning the “universe”, which was derived on a functional basis
- Did not include additional surge capacity percentages, but looked at 20 year force level forecast
- Considered Homeland Defense issues
- Transformation Options – 2 apply to DON
- Anticipating Force Structure Changes in March
- Used Optimization Model – applied additional rules when necessary to be consistent with strategy and service considerations. These rules were designed to open the field of consideration, the universe, as wide as possible.

Questions that arose:

- Are you confident you covered the entire universe? *Not as confident as I would like to be. We have undertaken the review of functions omitted by JCSGs.* (Johnson)
- Are you going to submit 80 Candidate Recommendations? *No. We are about done, there are a couple left to be decided upon, but that will be all.* (Johnson)

DCN: 2195

- The first bullet of your strategy gets away from the BRAC language. Why not use regular BRAC terms? The rest of the bullets seem to be military judgment considerations. (Salomon)
- Why don't you have a block for the application of military judgment in your approach? *We can add it in. Judgment being applied is imbedded throughout. We see military value as a way to quantify military judgment. And then in some cases military judgment is used again to decide against something.* (Salomon)
- Do your recommendations go to the ISG or directly to IEC? *They go to the ISG for informational purposes, but officially the recommendations are delivered directly to IEC.* (Johnson)
- Do the optimization model work well? *For the most part, yes. It did not work so well for aviation functions.* (Johnson)
- Would you call the last three rules on this slide (Slide 12) military judgment? *Yes, they reflect the strategic force lay-down – that is, are the right capabilities in the right place?* (Johnson)
- Are all the billets military? *No, they are both civilian and military.* (Salomon)
- Other than political issues, are there other issues with relocating SUBASE New London? *There may be an issue with SSNs and SSBNs located together.* (Johnson)
- Does this slide (Slide 18) show all aviation actions? *Yes.* (Johnson)
- Isn't Ft. Gillem closing? *Not totally.* (Salomon)
- Are there other sites to support reservists displaced by the movement of functions from NAS Atlanta? Is there evidence of how this impacts the pilots? What has happened in the past with such actions? (Salomon)
- Is the Marine Corps participating? *Yes, they have some recommendations that relate to reserve activities. Otherwise, they seem to be sized and located appropriately.* (Johnson)
- What is a SFG? *Army Special Forces Group?* Why involved in a possible Navy recommendation? *Because the Army asked the Navy to be a receiving site.* (Salomon)
- Was there coordination with the States on reserve realignments (Guard realignments)? *Yes.* (Johnson)
- Recommendation is to move out of NAVFAC EFD South Charleston (Slide 36)? *Yes, sub-divide to Mid-West and Mid-Atlantic.* (Johnson)
- Does closure of NAVFAC EFA Northeast close Philadelphia? *No, just gets us out of leased space.* (Johnson)
- What are REDCOMs? *These commands manage reserve activities for the region.* (Johnson)
- Did you look at closing MCRD San Diego and moving to Camp Pendleton? (Pirie)
- What is the impact on excess capacity of Officer Accession Training? *None. So the same strategy did not apply to Navy classrooms? These are PME courses which are sized and located effectively so there was no opportunity to reduce capacity.* (Salomon)
- What Weapons Stations are you looking at? (Johnson)
- What about the PG school, is that a clean closure? *No, the Navy Research Lab Detachment and Fleet Numeric and Oceanographic Center are left. The NRL is to be moved while the FNOC may move or stay as an enclave.* (Johnson)
- What is the status of transferring Crane to the Army? (Johnson)
- Why Cambria – this is a small action that does not be done under BRAC? *We considered all functions/installations regardless of size.* (Pirie)

Informal observations provided at briefing: DCN: 2195

- Your military value analysis approach is not consistent with other groups that we have seen so far.
- Create a table that consolidates the surge capacity considerations that were used by JCSGs to inform their recommendations concerning Navy functions.
- Need to strengthen the link between military judgment for keeping SUBASE San Diego and overall DON strategy.
- Criteria 7 and 8 seem to be inconsistently applied in quad charts. Be sure that the everyone in the Department of the Navy is on the same page.
- It is useful/helpful that you showed all considerations, not just the resulting candidate recommendations.
- Typographical error (missing negative sign) on savings and NPV on Slide 21.
- Army/Navy Reserve Center scenarios are confusing. Find a way to present package in totality.
- Slide 51 summarizing fenceline closures enabled by JCSG activities is extremely helpful and necessary.
- Link between rules and strategy needs to be explained in more detail.

Additional observations to consider:

- Northeast consolidation discussion should include additional rationale for maintaining excess capacity (i.e. – Everett).
- Argument for retaining two Marine Corps recruit depots is weak and should be reexamined as this is not consistent with the Navy and Air Force.
- Some quad charts need a strengthened argument for why military judgment was used to override military value.
- Need to amend quad charts by adding receiving sites as they were missing in some cases.
- Several activities are being relocated to a non-DoD facility. Has NASA concurred with realignment to Stennis Space Center? No mention of coordination was made.
- MILCON avoidance is an important consideration, however, it should not automatically outweigh the other BRAC criteria.
- Additional discussion is needed on the role of USMC participation in the overall Navy process.