

SUBJECT: Joint Analysis Scenario Team (JAST) Minutes

1. Date of meeting: 15 December 2003
2. Attendees:
 - a. Jim Casey – OSD/CTC
 - b. Brian Buzzell – OSD/CTC
 - c. David Powell – Army/Alion
 - d. Mike Callaghan – AF/Scitor
 - e. LTC Phil Lawman – AF
 - f. CAPT Chris Nichols – Navy
3. Not in attendance:
 - a. CAPT Jason Leaver - Navy
 - b. COL Walter Hamm – USMC
 - c. LTC John Vignali - Army
4. Locations: Pentagon room – 5D230
5. Minutes prepared by Dave Powell, Army/Alion
6. Discussion: The Army as been designated the lead Service to develop the methodology for Joint analysis between MILDEPs. This meeting was held to establish the initial issues associated with conducting joint/multi-component analysis and process within the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) framework. This framework should be established by the end of January 2004. General discussion of potential issues and possible alternative solutions were discussed. The following issues, with the process and alternatives, were identified during the meeting.
 - a. How or should the JAST be charter?
 - i. As a JCSG through the ISG
 - ii. Between the MILDEPs with or without a MOA
 - iii. Be an ad hoc organization
 - b. How do we bring an issue to the table to be examined by the JAST?
 - i. Nomination by one MILDEP DAS
 - ii. After ISG approval
 - iii. Some combination of the above
 - c. How does the Team get approval to conduct analysis once an issue has been brought to the table?
 - i. Nomination by one MILDEP DAS
 - ii. All affected MILDEP DAS's must approve
 - iii. Approved by ISG
 - d. When is an issue tabled during the BRAC process?
 - i. As a result of Guiding Principles/ Strategic Imperatives
 - ii. After capacity analysis by MILDEP
 - iii. After MILDEP MVA
 - iv. As a result of excess capacity on an installation during scenario development by MILDEP
 - v. As a result of JCSG recommendations
 - vi. All or some of the above
 - e. Are there some specific issues that the Team should examine?

- i. Homeland security projection platforms
 - ii. ????
- f. How does the Team get approval on possible alternative scenarios to solve issue?
 - i. Gaining MILDEP
 - ii. Losing MILDEP
 - iii. Both losing and gaining MILDEP
 - iv. After approval of ISG
- g. What level of access does the Team have to MILDEP data?
 - i. MILDEP/JCSG MVA analysis?
 - ii. MILDEP/JCSG capacity analysis?
 - iii. Other installation data?
- h. Does the Team deal with Selection Criteria 1-4? (Note: This is a critical issue to resolve immediately if there is any intent of the JAST conducting MVA analysis and coordinating the approach prior to the MVA data call release.)
 - i. Yes to directly compare installations across MILDEP lines for that issue
 - ii. Take input from MILDEP MVA
 - iii. Not at all
- i. Who conducts COBRA?
 - i. Gaining MILDEP
 - ii. Losing MILDEP
 - iii. Both to prevent one MILDEP from gaming results and then reconcile results
- j. How or who should conduct analysis on Criteria 6-8?
 - i. JAST
 - ii. Gaining and losing MILDEP
- k. How is the MILDEP notified of solutions and agree with them?
 - i. By Head of JAST
 - ii. By Service representative on JAST
- l. Who approves recommended solutions from the Team?
 - i. Head of the JAST
 - ii. MILDEP DASs affected
 - iii. MILDEP BRAC senior approval process
 - iv. ISG
 - v. IEC
 - vi. Some combination of above
- m. Does the ISG or IEC have any play in results?
 - i. No, MILDEP program and part that MILDEP recommendation
 - ii. After MILDEP approve provide information briefing to ISG
 - iii. Information brief to ISG and approval by IEC
- n. Once a recommendation is accepted, who will be responsible for the cost and who gets credit for the savings (post BRAC)?
 - i. OSD pays cost, both share in savings
 - ii. OSD pays cost, losing gets savings

- iii. If OSD funding is exhausted and OSD approves of recommendations, who pays and gets savings?
 - 1. Losing for complete scenario?
 - 2. Shared by losing and gaining?
- o. How will security be observed with work-in-progress of multi-MILDEP BRAC information? Trust issue?
- 7. Future meetings: Please review these issues and alternatives to ensure completeness and provide any comments back to Dave Powell by the end of the month in 9 January 2004. A revised issue list will be developed and provided to all members at that time. Once a revised issue/alternative list is delivered, each MILDEP will need to develop a position for each issue by the next meeting. The next meeting will be coordinated for mid-Jan 2004.