DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
(INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT)
1000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20350-1000

DCN 8553

03 August 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, OSD BRAC OFFICE

Subj: DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY COMMENTS ON THE ISG MEETING MINUTES FOR JULY 23, 2004

Per the tasking memo of 28 July 2004, the following comments are provided by the DoN Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG) members on the subject minutes:

General Comment

While the fourth paragraph on page 1 regarding the overall BRAC schedule and tasking to develop notional scenarios is factually correct, it begs the question of how exactly the deliberative process will integrate Transformational Options, military judgment and other key drivers in the scenario development and analysis phase. The process for this incorporation takes on even more importance in light of the ISG decision not to further develop Imperatives. Whether separately or during the training exercise on scenario development, the ISG should have a candid discussion and clear understanding of the process to integrate analytical data and Transformational Options, as well as the rationale for selection of Transformational Options and scenarios. The DoN ISG members are concerned that we could rush to decisions without fully understanding the process to get there.

Specific Comments

1. Page 1, paragraph 2, first sentence: Change the word "most" to "many" for clarity and accuracy. Change the word "questionable" to "open to question." Concern is that seeming to characterize use of Imperatives generally as "questionable" could later limit the ability to include definitive requirements statements ("imperatives" or constraints) in the analysis, since this sentence could be construed as saying the ISG disallowed them as inherently faulty. We believe the ISG's decision was based largely upon the potentially problematic nature of the current formulation of the Imperatives and uncertainty about their use. The concept underlying the use of Imperatives is valid and useful, and may well come into play later in the process.

2. Page 1, paragraph 2, second sentence: Insert the word "currently" before the word "written" to reinforce the notion that the ISG took issue with what was before it, not some subsequent construct.

3. Page 1, paragraph 2, fourth sentence: Delete the word "the" before the word "concepts;" delete the word "must" and replace it with "should" for clarity and accuracy.

4. Page 1, paragraph 3, first bullet: Revise to state "The Military Value principles represent the essential elements of military judgment the ISG expects to apply in the BRAC process." This echoes the language in DEPSECDEF's Principles coordination tasker and is a clearer statement of the thrust of the ISG's discussion.

5. Page 1, paragraph 3, second bullet: Insert at the end of the sentence the words "...at this point in the process, as data, military judgment, and analytical results should reveal whether constraints are necessary to produce viable results." The sentence as written seems to state constraints might never be necessary; this is not consistent with the discussion in the ISG.

6. Page 1, paragraph 3, third bullet: Revise to state "Draft imperatives would be recast as important areas for consideration during analysis and then transmitted to the JCSGs and the Services for their use as appropriate." This more clearly states what would happen to the present draft imperatives. The ISG discussion reflected no intention to require mandatory use of these as considerations, but rather suggested it more appropriate for the Services and JCSGs to use them as guidance or statements of important factors where necessary.

7. Page 1, paragraph 4, first sentence: Insert the word "draft" before Transformational Options to indicate that the Transformational Options have not yet been finalized or approved by the ISG, IEC or SECDEF.

8. Page 1, paragraph 4, fifth sentence: Insert the word "draft" before Transformational Options to indicate that the Transformational Options have not yet been finalized or approved by the ISG, IEC or SECDEF.

9. Page 3: Please change my title to read "Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy for BRAC". Also, please change Mr. Biddick's title to read "Deputy to Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy for BRAC" (or Deputy to SA to SECNAV).

These comments have been coordinated with VCNO and ACMC. A line-in/line-out version of the draft minutes, incorporating the above changes, is provided as an attachment.

Anne R Davis

Anne Rathmell Davis
Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy
for Base Realignment & Closure

Attachment as stated

BRAC 2005 Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG)

Meeting Minutes of July 23, 2004

The Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), Mr. Michael W. Wynne, chaired this meeting. The list of attendees is attached.

The Chair opened the meeting by noting the large number of draft Imperatives, further commenting that because ~~most~~ many were broad and/or appeared to be restatements of mission requirements, their utility within the analysis was ~~questionable~~open to question. The Chair stated the Imperatives as currently written could unnecessarily restrict the Department from taking aggressive action in the BRAC process. After discussion, the ISG members and the Joint Cross-Service Group (JCSG) representatives agreed with the Chair's assessment and expressed the view that the Military Value principles were sufficient to guide the BRAC process within the JCSGs. The ISG agreed that going through the process of developing the Imperatives was instructive as the process provided a focus on ~~the~~ concepts and ideas that ~~must~~ should be considered in the BRAC decision-making process.

The ISG specifically agreed to the following:

- The Military Value principles ~~were sufficient for expressing~~represent the essential elements of military judgment the ISG ~~military judgment component of military value.~~expects to apply in the BRAC process.
- Having imperatives to act as constraints on the BRAC process is not necessary at this point in the process, as data, military judgment, and analytical results should reveal whether constraints are necessary to produce viable results.
- Draft imperatives would be recast as important areas for considerations during analysis and then transmitted to the JCSGs and the Services ~~and recast as considerations~~ for their ~~analysis~~use as appropriate.
- A memo expressing the ISG's decision would be formally coordinated with ISG members and issued to the Services and the JCSGs.

The ISG next reviewed the overall BRAC schedule. Mr. Potochney noted that draft Transformation Options are being consolidated for ISG review, the JCSGs are working on capacity analysis and that the next step is to develop scenarios. The ISG proceeded to discuss how scenarios will work and agreed with the Chair's recommendation to have each JCSG and Military Department develop three notional scenarios to be reviewed at the next ISG meeting. The review would be akin to a training exercise to gain insight into how scenarios will be developed, and briefed, and how the scenarios interact. The Joint Cross-Service Group representatives agreed to this approach and stated that they intended to use their draft Transformational Options to develop the scenarios since the JCSGs have not finalized their data analysis.

The Chair then requested the ISG to endorse the graduate flight training recommendation (see slide four of the attached briefing). After a short discussion, the ISG concurred with the recommendation.

Approved: _____
Michael W. Wynne
Acting USD (Acquisition Technology and Logistics)
Chairman, Infrastructure Steering Group

Attachments:
1. List of Attendees
2. Briefing slides entitled "Briefing to the Infrastructure Steering Group" dated July 23, 2004

Infrastructure Steering Group Meeting
July 23, 2004
Attendees

Members:

- Mr. Michael W. Wynne, Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics)
- Mr. Raymond DuBois, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (I&E)
- General William Nyland, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps
- Hon. Nelson Gibbs, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (IE)
- Hon. Geoffrey Prosch, Assistant Secretary of the Army (I&E)
- Ms. Anne R. Davis, Special Assistant~~,~~to the Secretary of the Navy ~~(I&E)~~for BRAC

Alternates:

- VADM Gerald L. Hoewing, Chief of Naval Personnel, OPNAV for Admiral Michael Mullen, Vice Chief of Naval Operations
- Maj Gen Robin E. Scott, Deputy Director for Force Applications, J-8, for General Peter Pace, Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
-

Others:

- Dr. Craig College, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (I&A)
- Mr. Dennis Biddick, Deputy to the Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy ~~(I&A)~~ for BRAC
- Mr. Fred Pease, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (I&A)
- Dr. Ron Sega, Chairman, Technical JCSG
- Dr. Paul Mayberry, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Readiness for Mr. Charles S. Abell, Chairman, Education and Training JCSG
- LtGen Peach Taylor, Chairman, Medical JCSG
- MajGen Craig Rasmussen, Chairman, Supply and Storage JCSG
- Mr. Donald Tison, Chairman, Headquarters and Service Activities JCSG
- Ms. Deborah Dunie, Director, Analysis Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Counterintelligence and Security) for Ms. Carol Haave, Chairman, Intelligence JCSG
- Ms. Deborah Culp, Program Director, Contract Management Directorate, Office of the Inspector General
- Mr. Wayne Howard, Director, Core Team, Intelligence JCSG
- Col David King, 0-6 Air Force Rep to Supply and Storage Joint Cross Service Group
- Mr. Robert Howlett, Director, Institutional Military Training, OUSD (Personnel and Readiness, Education and Training JCSG
- Col Carla Coulson, Army G-8, Headquarters and Service Activities JCSG
- Mr. Pete Potochney, Director, OSD BRAC

- Mr. Jay Berry, Acting Executive Secretary to the Industrial JCSG
- Col Mark Hamilton, Executive to the Air Force Surgeon General, Medical JCSG
- Mr. Alan Shaffer, Director of Plans and Systems, Director, Defense Research and Engineering, OSD-ATL
- Ms. Marie Forlini-Felix, Action Officer for Technical JCSG
- Mrs. Nicole Bayert, Associate General Counsel, Environment and Installations, DoD
- Capt William Porter, Senior Military Assistant, Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L)
- Commander John Lathroum, Force Integration Branch Officer, Forces Division, J-8
- Mr. Andrew Porth, Assistant Director, OSD BRAC
- Ms. Laurel Glenn, Action Officer, OSD BRAC