DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
1000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20350-1000

DCN:5454

MN-0328
IAT/JAN
16 December 2004

MEMORANDUM

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 9 DECEMBER 2004

Ref: (a) OSD Policy Memo Three (Criterion 5)
(b) OSD Policy Memo Four (Criterion 7 and 8)

Encl: (1) 9 December 2004 IEG Meeting Agenda
(2) Recording Secretary's Report of IEG Deliberations on 9 December 2004

1. The forty-eighth meeting of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) was convened at 1002 on 9 December 2004 in room 4D447 at the Pentagon. The following members of the IEG were present: Ms. Anne R. Davis, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy for all matters associated with BRAC 2005 (Special Assistant for BRAC), Co-Chair; Gen William L. Nyland, USMC, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps (ACMC), Co-Chair; VADM Justin D. McCarthy, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4), Member; Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree, Director Fleet Training (N7A), U.S. Fleet Forces Command, serving as alternate for VADM Kevin J. Cosgriff, USN, Deputy and Chief of Staff, U.S. Fleet Forces Command, Member; LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Aviation (AVN), Member; Ms. Carla Liberatore, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (I&L), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, serving as alternate for LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (I&L), Member; Dr. Michael F. McGrath, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research Development Test & Evaluation (DASN(RDT&E)), Member; Mr. Robert T. Cali, Assistant General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower & Reserve Affairs (M&RA), Member; Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service (NAVAUDSVC), Representative; Mr. Thomas N. Ledvina, Navy Office of General Counsel (OGC), Representative; Mr. David W. LaCroix, Senior Counsel, Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JACG, USN, Recorder; LCDR Vincent J. Moore, JAGC, USNR, Recorder; and Capt James A. Noel, USMC, Recorder. ADM John B.

Nathman, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations (VCNO), Co-Chair; was absent.

2. The following members of the DON Analysis Group (DAG) were present: Mr. Paul Hubbell, Deputy Assistant Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (Facilities) Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; Ms. Ariane Whittemore, Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4B); Mr. Michael F. Jaggard, Chief of Staff, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition (ASN(RD&A)); and CAPT Thomas Mangold, USN, alternate for RDML(sel) Charles Martoglio, USN, Director, Strategy and Policy Division, N51.

3. The following members or representatives of the Functional Advisory Board (FAB) were present: VADM Donald C. Arthur, Jr., MC, USN, Director of Naval Medicine/ Surgeon General of the Navy, N093/ Chief, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery; RADM William R. Klemm, USN, Deputy Commander, Logistics, Maintenance, and Industrial Operations, SEA-04, NAVSEASYSCOM; BGen Willie J. Williams, USMC, Assistant Deputy Commandant, Installations and Logistics (Facilities); Mr. George Ryan, OPNAV 091; Ms. Karin Dolan, Assistant Director of Intelligence for Support, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; Ms. Shanna Poole, Deputy, Logistics Chain Management Center, Installations and Logistics (I&L), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; RDML Mark Hugel, USN, Deputy Director, Fleet Readiness Division, N43B, OPNAV; Col Michael J. Massoth, USMC; CAPT William Wilcox, USN; CAPT David W. Mathias, USN; and, Mr. Thomas B. Grewe.

4. The following members of the IAT were also present: Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff; CAPT Jason A. Leaver, USN; Mr. Andrew S. Demott; CAPT Gene A. Summerlin, USN; CAPT Christopher T. Nichols, USN; CAPT Matthew A. Beebe, CEC, USN; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; and, CDR Beth L. Hartmann, CEC, USN. All attendees were provided enclosures (1) and (2). Ms. Davis presented the minutes from the 18 November 2004 IEG meeting for review and they were approved.

5. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the 10 December 2004 Infrastructure Steering Group meeting is cancelled, and that the next Infrastructure Executive Council meeting is scheduled for 20 December 2004. She also noted that OSD has issued Policy Memorandum Three on conducting Selection Criterion 5 (COBRA) analysis and Policy Memorandum Four providing guidance on conducting Selection Criteria 7 (Community Impact) and 8 (Environmental Impact) analyses. References (a) and (b).

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 9 DECEMBER 2004

6. The IEG moved into deliberative session at 1004. See enclosure (2). The meeting adjourned at 1141.

Anne R Davis

Anne Rathmell Davis
Co-Chair, IEG

TAB 1

Infrastructure Evaluation Group

9 December 2004
1000-1200
Pentagon, Room 4D447

Meeting called by:	Chairs	Recorder:	Capt Noel

----- Agenda Topics -----

Review and approve minutes of IEG Meeting of 18 Nov 04	Ms. Davis
Deliberative Session :	Ms. Davis

- Scenario Development
  - E&T DON-specific
  - HSA DON-specific
    - Reserve Centers (JAST)
    - Marine Corps Districts
  - Operational
    - Air Operations
  - Fenceline Closure Scenarios
- JCSG/ISG Issues
- Scenario Data Call Status
- IEG/FAB Open Discussion

Administrative

- Next meeting 16 Dec 04, 1000-1200, 4D447

Other Information

Draft minutes of 18 Nov 04 IEG meeting provided [To IEG members only]
Report of 18 Nov 04 IEG deliberative session provided [To IEG members only]
Other Read Aheads [To all attendees]

TAB 2

Department of the Navy
IAT

INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS TEAM
ODASN (IS&A), 2221 South Clark Street, Suite 900, Arlington, VA 22202

(703)-602-6500

RP-0329
IAT/JAN
13 Dec 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 9 DECEMBER 2004

Encl: (1) DON Analysis Group Brief to IEG of 9 December 2004

1. The thirty-second deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) convened at 1004 on 9 December 2004 in room 4D447 at the Pentagon. The following members of the IEG were present: Ms. Anne R. Davis, Co-Chair; Gen William L. Nyland, USMC, Co-Chair; VADM Justin D. McCarthy, USN, Member; Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree, alternate for VADM Kevin J. Cosgriff, USN, Member; LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Member; Ms. Carla Liberatore, alternate for LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member; Dr. Michael F. McGrath, Member; Mr. Robert T. Cali, Member; Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service, Representative; and, Mr. Thomas N. Ledvina, Navy Office of General Counsel (OGC), Representative. The following members of the DON Analysis Group (DAG) were present: Mr. Paul Hubbell; Ms. Ariane Whittemore; Mr. Michael F. Jaggard; and, CAPT Thomas Mangold, USN, alternate for RDML(sel) Charles Martoglio, USN. The following members or representatives of the Functional Advisory Board (FAB) were present: VADM Donald C. Arthur, Jr., MC, USN; RADM William R. Klemm, USN; BGen Willie J. Williams, USMC; Mr. George Ryan; Ms. Karin Dolan; Ms. Shanna Poole; RDML Mark Hugel, USN; Col Michael J. Massoth, USMC; CAPT William Wilcox, USN; CAPT David W. Mathias, USN; and, Mr. Thomas B. Grewe. The following members of the IAT were also present: Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff; Mr. David LaCroix, Senior Counsel; CAPT Jason A. Leaver, USN; Mr. Andrew S. Demott; CAPT Gene A. Summerlin, USN; CAPT Christopher T. Nichols, USN; CAPT Matthew A. Beebe, CEC, USN; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; CDR Deputy, USN; CDR Beth Hartmann, CEC, USN; LCDR Vincent J. Moore, JAGC, USNR; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC. All attendees were provided enclosure (1).

2. Ms. Davis used slide 4 of enclosure (1) to discuss the status of scenario development for the DON E&T Navy Officer Accession Training Function. She noted that in response to DON scenarios to consolidate Officer Training Commands (OTCs) and relocate the Naval Academy Preparatory School (NAPS) to NAVSTA

Great Lakes (DON-0086) and NAS Pensacola (DON-0087), Field Support Activity Washington suggested an alternative scenario to relocate NAPS to NAVSTA Annapolis. During its 6 December 2004 deliberative session, the DAG considered this alternative scenario noting that it would open up space at NAVSTA Newport and fit within the apparent excess classroom capacity at NAVSTA Annapolis (although military construction may be required to rehabilitate those classrooms). The DAG noted that military construction may also be required for billeting and dining facilities to accommodate NAPS. After reviewing the quad chart and scenario alignment assessment for this scenario (see slides 22-23 of enclosure (1)), the IEG approved posting the following scenario to the OSD scenario tracking tool subject to further refinement, and issuance of a scenario data call (SDC):

Relocate Naval Academy Preparatory School, Newport, RI to Naval Station Annapolis, MD.

3. Ms. Davis used slide 5 of enclosure (1) to discuss the status of scenario development for the HSA DON Reserve Centers Function. She noted that IAT coordination with the Army and Air Force through the Reserve Center Process Action Team (RCPAT) and Joint Action Scenario Team (JAST) has led to 51 scenarios that consider opportunities for joint action, and that during its deliberative session on 29 November 2004, the DAG reviewed 28 Reserve Center scenarios. Three are DON scenarios that move the following Inspector-Instructor (I&I) Staff units onto DOD installations: I&I Baltimore, MD; I&I Tampa, FL; and, I&I Newport News, VA. See slides 24-25 of enclosure (1). The remaining 25 JAST scenarios consolidate reserve activities within a geographic area to create joint Armed Forces Reserve Centers (AFRCs) on identified DOD fencelines. Two JAST scenarios would add to or alter an existing AFRC while the remaining 23 would require construction of new AFRCs. See slides 26-27 of enclosure (1).

4. Ms. Davis noted that during its deliberative session on 6 December 2004, the DAG reviewed an additional 26 JAST Reserve Center scenarios. The DAG noted that 14 of these scenarios would establish AFRCs at contingent locations not on a DOD fenceline, thereby representing greater execution risk. See slides 28-29 of enclosure (1). Ms. Davis stated that the IAT is working with the Army to get more formal documentation on the status of receiver property for these 14 scenarios and that analysis of these scenarios would likely result in contingent recommendations, since there are questions as to whether the land at the designated receiver sites will be made available.

She noted that the DAG reviewed an additional four JAST scenarios that would replace an existing Service reserve center by building a new AFRC in the same location (see slides 30-31 of enclosure (1)). The remaining eight scenarios would build a new AFRC on DON property without involving any DON units. See slides 32-33 of enclosure (1). The IEG noted that that there may be value to building new AFRCs on property that DON does not plan to keep, but that scenarios to build new AFRCs at Smoky Point, WA and NAS JRB Ft Worth, TX would possibly conflict with DON scenarios to close NAVSTA Everett, WA and NAS JRB Ft Worth, TX. After reviewing the scenario alignment assessments for the 54 Reserve Center scenarios, the IEG approved posting them to the OSD scenario tracking tool subject to further refinement, and issuing SDCs. Ms. Davis noted that the Service deliberative bodies will gather and share Service data to conduct a single COBRA analysis for JAST scenarios, evaluate the shared COBRA results, and develop a process to determine which Service will issue any candidate recommendations that arise from these scenarios.

5. Ms. Davis used slides 7-8 of enclosure (1) to discuss the status of scenario development for Marine Corps Recruiting Districts (MCDs). She noted that during its deliberative sessions on 29 November and 7 December 2004, the DAG concluded that MCDs could not be analyzed like other Regional Support Activities (RSA) since alignment with Navy IM regions was not relevant for MCDs. Accordingly, the DAG approved a construct to evaluate MCDs as a stand-alone group, noting that MCDs become the fifth group in the HSA DON RSA Middle Management category (also referred to as category "C"). The military value scoring plan for RSA category "C" was appropriately modified and the optimization model was revised to allow MCDs to relocate to a Marine Corps Recruiting Station (RS) within the district, thereby optimally locating MCDs within the managed district. Using the revised methodology, the DAG then developed initial MCD scenario proposals. After reviewing the quad charts and scenario alignment assessments (see slides 34-37 of enclosure (1)), the IEG approved posting the following scenarios to the OSD scenario tracking tool subject to further refinement, and issuance of SDCs:

a. Relocate Fourth MCD from Cumberland, PA to Ft Detrick, MD.

b. Relocate Eighth MCD from NSA New Orleans, LA to NAS JRB Ft Worth, TX.

The IEG noted that this latter scenario will require de-confliction with the DON scenario to close NAS JRB Ft Worth, TX.

6. Ms. Davis used slides 9-12 of enclosure (1) to review the status of scenario development for the DON Aviation Operations Function. She reminded the IEG that the DAG had developed Reserve Air Station scenario options that included several joint options (e.g., close NAS JRB Willow Grove by relocating assets to McGuire AFB). Ms. Davis stated that the DAG discussed west coast aviation options and determined that while there was some flexibility, west coast aviation laydown will be dependent on the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS) requirement to move a carrier strike group to the Pacific, noting that the impact of moving the accompanying air wing could generate a "domino" effect for west coast aviation laydown considerations. Accordingly, the DAG decided to defer further analysis of west coast aviation pending analysis of scenarios moving a carrier strike group to Hawaii or Guam. Ms. Davis stated that the DAG had discussed a scenario to close NAS Brunswick, noting that this scenario was previously deferred pending input from U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) on the potential impact that such a scenario would have on the homeland defense mission. Additionally, Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the DAG continued its review of east coast tactical aviation (TACAIR) laydown to ensure flexibility commensurate with the west coast, and determined that viable closure options are available if training air stations are considered.

7. Ms. Davis advised the IEG that the DAG, during its 29 November 2004 deliberative session, discussed a desire to single site aircraft on each coast, thereby optimizing maintenance and training and resulting in likely cost savings. The DAG specifically discussed implications for single siting east coast patrol aircraft. Applying the assumption that S-3 squadrons will disestablish by 2009, the DAG noted that NAS Jacksonville appears to have enough excess capacity, i.e., available Type II hangars, to accept all squadrons from NAS Brunswick, thereby suggesting the viability of exploring closure options for NAS Brunswick. Accordingly, the DAG reviewed the scenario to close NAS Brunswick during its deliberative session on 6 December 2004, and decided to recommend it to the IEG. The IEG noted that the planned disestablishment of existing S-3 squadrons at NAS Jacksonville may not alleviate the requirement for new military construction to accommodate all squadrons from NAS Brunswick due to unique hangar specifications needed for the P-3 and future MMA aircraft. The IEG noted that the potential closure of NAS Brunswick raises the issue of DON's ability to

support NORTHCOM's homeland defense mission, i.e., maritime patrol. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that she will meet with NORTHCOM and United States Strategic Command staff on 10 December 2004 to discuss this issue. After reviewing the quad chart and scenario alignment assessment (see slides 38-39 of enclosure (1)), the IEG approved posting the following scenario to the OSD scenario tracking tool subject to further refinement, and issuance of a SDC:

Close NAS Brunswick, ME. Aviation assets move to NAS Jacksonville, FL and the Aviation Intermediate Maintenance Depot (AIMD) would move or consolidate to Base X.

8. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the DAG discussed TACAIR laydown during numerous deliberative sessions in October and November 2004 to ensure that DON will maintain sufficient capacity and flexibility to base DON TACAIR squadrons and concomitant assets on the west and east coast for the next twenty years, and to identify potential requirements for future investments. She noted the DAG's concern that future growth could impact the continued viability of NAS Oceana to serve as a Navy Master Jet Base (MJB) and thus there was a need to look at flexibility options for basing TACAIR presence at NAS Oceana.

9. Ms. Davis noted that the DAG focused on identifying options that provide flexibility for east coast TACAIR laydown and determined that because of their high military value, NAS Pensacola and NAS Whiting Field appear to be viable options for analysis. The IEG noted that there are E&T JCSG scenarios that uncover NAS Whiting Field (i.e., remove the undergraduate flight training mission) and thus offer the potential of a fenceline closure scenario for NAS Whiting Field. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that during its 29 November 2004 deliberative session, the DAG discussed the value of determining the amount of investment required to transform either NAS Pensacola or NAS Whiting Field into a MJB, recognizing that the training mission must be relocated to allow for TACAIR basing. Additionally, the DAG noted that the Marine Corps plans to single site JSF assets at MCAS Cherry Point. Therefore, MCAS Beaufort will apparently have significant excess hangar capacity by 2024, since the Marine Corps does not plan to base TACAIR assets at MCAS Beaufort after the transition to JSF in 2012 (after the BRAC implementation period). Accordingly, the DAG reviewed scenarios to close NAS Oceana and MCAS Beaufort during its deliberative session on 6 December 2004, and decided to recommend them to the IEG. After reviewing the quad charts and scenario alignment assessments (see slides 40-45 of enclosure (1)), the IEG

approved posting the following scenarios to the OSD scenario tracking tool subject to further refinement, and issuance of SDCs:

a. Close NAS Oceana, VA. All F-18 squadrons, station aircraft and VR-56 squadron move to NAS Pensacola, FL. All VF squadrons disestablish or transition to VFA and the AIMD will move or consolidate to Base X.

b. Close NAS Oceana, VA. All F-18 squadrons, station aircraft and VR-56 squadron move to NAS Whiting Field, FL. All VF squadrons disestablish or transition to VFA and the AIMD will move or consolidate to Base X.

c. Close MCAS Beaufort, SC. All squadrons move to MCAS Cherry Point, NC.

10. The IEG noted that the only two bases on the east coast that appear to have favorable environmental conditions for basing supersonic jet squadrons are MCAS Cherry Point, NC and MCAS Beaufort, SC. They appear to be un-encroached, have adequate airspace, and a minimum of environmental issues. Additionally, CFFC noted that NAS Pensacola is likely to present similar encroachment issues as NAS Oceana, particularly in light of Air Force plans to base JSF assets at Eglin AFB, FL. The IEG noted that the Navy will need to build two Fleet Replacement Squadrons (FRSs) by 2015 and indicated that determining the site for future FRSs will significantly impact Navy TACAIR laydown. Accordingly, the IEG directed the DAG to develop a scenario to close NAS Oceana and move the assets to MCAS Beaufort, notwithstanding the fact that MCAS Beaufort has significantly lower military value than NAS Oceana.

11. Ms. Davis used slide 12 of enclosure (1) to advise the IEG that the HSA JCSG has developed scenarios designed to consolidate base management functions. She reminded the IEG that the close NAS Atlanta scenario, identifying Dobbins ARB, GA as the receiver (IAT 0040), and the close NAF Washington scenario, identifying Andrews AFB, MD as the receiver (IAT 0043), essentially change base management without movement of assets and are consistent with a series of HSA scenarios that consolidate base management. Ms. Davis noted that the HSA JCSG has agreed to assume responsibility for the IAT-0040 scenario. Accordingly, the IEG approved the DAG recommendation to delete these two DON scenarios and rely on the HSA JCSG analysis of their applicable scenarios. The IEG further decided that the relocation of VAQ 209 to Whidbey Island action (included in the

DON scenario to close NAF Washington) should no longer be pursued as a BRAC action since the relocation of VAQ 209 is a force structure move that can be accomplished independent of BRAC.

12. Ms. Davis used slide 13 of enclosure (1) to discuss the status of fenceline closure scenario development. She stated that during its deliberative session on 7 December 2004, the DAG reviewed the COBRA results for the close Naval Postgraduate School (NPGS), Monterey, CA scenarios (DON-0070 would close NPGS and privatize the graduate education mission while DON-0071 would close NPGS and relocate and consolidate it at the Naval Academy). The DAG will continue to refine the base data and shelve the information until it is determined that the E&T JCSG NPGS scenarios will become candidate recommendations. Ms. Davis stated that the IAT is continuing to perform a quality assurance review on the SDC response to the HSA JCSG scenario that uncovers Potomac Annex before presenting it to the DAG. The IEG expressed concern that the Potomac Annex property is located in downtown Washington, DC and contains Navy Flag housing that may be difficult or impossible to replicate. Ms. Davis advised the IEG that during its 6 December 2004 deliberative session, the DAG reviewed the quad chart and scenario alignment assessment for the scenario to close Navy Supply Corps School, Athens, GA (an E&T JCSG scenario to establish a joint center of excellence for Logistics/Supply Training at Fort Lee, VA uncovers the base). The SDC was released on 8 December 2004. Ms. Davis noted that the DAG is scheduled to review the quad chart and scenario alignment assessment for the fenceline closure of NAS Whiting Field, FL on 13 December 2004, since E&T JCSG scenarios (E&T-0006, E&T-0046, E&T-0047 and E&T-0048) uncover NAS Whiting Field, FL.

13. Ms. Davis used slide 15 of enclosure (1) to continue the IEG's discussion of JCSG issues. The IEG discussed the following specific issues:

a. Capacity and Military Value. The IEG remains concerned that deviations from approved capacity and military value methodologies could lead to undesired results (e.g., the Supply and Storage JCSG's re-evaluation of military value may dramatically affect the ranking of Service Inventory Control Points) that may not be auditable and supportable. Ms. Davis noted that DON JCSG representatives and IAT members supporting the JCSGs continue to voice objections to methodology deviations within the JCSGs. She further noted that the Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG) plans to address the formation of a "Red"

team comprised of non-DOD members to review JCSG candidate recommendations. The IEG directed DON JCSG representatives to apprise the IEG of significant shifts of analysis by the JCSGs, thereby allowing DON ISG representatives to raise these issues with the ISG.

b. Cost efficiency. Ms. Davis noted that the cost efficiency issue (i.e., the importance of monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of outcomes in terms of unit costs) may be resolved by a DOD Comptroller memorandum that is expected to develop a standard metric for measuring these unit costs.

c. Scenario Analysis. The IEG expressed concern that the JCSGs are improperly using scenario analysis to produce solutions rather than gather data for analysis, raising the potential for inadvertently overlooking good options or not performing analysis on some scenarios. Additionally, the IEG expressed concern that in light of the 20 December 2004 OSD due date for JCSG candidate recommendations, some JCSGs may be utilizing an abbreviated COBRA analysis. The IEG noted that an abbreviated COBRA analysis may be adequate for a decision not to pursue a scenario, however, any candidate recommendation will require a full COBRA analysis.

d. BRAC Implementation. The IEG expressed concern that some JCSGs are insisting on designating a "lead" Service prior to conducting analysis, e.g., the Technical JCSG requiring a decision concerning Service proponency before beginning analysis of the RDT&E Function. While such a designation is appropriate for BRAC implementation, it is not required for analysis purposes.

e. ISG. The IEG expressed concern that the ISG chair is proceeding with analysis for the Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC) despite Service objections in specific cases where military judgment has concluded a scenario to be unacceptable. The IEG noted that this approach could create an unnecessary volume of analysis for the JCSGS, MILDEPs and ultimately the IEC and brings into question the role of the ISG if it is intended that only the IEC can cancel further consideration of individual scenarios.

14. Ms. Davis used slide 16 of enclosure (1) to advise the IEG of additional integration issues. She noted that the IEG and DAG need as much advance notification as possible from the DON JCSG representatives concerning scenarios that might lead to fenceline closures. She stated that the recently issued DOD

policy guidance memoranda on Selection Criteria 5, 7, and 8 contain no significant modifications, and DOD policy guidance memoranda is pending for Selection Criterion 6, Surge, and Homeland Defense issues. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the process for reconciling candidate recommendations and wedge allocation is still being formulated. She stated that the JCSGs are beginning to ask DON to perform analysis, particularly COBRA analysis (e.g., the DAG reviewed the COBRA response for Scenario DON-0071, close Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA for the E&T JCSG during its deliberative session on 7 December 2004). Ms. Davis stated that the DAG and IEG must avoid making recommendations in areas that fall within a JCSG's functional responsibility. Lastly, she re-emphasized that the OSD imposed 20 December 2004 deadline for JCSG candidate recommendations is unrealistic considering the current status of JCSG SDCs and noted that DON has not been successful in getting the ISG to consider modifying this deadline when the issue has been raised to the ISG in the past.

15. Ms. Liberatore, alternate for LtGen Kelly, Member, departed from the session at 1128.

16. Ms. Davis used slides 17-18 of enclosure (1) to update the IEG on the status of the SDC process, stating that while some JCSG SDCs require clarification before they are issued, the process is generally going well. See slide 17 of enclosure (1). She noted that the field is generally timely answering SDCs and they are providing an incredible amount of detail. She informed the IEG that DAG resolution of common issues being seen in the SDC responses includes: eliminating base operating support costs that are already included in the COBRA model to avoid double counting; taking the position that a gaining activity's increased mission costs are cancelled by a losing activity's commensurate savings, absent a demonstrated differential; and, at direction of the OSD COBRA JPAT, applying a consistent rule set for evaluating Tricare costs that allows the Medical JCSG to resolve medical manpower and military construction costs at the conclusion of analysis. Lastly, Ms. Davis noted that the SDCs are becoming more complex, with up to 28 actions per data call.

17. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the DAG will continue scenario analysis by conducting COBRA, economic, community infrastructure, and environmental impacts analyses. She noted that the IEG will begin reviewing COBRA results at the 16 December 2004 deliberative session and will identify potential dates for delivering DON candidate recommendations to the ISG. Ms. Davis stated that the DAG will continue releasing SDCs and

reviewing responses thereto, and prepare to update the DON leadership on the progress of the DON BRAC 2005 process in mid-January 2005.

18. The deliberative session adjourned at 1141.

JAMES A. NOEL
CAPTAIN, U.S. Marine Corps
Recorder, IAT