

Criteria 1-4

- **Force Structure Capabilities:** The Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group (IJCSG) scenarios have been constructed to accommodate the current and surge requirements. Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) manpower levels increase through FY09, Army manpower levels increase through FY05, and end strength levels beyond FY11, as reported in the 20-Year Force Structure Plan, remain flat through FY25. Therefore, we find that this recommendation is consistent with the 20-Year Force Structure Plan.
- **Military Value Analysis Results:** The Defense Intelligence Community's functions are very broad and diverse. Addressing each of these functions individually would result in an unworkable number of scoring plans that would not be representative of the military value of the facilities performing the functions. The IJCSG used a single scoring plan to achieve the BRAC 2005 goal of looking across the Defense Intelligence Community to optimize efficiencies and consolidate or collocate where appropriate. Binning/clustering of facilities was conducted based on Analytical Frameworks (Minimize Vulnerable Commercial Leased Space, Improve COOP and Mission Assurance, Align Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers (JRICs), Improve Information Flow and Mission Synergy, Align Intelligence Education and Training, Consolidate DoD Security Central Adjudication Facilities) and on statistical analysis of facility attributes in the military value scoring plan. These attributes were grouped in two attribute categories: the Physical Infrastructure Attribute Category (Facility Capability, Facility Condition, Survivability/Force Protection, Specialized Equipment, Ownership/Type Space) and the Location Attribute Category (Geophysical Constraints, Mission Assurance/COOP, Buildable Land, Human & Intellectual Capital, Geographic and Professional Relationships, Economic Cost of Location). The IJCSG also looked at facilities with a low overall Military Value score. Results of this analysis support the strategy-driven scenarios being considered, but did not identify any additional data-driven scenarios. The optimization tool was not used to maximize Military Value because capacity analysis determined there was **no** overall excess capacity in the Defense Intelligence Community.

The result of the Military Value Scoring Plan is a "1 to 267" listing of intelligence facilities that is predominantly a reflection of a facility's condition performing its current intelligence mission. Based on military judgment, only those buildings which directly support the intelligence function are included in the IJCSG Military Value Report. Military Value scores for those buildings ranged from a low of 7.16 to a high of 66.16 and are reported in the Draft IJCSG Military Value Report dated April 13, 2005.

The move from Crystal Park 5 to the Defense Intelligence Analysis Center (DIAC) is clearly an improvement in military value rank from 96 to 5. The move of intelligence functions from Bolling Air Force Base to Rivanna Station relocates those functions from a facility with a military value rank of 5 to one with a rank of 26. Although Rivanna Station has a lower quantitative military value rank than the DIAC, it was the military judgment of the IJCSG that movement of DIA intelligence functions to Rivanna Station had higher overall military value because:

- the collocation of DIA intelligence functions with like Army intelligence functions at Rivanna Station improves effectiveness and efficiency of military force, counterproliferation, and scientific and technical intelligence analysis;
- the proximity of Rivanna Station to the Washington D.C. metropolitan area creates a viable COOP/mission assurance capability for both DIA and U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command (an objective consistent with the guidance of Presidential Decision Directive Number 67); and
- the establishment of an open-source analysis capability at Rivanna Station further enhances the effectiveness and efficiency of co-located functions.

This recommendation also reduces the total amount of DIA leased space in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area and avoids the need for leasing additional Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility (SCIF) workspace required for recent growth at National Ground Intelligence Center (NGIC) and programmed growth at DIA.

This recommendation accommodates current and surge requirements and addresses projected changes in mission tasking and programmed growth included in the 20-Year Force Structure Plan. DIA has previously programmed construction (FY-04) that accommodates transferring approximately 1,300 military and civilian authorizations from its largest leased facility in the Washington D.C. metropolitan area (DIA Clarendon) but it does not address other increases in force structure or new missions. Programmed DIA force structure growth (“Strategy for Strengthening Intelligence” – PBD-339) adds additional civilian authorizations at the DIAC. New missions include designation of DIA as the new Joint Functional Component Command for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (JFCC-ISR) that transfers additional military and civilian personnel billets from U.S. Strategic Command to the DIAC. This recommendation accommodates these force structure factors as well as vacating leased space in Crystal Park 5. DIA has programmed sufficient operations and maintenance funds to accommodate “steady state” sustainment of this recommendation.

- Below are arrayed the original military value scores and relative rank of the facilities in the Intelligence function, with the three facilities that are the subjects of this recommendation in ***bold and italics***.

[NOTE: The Military Value list of facilities for the Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group is classified and held separately. This report is available upon request to members of the Commission and Congress with the appropriate security clearances and accesses.]

- **Capacity Analysis Results:** Capacity information shown below is taken from the Draft Intelligence Joint Cross Service Group Capacity Analysis Report dated April 13, 2005. Department of Defense Agencies and Military Departments provided the initial data to identify square footage and personnel authorized for the accomplishment of intelligence functions at each existing location. Current Capacity was determined by identifying total useable square footage (owned, leased, or controlled by the Department of Defense) being used to perform the intelligence functions. Current Usage was computed by adding the space needs for personnel occupying the facilities to the space needed for specialized equipment and administrative support space (determined by the number of people occupying the facility). In computing the space needs of personnel occupying each facility, the IJCSG

developed an algorithm by applying military judgment to DODI 5035.5 space allocation standards. The difference between the Current Usage and Current Capacity was identified as excess space. The optimization tool was not used to minimize Excess Capacity because capacity analysis determined there was **no** overall excess capacity in the Defense Intelligence Community.

Due to a lack of space, the Intelligence Community primarily handles surge operations by reassigning and reallocating existing resources within the current available square footage. The Intelligence Community also flexes to increase 24x7 support by reallocating existing personnel from traditional first shift operations and bringing in a limited number of new personnel (reservists, annuitants, contractors with appropriate expertise and clearances). Therefore, for the purpose of this analysis, the Intelligence Joint Cross Service Group defined Capacity Required to Surge (SC) to be zero square feet.

All three facilities in this recommendation showed capacity *shortfalls* as shown below. As explained in "Force Structure Capabilities" above, the shortfall at the Defense Intelligence Analysis Center (DIAC) is only partially addressed by the current DIAC construction. The capacity analysis supports the recommendation to construct additional capacity. The total shortfall at the DIAC was compared against all other facilities in the IJCSG database with excess capacity -- none had sufficient excess capacity to accommodate the current or projected DIAC shortfall. When taken in combination with FY04 DIAC construction, this recommendation addresses capacity shortfalls.

Below are arrayed the original capacity analysis results of the facilities in the Intelligence function, with the three facilities that are the subjects of this recommendation in ***bold and italics***.

[NOTE: The Capacity Analysis list of facilities for the Intelligence Joint Cross-Service Group is classified and held separately. This report is available upon request to members of the Commission and Congress with the appropriate security clearances and accesses.]