

BRAC 2005
Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)
Meeting Minutes of 16 July 2004

Dr. Ron Sega, Director, Defense Research and Engineering chaired the meeting. The list of attendees is enclosed in attachment 1. Pre-meeting issue papers are enclosed in attachment 2. The primary objective for the meeting was to provide the TJCSG principals with an update on the final draft solutions to their critical issues. These solutions were developed at the Mini-Off Site – CIT member Planning Boot Camp, held 12-14 July 2004, at Quantico. The key points, decisions and action items from the meeting are as follows:

Key Points:

- The TJCSG discussed the Dry Run of Optimization and Scenario Analysis issue paper. The TJCSG Execution Model, approved 3 May 2004 outlines the currently approved TJCSG analysis process. The subgroup leads stated that a dry run will help refine the execution model and help define other information needs as well as determine limitations of the Linear Optimization Model (LOM). The Dry Run may also identify any elements in the BRAC Execution Model that might produce unintended results. If any unexpected results are identified, then the team will perform a sensitivity analysis to scope the issue, and if needed, recommend adjustments to the Execution Model. Mr. Goldstayn took an action to prepare an issue paper to discuss contingency plans if the model produces inconclusive results and/or aberrant behavior. The Dry Run will require notional data from the Analytic Team (with guidance from subgroups), and briefings on linear optimization and COBRA & selection criteria 6-8. If the Dry Run identifies any modifications or updates that must be made to the Execution Model. These will be presented to the CIT for review, and then to the TJCSG for approval. The updated Execution Model will then be incorporated into the next Master Plan update. (Action Item: Dr. Higgins, Subgroups Leads, CIT alternates, and Analytical Team)
- The TJCSG reviewed the Monitoring Request for Clarification (RFC) Questions Issue paper. The TJCSG has identified gaps and discrepancies in some of the data provided by the MILDEPS in response to the first data call and therefore, have established a RFC process. Since the RFC process requires close management of the data, it was agreed that the CIT needs a staffer to collect the data from all the Services and Defense Agencies. The CIT needs a process to track and identify when there are deficiencies in gathering the RFC data. It was also agreed that the scope of this effort needs to be expanded to include tracking of other key data/information such as MV Data, scenario analysis, etc. Such status reports should be provided on a continuous basis to TJCSG & CIT members (Action Item: Mr. Al Shaffer & CIT)
- The TJCSG reviewed the Scenario Guidelines Issue paper. The TJCSG directed the CIT to determine if the TJCSG should adopt principles or imperatives for internal use, or to submit to the ISG for approval. Instead the CIT suggested four Scenario Guidelines for internal TJCSG use and approval. The TJCSG recommended three of

the four be rewritten. The TJCSG agreed that the time to share these guidelines with the ISG would be as part of the TJCSG's next briefing to the ISG on scenario analysis methodology. It was also discussed that the word "redundant" and "full range" need to be clarified and justified in terms of BRAC. (Action Item: Ms. Felix & Mr. J. Erb)

- The TJCSG briefly discussed how selection criteria five through eight are used in the scenario process. The TJCSG members requested a briefing on these criteria from the Joint Process Action Team. The OSD BRAC office recommends that the principles receive the scenario development brief which discusses the criteria. Also, it is recommended that these criteria be included in the TJCSG Master Plan. (Action Item: Ms. Felix)

Decisions:

- The TJCSG agreed to the "Dry Run" of Optimization and Scenario Analysis issue paper with the following update to the 2nd paragraph under Issue Summary: The Dry Run requires subgroups to: meet; receive information briefing on linear optimization, and COBRA; develop transformation options, principles, and imperatives, and; conduct a dry run exercise using notional data that has a range of capacity data.
- The TJCSG has agreed to the Monitoring RFC Status issue paper, but expanded scope to include of other key data such as Military Value.
- The TJCSG agreed to the Scenario Guidelines issue paper and that Dr. Sega would use them to explain and justify our eventual scenario proposals to the ISG. Each proposal (e.g. Relocate Site A to Site B) will be justified within the context set by these guidelines.
- The TJCSG has agreed to the Criteria 5-8 Usage issue paper.

Action Items:

1. The following actions are related to Dry Run of Optimization & Scenario Analysis Issue Paper:

a. Develop a Dry Run Plan for carrying out the BRAC Execution Model and be able to execute it. Action: Dr. Higgins, 23 July 2004.

b. The Analytical Team with the guidance of the subgroups will provide notional data that has a range of capacity data for the "Dry Run" of Optimization and Scenario Analysis. (Action: Analytical Team & Subgroup Leads).

2. Develop a contingency plan for inconclusive/aberant BRAC Execution Model behavior during the Optimization & Scenario Analysis Dry Run. Action: Mr. A. Goldstyan, 29 July 2004

4. The Following Actions are related to Monitoring RFC Status Issue Paper:

a. Assign a responsible CIT representative that will gather RFC and other key data Status information from all the Services concerning required data. Action: Mr. Al Shaffer : 23 July 2004

b. Define a methodology or process map for tracking and identifying when there are deficiencies in collecting data. A status report should be provided on a continuous basis to TJCSG & CIT concerning the status of the data which should include capacity, MilVal, and scenario. Action: Mr. Al Shaffer, 28 July 2004

5. The following actions are related to Scenario Guidelines Issue paper:

a) Update draft issue paper with changes provided at the TJCSG meeting, 16 July 2004 to Mr. Erb. Action: Ms. Felix, S: 16 July 2004, Completed

b) Finalize draft issue paper. Action: Mr. J Erb, 23 July 2004

c) Provide an information paper to clearly define what we mean by "redundant" and "full range" in terms of BRAC. Action: Mr. J. Erb, 23 July 2004

d) Draft an action paper to determine who is responsible to share the proposed scenario guidelines with the ISG. Action: COL Buckstad, 28 July 2004.

6. The following action is related to Criteria 5-8 Usage issue paper:

a) Schedule the JPAT briefings on #5-8 criteria and how it affects the entire process. Action: Ms. Felix, 23 July 2004.

Signed: _____

Mr. Al Shaffer

Chairman, Capabilities Integration Team

Approved: _____

Dr. Ronald Sega

Chairman, Technical Joint Cross Service Group

Attachments:

1. List of Attendees
2. Issue Papers

**Technical JCSG Meeting
July 16, 2004
Attendees**

Members:

Dr. Ron Sega (Chair)
Mr. Jay Erb, OSD
Dr. Dan Stewart, Air Force (via telecon)
Col Hamm, Marines (Alternate)
Mr. Don DeYoung, Navy CIT Alternate
COL Buckstad, OSD

Other:

Mr. Al Shaffer
Mr. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC Office
Mr. Al Goldstyan, AF CIT Rep
Col Eileen Walling, AF CIT Rep
Mr. Roger Florence, DOD IG
Mr. Matt Mleziva, AF
Dr. Karen Higgins, Navy
Dr. Bill Berry
Mr. Daniel Thomas
Dr. James Short, OSD
Mr. Brian Simmons, Army CIT Alternate
Mr. Thom Mathes, Army
Dr. William Berry, OSD

CIT and TJCSG Session
15, 16 July 2004

Subject Outline

Introduction

- 1. "Dry Run" of Optimization and Scenario Analysis
Expected Result: CIT and TJCSG provide insight and special instructions as needed
- 2. Monitoring RFC Status
Expected Result: Monitor Data
- 3. Scenario Guidelines:
Expected Results: The CIT and TJCSG will approve presented guidelines.
- 4. Criteria 5-8 Usage
Expected Result: The CIT and TJCSG will approve usage guidelines

Discussion and Closing Remarks

Table of Contents

1."Dry Run" of Optimization and Scenario Analysis.....2

2. Monitoring RFC3

3. Scenario Guidelines.....4

4. Criteria 5-8 Usage.....9

1. "Dry Run" of Optimization and Scenario Analysis

Expected Result: CIT and TJCSG provide insight and special instructions as needed

Issue Paper
##¹

Subject: Execute a "Dry Run" of Execution Model

Points of Contact: Dr. Schuette and Dr. Higgins

Issue Summary:

The TJCSG subgroups leaders desire to exercise the Execution Model to help determine completeness, additional information needs, and additional TJCSG decision points. The TJCSG has an Execution Model on paper. The Subgroup Leaders believe a dry run will help refine the model and help define other information needs. This will help reduce risk.

The Dry Run requires subgroups to: meet; receive information briefing on linear optimization, and COBRA; transformation options, principles, and imperatives, and; conduct a dry run exercise.

Dry Run execution as a minimum will validate the single bin concept. If time available a multiple-cross bin concept will be validated.

The Dry Run expected results are: TJCSG members will gain an appreciation for Execution Model detail and help improve the Execution Model. Procedures for creating scenario & process to execute scenario.

Recommendation – TJCSG provide any special instructions as needed

CIT recommendations:

AF Representative: Concur
Army Representative: Concur
Marine Representative: Concur
Navy Representative: Concur

¹ Issue number pending assignment

2. Monitoring RFC Status

Expected Result: TJCSG approve need for RFC status reporting

Issue: BRAC DATA UPDATE STATUS TRACKING

Point of Contact: Col. Walter B. Hamm

Background: The Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG) has identified gaps and discrepancies in some of the data provided by the Military Departments in response to the first data call. Because this is a Department wide issue, the Chairman, ISG, has directed that “senior Service representatives to the JCSGs should be the first line of authority to identify and resolve data problems.” He has also directed that “each JCSG Chair should establish procedures with each Military Department and Defense Agency that enable the JCSG to raise and track data clarification issues through their senior Military Department representative to ensure data quality issues are resolved.” As a result, the TJCSG has established a “Request for Clarification Process” to guide the data corrections effort.

Discussion: Due to the tight timelines within the BRAC process, it is imperative that these gaps and discrepancies be corrected as soon as possible, which requires close management of the data update process. Key to this is timely and accurate information on the update process, ie., a data update status report. This should include the current status on each Request For Clarification (RFC) submitted to a MilDep, status of supplementary data calls, and status of data issues being worked by a MilDep in support of the TJCSG but not specifically requested. This report should be provided weekly or may be more frequent to best serve the fast moving BRAC process.

Recommendation: That the Chairman, Technical JCSG, request a weekly data update status report from the MILDEP Principals.

CIT recommendations:

AF Representative:

Army Representative:

Marine Representative:

Navy Representative:

(General: CIT members agreed to the need for RFC status reporting. Issue Paper is subject to further update)

3. Scenario Guidelines

Expected Result: TJCSG Approval

TJCSG Scenario Guidelines Issue **07-15-04-0X**

Issue: The TJCSG directed the CIT to determine if the TJCSG should adopt Principles or Imperatives for internal use, or to submit to the ISG for approval.

Point of Contact: Al Goldstayn & Jim Short

Issue Summary:

- Mr Wynne states in a memo that Imperatives must be traceable to a Principle. For that reason, the CIT discussed what Principles it might recommend to the TJCSG
- CIT consensus is to propose no Principles, and therefore no Imperatives, to the TJCSG
- Instead, the CIT recommends four TJCSG-specific Scenario Guidelines for approval by the principals.

Scenario Guidelines Recommendations for TJCSG approval:

1. “DoD will maintain responsive technological superiority by retaining sufficient technical infrastructure and intellectual resources while leveraging commercial, international, academic and other (U.S.) government technology efforts.”
2. Retain sufficient redundant organic capability within the Department’s technical capability to conduct and manage research to enable and promote the growth of intellectual capital, enhance innovation and promote the competition of ideas in technology areas relevant to warfighting requirements or opportunities.
3. Retain sufficient organic capability within the Department to perform and manage the performance of development, acquisition, and in-service engineering of weapon systems and support systems for the classes and types of systems required by the military departments.
4. Retain sufficient organic capability within the Department to perform and manage the performance of test and evaluation of the classes and types of weapons systems and support systems over the full range of terrain and climatic conditions, including systems-of-systems which demonstrate a military capability (often in conjunction with training).

CIT Coordination

Army:

AF:

Navy:

Marine Corps:

JCS:

(Coordination subject to update)

Attached as information

Second draft Issue Paper from CIT Work Group, 14 Jul

First Draft Issue Paper, 12-13 Jul

WORKING PAPER – SECOND DRAFT

Issue Paper

##

TJCSG PRICIPLES AND IMPERATIVES

Issue: The TJCSG has directed the CIT to determine if there should be any imperatives adopted by the TJCSG for either forwarding on to the ISG for approval, or for internal use.

Point of Contact: COL Buckstad on behalf of the CIT Working Group 14 Jul

Issue Summary:

- As a basic framework, Transformational Options direct options for the building of scenarios. Imperatives limit scenarios.
- Per ISG guidance, Imperatives must be traceable to a Principle. For that reason, the first analysis considered if there was a Principle that should be recommended to the TJCSG, to enable any internal or external imperatives. The CIT working group proposed the following **principle** be adopted:

“DoD will maintain responsive technological superiority by retaining the capability of essential infrastructure and intellectual resources while leveraging commercial, international, academic and other (U.S.) government technology efforts.”

- The CIT working group reviewed the draft imperatives provided several weeks ago (based on initial Service recommendations – most of which was modified prior to the Imperative list provided by the ISG. It was the group’s recommendation that (for now) imperatives be limited so as not to constrain TJCSG sub-group scenario development, with two exceptions:
 - The CIT working group recommended that the TJCSG adopt the following (internal) **Imperative:**

“The TJCSG will not recommend to the Secretary any closure or realignment that eliminates necessary redundant organic (insert “organic”, AF recommendation) technical research capability, discourages the growth of intellectual capital, discourages innovation or discourages the competition of ideas.”

In the event an internally accepted Imperative can be worded positively, the above recommended **Imperative** would be worded

“Retain necessary redundant organic (“organic”, AF recommendation) technical research capability to enable and promote the growth of intellectual capital, enhance innovation and promote the competition of ideas.”

- The CIT working group also recommended that the TJCSG adopt the following (internal) **Imperative**:

“The TJCSG will not recommend to the Secretary any closure or realignment that eliminates the required organic capability in the areas of technical development and acquisition for Department of Defense weapons and support systems” {Admin note: presented 14 Jul}

In the event an internally accepted Imperative can be worded positively, the above recommended **Imperative** would be worded:

“Retain the required organic capability in the areas of technical development and acquisition for Department of Defense weapons and support systems” {Admin note: presented 14 Jul}

- Additionally, the CIT working group recommended that the TJCSG adopt the following (internal) **Imperative**:

“The TJCSG will not recommend to the Secretary any closure or realignment that eliminates the Department’s organic (“organic”, AF recommendation) capability to test and evaluate materiel and systems over the full range of terrain and climatic conditions.”

In the event an internally accepted Imperative can be worded positively, the above recommended **Imperative** would be worded:

“Retain the Department’s organic (“organic”, AF recommendation) capability to test and evaluate materiel and systems over the full range of terrain and climatic conditions.”

- The CIT working group agreed that once the sub-groups do their analysis of the scenario process, there may be additional imperative recommendations forthcoming. The initial sub-group analysis of the scenario process is scheduled for next week. The CIT working group recommends the CIT task the sub-groups to recommend any additional imperatives for internal TCJSG adoption, NLT 10 August. This will allow time for the CIT to review the recommendations, and obtain TCJSG principles approval prior to starting the scenarios.

Recommendations:

- The CIT recommend the (above) Technical Principles to the TCJSG executives for approval. Further, the CIT recommend to the TJCSG executives that this principle be forwarded to the ISG for their information.

- The CIT recommend the (above) two Imperatives to the TCCSG executives for approval. Further, the CIT recommend to the TJCSG executives that these three Imperatives are for internal use and made a matter of record.
- The CIT task the sub-groups to provide any additional recommended Imperatives NLT 10 August.

Coordination

End second draft

WORKING PAPER – FIRST DRAFT

TJCSG PRINCIPLES AND IMPERATIVES

Issue #

Issue: The TJCSG has directed the CIT to determine if there should be any imperatives adopted by the TJCSG for either forwarding on to the ISG for approval, or for internal use.

Point of Contact: Jay Erb

Issue Summary:

- As a basic framework, Transformational Options direct options for the building of scenarios. Imperatives limit scenarios.
- Per ISG guidance, Imperatives must be traceable to a Principle. For that reason, the first analysis considered if there was a Principle that should be recommended to the TJCSG, to enable any internal or external imperatives. The CIT working group proposed the following principle be adopted: “DoD will maintain responsive technological superiority by retaining the capability of essential infrastructure and intellectual resources while leveraging commercial, international, academic and other (U.S.) government technology efforts.”
- The CIT working group reviewed the draft imperatives provided several weeks ago (based on initial Service recommendations – most of which was modified prior to the Imperative list provided by the ISG. It was the group’s recommendation that (for now) imperatives be limited so as not to constrain TJCSG sub-group scenario development, with two exceptions:
 - The CIT working group recommended that the TJCSG adopt the following (internal) Imperative: “The TJCSG will not recommend to the Secretary any closure or realignment that eliminates a minimum redundant technical research capability, so as to discourage the growth of intellectual capital, discourage innovation or discourage the competition of ideas.” In the event an internally accepted Imperative can be worded positively, the above recommended Imperative would be worded “Retain a minimum redundant technical research

capability to enable and promote the growth of intellectual capital, enhance innovation and promote the competition of ideas.”

- The CIT working group also recommended that the TJCSG adopt the following (internal) Imperative: “The TJCSG will not recommend to the Secretary any closure or realignment that eliminates the Department’s capability to test and evaluate materiel and systems over the full range of terrain and climatic conditions.”
- The CIT working group agreed that once the sub-groups do their analysis of the scenario process, there may be additional imperative recommendations forthcoming. The initial sub-group analysis of the scenario process is scheduled for next week. The CIT working group recommends the CIT task the sub-groups to recommend any additional imperatives for internal TCJSG adoption, NLT 10 August. This will allow time for the CIT to review the recommendations, and obtain TCJSG principles approval prior to starting the scenarios.

Recommendations:

- The CIT recommend the (above) Technical Principle to the TCJSG principles for approval. Further, the CIT recommend to the TJCSG principles that this Principle be forwarded to the ISG for their information.
- The CIT recommend the (above) two Imperatives to the TCCSG principles for approval. Further, the CIT recommend to the TJCSG principles that these two Imperatives be for internal use, but be made a matter of record.
- The CIT task the sub-groups to provide any additional recommended Imperatives NLT 10 August.

CIT COORDINATION

4. Criteria 5-8 Usage

Expected Result: The CIT and TJCSG will approve usage guidelines

CRITERIA 5-8 Issue #²

ISSUE: TJCSG MUST USE CRITERIA 5-8 IN SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT AND SCENARIO ANALYSIS.

POINT OF CONTACT: Col. Robert Buckstad

ISSUE SUMMARY:

The Secretary of Defense has approved eight Criteria to be used to govern BRAC recommendations. Criteria 1-4 were required to be used in preparing the questions and the analysis for Military Value ranking. Criteria 5-8 are required to be used in preparing BRAC scenarios and in finalizing BRAC recommendations. The Department has formed Joint Process Action Teams to update the COBRA model (Criteria 5) and provide standard factors to be used in the model, to provide economic impacts (Criteria 6 & 7) information for communities around military installations and to provide standardized environmental factors (Criteria 8) for each military installation. These data should be used by the TJCSG in forming final recommendations. The Joint Process Action Team (JPAT) teams will provide specific comparative data on these criteria to the TJCSG. The TJCSG can send out specific directed requests for additional data for COBRA analysis to further the cost analysis.

CRITERIA 5-8 TABLE TO BE INCLUDED IN THE TJCSG MASTER PLAN:

The following table outlines the 5-8 criteria and what the criteria includes. This table should be included as Table 9 (page 16) in the TJCSG Master Plan.

Criteria ¹⁵ – The technical facilities ability to:	The criteria includes ¹⁶:
5. The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.	A non-budget quality scenario comparative tool (COBRA), A 20-yr. payback period (ROI), the costs of moves, construction and a variety of other factors, a set of OSD-approved common factors, and impact on other DOD and Federal Agencies
6. The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.	Potential job loss, potential indirect job loss, total potential job change in the economic area, and the impact of other recommendations affecting the same economic area.
7. The ability of both the existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, mission, and personnel.	The following 10 factors: Population, Child Care, Cost of Living, Education, Employment, Housing, Medical/Health, Safety/Crime, Transportation, and Utilities.
8. The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental	The following 10 factors: Air Quality, Dredging, Cultural Resources, Marine Resources, Land Use, Noise, Wetlands, Threatened/Endangered species, Waste Disposal, Water

² Issue paper will be logged (number assigned) by the CIT within 5 work days.

15 Jul 04

compliance activities.	Resources. It also includes overhead satellite data (IVT) showing encroachments and physical layout.
------------------------	--

RECOMMENDATION: TJCSG concur with the inclusion in the Master Plan.

CIT recommendations:

- AF Representative: agree
- Army Representative: agree
- Marine Representative: agree
- Navy Representative: agree