

**BRAC 2005**  
**Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)**  
**Meeting Minutes of 11 August 2004**

Mr. Al Shaffer chaired the meeting in Dr. Sega's absence. The agenda is enclosed in attachment 1. The list of attendees is enclosed in attachment 2. Pre-meeting documentation for the meeting is enclosed in attachment 3. The primary objective for the meeting was to provide the TJCSG principals with the Scenario Areas of Interest. The key points, decisions and action items from the meeting are as follows:

Feedback from 6 August 2004 ISG Meeting – Dr. Foulkes

**Key Points:**

- Dr. Foulkes provided a brief synopsis of the 6 August 2004 ISG Meeting. The purpose of this ISG meeting was to review notional scenarios from the JCSGs and Services to highlight where "conflicts" might arise in scenarios. In addition, to begin to identify what data elements constitute a solid definition for a scenario to be brought to the JCSG.
- Dr. Foulkes indicated the ISG accepted the three TJCSG notional training scenarios and the ISG did not express any concern with the TJCSG decision to not include specific sites in these scenarios.
- Service BRAC Principals expressed tremendous concern about the existing training scenario identification process.
- Mr. Wynne proposed that we "register" the notional scenarios in a tracking tool and periodically review them for further training just as if they were real scenarios. The Air Force and the Navy objected to this since they considered this as a one time training exercise.
- Mr. Wynne indicated the training scenarios were an exercise, however they will be recorded, and subsequent analysis would determine their feasibility to become final BRAC recommendations.
- The other JCSGs and Services' training scenarios were much more specific and identified specific sites.
- The Services and JCSGs were given an action item to develop three more training scenarios to be presented at the 27 August 2004 ISG Meeting. These will be due to the OSD BRAC Office on 25 August 04. No further guidance on the specificity level required for the next three.
- The format for future scenarios to be presented to the ISG will consist of two quad charts which summarize the description of the proposal, the transformational options or BRAC objectives supported by the scenario, cost and personnel data, Criteria 6 through 8, and other comments.

- ISG will increase meeting time to 90 minutes and meetings will be scheduled weekly beginning 27 August 2004 in order to make the BRAC Recommendation suspense.
- Services and JCSGs suspense was moved up from 31 December 2004 to 15 December 2004 to avoid working over the holidays.

#### Approval of CIT Resolved Issues

- There was a discrepancy regarding two issue papers. One issue paper titled "Data Quality" # 07-16-04-06 recommends that the TJCSG establish face-to-face discussions with the Service BRAC offices to address RFCs issues. The second issue paper titled "Cancel the Capacity Data Call RFCs" # 08-10-04-01 recommends canceling all RFCs.

Issue Paper 07-30-04-02, Capacity Measures for LOM Runs was approved with the use of FTEs as long as it done within a bin. TJCSG agreed not to run the LOM using FTEs in order to assess cross-functional or cross-capability scenarios. This is because the FTEs in each Function and Capability Area have different characteristics and requirements (e.g. education, skill sets, etc.). TJCSG reserve the right and flexibility to use expert military judgment for cross-functional/cross-capability scenarios. Therefore, TJCSG has not yet defined a process to do cross-functional/cross-capability runs using the LOM.

#### Review of Scenario Areas of Interest

- CIT believes the potential jointness for future technologies of scenario areas of interest represents about 85% of the TJCSG potential scenarios.
- CIT Chair believes this should serve as the first cut of the next three training scenarios for the ISG.
- RADM Cohen indicated that Scenarios should be based on data not on perception.
- TJCSG discussed the feasibility of obtaining additional data (such as sub-DTAP data) for any scenarios considered. Overall view is there is not sufficient time to request for additional broad data call from the fields. Therefore, the TJCSG will need to limit the any additional data calls to only those scenarios which are recommended.
- The TJCSG Principals agreed that any scenarios proposed should be "neutral" with respect to any of the Services' organizational constructs

#### **Action Items:**

1. TJCSG to prepare three more notional training scenarios to the ISG on 27 August 2004. Due to OSD BRAC by 25 August 2004. (Action Officer: Mr. Shaffer)
2. Clarify the two conflicting issue papers regarding the release of Capacity Data Call RFCs. (Action Officer: CIT Members, August 19, 2004)

Point of Contact is Marie F. Felix

August 11, 2004

BRAC FOUO

- Next TJCSG Meeting is scheduled for August 19, 2004, 1000-1200 hrs EDT, Crystal City, Presidential Tower 1, Rm 9200 to review Subgroups output from the Dry Run Exercise. Mr. Shaffer is working to extend Dr. Sega's time for this meeting to instead last from 0800-1200 hrs EDT. More to come.

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Al Shaffer  
Acting Chairman, Technical Joint Cross Service Group

Attachments:

1. Outline -Agenda
2. List of Attendees
3. Pre-meeting documentation

# **TJCSG VTC AGENDA**

**11 Aug 04**

**0900-1000 HRS EDT**

**4C1061**

- **Dr. Foulkes ISG Meeting Feedback**
- **Clearance of Resolved Issues**
- **Scenario Areas of Interest**
  - **Seeking TJCSG Insight**
- **Specific Scenarios from Subgroups and CIT**
  - **Seeking TJCSG Insight**
- **Review Unresolved Issue Papers**
  - **Seeking TJCSG Recommendations**

**Attachment 2**  
**Technical JCSG Meeting**  
**August 11, 2004**  
**Attendees**

**Members:**

Mr. Al Shaffer, OSD, (Alternate TJCSG Chair for Dr. Segal)  
Mr. J. Erb, JCS  
Dr. D. Stewart, Air Force (via VTC)  
Dr. J. Foulkes, Army  
Dr. Barry Dillon, Marines (via VTC)  
RADM Jay Cohen, Navy

**Other:**

Mr. Don DeYoung, Navy CIT Alternate  
Mr. Al Goldstyan, AF CIT Rep (via VTC)  
Col Eileen Walling, Alternate AF CIT Rep (via VTC)  
Mr. Brian Simmons, Army CIT Alternate (via VTC)  
Dr. Bob Rohde, Army CIT Rep  
Dr. Larry Schuette, Navy  
COL Pete DeSalva, Marines  
Mr. Gary Strack, OSD  
Maj Ron Mahn, OSD  
Ms. Marie Felix, OSD  
COL Walt Hamm, Marines CIT Rep  
Mr. Thom Mathes, Army  
Mr. Steve Kratzmeier, Army  
Dr. Karen Higgins, Navy  
Mr. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC  
Mr. Matt Mleziva, AF  
Mr. Roger Florence, OSD IG  
Mr. Dan Thomas, Army  
Mr. John Miner, AF  
CDR Jim Melone, Navy

**Issue #07-01-04-01**

**Issue:** Defense Agencies Data Input

**Point of Contact:** Col. DeSalva

**Issue Summary:**

07/01/04 Initial issue paper submitted to CIT for consideration

1. There are five Defense Agencies (DA) identified by OSD as responding to TJCSG questions the analytical team has only been able.
  - Three are included in the master db received from OSD (DISA, MDA, and DCMA).
  - Two were provided in “hardcopy” format (DARPA and DTRA)
2. MilDeps/JCSGs have been told by the OSD BRAC office to use the “hard copy” data from DAs in their analysis.
  - Manual processing of the data is grossly inefficient and time consuming.
  - Practically speaking, in order to conduct analysis, the “hard copy” data must be inputted into the OSD “master” database.
3. If each MilDeps/JCSG converts the “hard copy” data independently this will create multiple unsynchronized databases, seriously degrading data uniformity, and drastically raising the likelihood of error introduction during the transcription process.
  - Increases the total manpower requirement by up to a factor of ten (seven JCSGs and the three MilDeps)
    - Conversion of one JCSGs hardcopy data input for one update involved 13,500 data elements and took 40 man-hours. It involved personnel from the subject agencies and the JCSG. Of the two agencies providing hardcopy responses to the TJCSG, one has had no updates (DARPA) and the other three updates (DTRA).
  - Independent data conversion increases the opportunity for the introduction of error into the separate databases by up to a factor of ten.
    - No process has been identified that will integrate the separate databases into the OSD “master” database. This poses a serious challenge in maintaining configuration control.
    - All updates must be verified by the respondent/originator.

**Recommendation:** Coordinate with the MilDeps and the other JCSGs to insist OSD provide a single and complete “master” database. This includes data capture, data conversion of the hardcopy data, and configuration management at the OSD-level.

**CIT Recommendation: Concur**  
**AF Position: Concur**  
**Navy Position: Concur**  
**Army Position: Concur**  
**Marine Corps Position: Concur**  
**JCS Position: Concur**

---

DRAFT ACTION MEMORANDUM

MEMORANDUM FOR ACTING UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
(ACQUISITION, TECHNOLOGY AND LOGISTICS), CHAIRMAN,  
INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING GROUP

SUBJECT: Integration of Defense Agency (DA) Data Into OSD BRAC Database

The DAs have been given the option of responding to BRAC data calls via “hardcopy” inputs. To date, no coordinating action has been taken by the OSD BRAC office to ensure the proper integration of this data into the OSD BRAC database. It has been left up to the individual Joint Cross Service Groups (JCSGs) and Military Departments (MilDeps) to incorporate this data into their separate analysis.

I am confident that the Technical JCSG (TJCSG) can accomplish this integration, but I am concerned that this situation will present opportunities to introduce error into the separate and unsynchronized databases, will require an inordinate amount of effort to accomplish, and will have to be repeated a number of times. This will make everyone’s task unnecessarily difficult, and introduce an element of risk that can be avoided with proper coordination. A process needs to be established by which all DA data is integrated into the OSD “master” database in such a way that all JCSGs and the MilDeps get the same data.

In an effort to optimize the BRAC database synchronization, I recommend that the OSD BRAC office take responsibility for integrating all Defense Agency data into the OSD BRAC database prior to releasing updates to the JCSGs and the MilDeps.

My staff stands ready to assist in development of the guidance if you desire. My point of contact for this issue is .....

Dr Sega Signature block

Data Quality  
Issue # 07-16-04-06

ISSUE: The data obtained from Data Call No. 1 contained errors and omissions.

POINT OF CONTACT: Thom Mathes

ISSUE SUMMARY: There is low confidence, despite the care taken in structuring the questions to reduce the chance of misinterpretation or misunderstanding of their intent, that the data obtained from Data Call No. 2 will demonstrate many of the same problems.

SUGGESTED COURSE OF ACTION:

- (1) the TJCSG send out the RFCs from Data Call No.1. Since it is expected that we will receive responses from the field within 10 days it will give us some degree of confidence in whether the RFC process works and will provide us good data. This will be of particular benefit should it be necessary to correct any problems encountered with Data Call No. 2.
- (2) Should we receive good data from these RFCs, the subgroups could then use this data to run the Capacity calculations at the organizational/installation level. This would give us confidence, and would provide the opportunity to make any adjustments should be necessary
- (3) Should the RFCs not provide the desired results it would give us approximately 45 days to develop a methodology on how we can go forward should we get the same quality of data in Data Call No. 2 as we have seen in Data Call No. 1.
- (4) Al Shaffer to meet with Service BRAC offices to provide them with an orientation briefing and improve the line of communication. It is recommended that this be done within 30 days for the release of Data Call No. 2 (Desire: Collectively meet with Service BRAC Office designated representatives, e.g., MAJCOM and MACOM BRAC representatives.)
- (5) It is recommended to establish face-to-face discussions between the TJCSG and the Service BRAC offices to work the RFC issue.

Other information: This is a time sensitive recommendation. Implementation must occur by 7 August to affect field responses to TJCSG questions.

Recommendation: CIT and TJCSG implement the above COA.

CIT recommendations: Concur

AF Representative: Concur

Army Representative: Concur

Marine Representative: Concur

Navy Representative: Concur

TJCSG Management Metrics  
Issue #07-16-04-09

**ISSUE:** There is a need to establish metrics<sup>2</sup> that track and measure the critical process indicators used by the TJCSG to determine Capacity and MIL VAL.

**POINT OF CONTACT:** Thom Mathes

**ISSUE SUMMARY:** To assure that the process is functioning efficiently and effectively the TJCSG needs to put in place a number of metrics that track the quality of the Capacity and MIL VAL database, progress of the analysis, responsiveness of the field to RFCs (request for clarification), and the status of the decision making process.

**SUGGESTED OPTIONS:**

- (1) the TJCSG has initiated an action with IDA to develop and implement a Quality Assurance plan [briefed to TJCSG by IDA on 8 Jul 04]. This QA Team would report directly to the CIT Chair.
- (2) Data Quality and Process Integrity
  - the IDA briefing identified a number of QA checkpoints within the analysis process to ensure processes are being followed. The details of what this specifically entails still needs to be defined by the QA Team [chart 11 of the 8 Jul 04 IDA briefing]
  - Are there any voids that would prevent us from processing the Capacity data analysis? It is recommended that upon receipt of the RFCs from data call No. 1 from the field that the subgroups perform a sample Capacity analysis at the organization/installation level that should answer this question.
- (3) Timeliness of Process – what are the discriminating indicators that identify how well we are doing? For example:
  - Execution to key events identified within Master Plan's Work Breakdown Structure milestone schedule. This is important because these events are dependent on one another to accomplish the task. The Analytical Team should have the capability to perform this analysis. Any process owner not in a green status should prepare a risk mitigation plan for TJCSG review and approval.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Track System is under construction. CIT members are checking to determine if an existing system exists.

<sup>2</sup> Capture trend information early to help prevent problems

To meet the current needs at hand the following events should be evaluated since they will be an indicator of those things that will impact subsequent data calls:

- Data Call 2 from sub-group initiative thru field response. The 60 day timeline only starts when the Service BRAC office(s) receive the questions.
- RFC from sub-group initiation thru field response. The 10 day timeline does not include the time from subgroup preparation until it is received by the Service BRAC office(s) [chart 15 of the 8 Jul 04 IDA briefing].
- The quality of the RFCs. Do they require additional RFCs to be generated?
- Timeliness of the Capacity and MIL VAL Q&A received from the field

Other Information. Summary of metrics topics follow:

- Capacity Data Base Quality
- Military Value Data Base Quality
- Analysis Progress
- Field question and response timing
- Decision Making progress
- Risk Area Mitigation (Master Plan, page 52, subject, Management Issues Identification and Mitigation)

Recommendations

- (1) Implement options 1, 2, and 3.
- (2) Identify process owner by name to improve accountability
- (3) Include metrics in the Master Plan.

CIT recommendations: Concur

AF Representative: Concur

Army Representative: Concur

Marine Representative: Concur

Navy Representative: Concur

Information Paper #07-16-04-10

Subject: Master Plan Changes

Points of Contact: Col Buckstad

Information Summary: The master plan requires updating. The changes include:

Change 1

- Update WBS, Schedule, and responsibilities
- Improve Execution Model and WBS synchronization
- Add BRAC Decision Criteria 5 through 8
- Improve synchronization between the execution model and WBS
- TJCSG decision alternatives improvements
- Detail data management procedures
- Refine portal Maintenance and use
- Detail Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP) for hardware
- Improve Table of Contents for figures
- Move Administration and Execution Model paragraphs an appendix
- Insert date of Intelligence and Technical JCSG MOA
- Improve descriptions of TJCSG SOPs

Change 2

- Update Post Analysis and Decision Support Activities
- Update WBS, Schedule, and responsibilities
- Continue to Improve Execution Model and WBS synchronization
- Synchronize Master Plan and Analysis Plan

The above coordinated with the TJCSG subgroups, JCSGs and Service BRAC offices.

CIT recommendations: Concur

AF Representative: Concur

Army Representative: Concur

Marine Representative: Concur

Navy Representative: Concur

TJCSG BRAC Recommendation Report Format Information Paper  
#07-16-04-11

Subject: TJCSG BRAC Recommendation Report Format

Points of Contact: Col Buckstad

Information Summary: The information paper presents the format for the required Nov 04, TJCSG BRAC recommendations. The TJCSG must deliver their BRAC recommendation in Nov 04. The report represents the culmination of TJCSG analysis, work efforts, and decisions. The TJCSG subgroup leaders believe that the definition of the TJCSG report requirements will help them focus work efforts.

The figure below is the working draft report format:

---

Staff Action Summary – internal to TJCSG. This paper summarizes TJCSG coordination.

Transmittal memorandum (from TJCSG to ISG)

TJCSG BRAC Report - This represents a possible OSD BRAC Office staff format for the for the BRAC report.

Executive Summary  
Table of Contents  
Chapter 1 - Introduction and Background  
Chapter 2 - Force Structure Plan  
Chapter 3 - BRAC Process  
Chapter 4 - Description of Analysis  
Chapter 5 – Recommendations  
Appendices (as required, see Decision Paper)  
{The above is an OSD BRAC Office staff recommendation}

Decision Paper  
{Report appendix}

Cover Page  
Execution Summary  
Table of Contents

1. Purpose
2. Need

3. Decision Alternative<sup>3</sup> Summary
    - a. Alternative 1
    - b. Alternative 2
    - c. Alternative 3
  4. Criteria
  5. Critical Assumptions
  6. Background
    - a. Sec Def Guidance
    - b. USD-ATL guidance
    - c. TJCSG Guidance
  7. Analysis
    - a. Analysis Method
    - b. Decision Method
    - c. Strategic Environment Assessment
    - d. Alternative Analysis (Summarize the analysis for each alternative)
    - e. Alternative Effects (a.k.a., Impact)
    - f. Alternative Risk Identification and Mitigation
    - g. Alternative Comparison
  8. Recommendation
  9. Point of Contact
- Subject Matter Index

#### Signature

#### Appendices

*(Detailed information and supporting information, e.g., Public Law details, Guidance memorandums, Master Plan, cost data from COBRA, TJCSG decisions)*

*End Notes Page*

---

Draft TJCSG BRAC Recommendation Report Format (above)

Other information: OSD BRAC office staff has not formally published guidelines in this area to date. It is expected that the Decision Paper when completed will contain the essential information elements for TJCSG decision. Additionally, the paper will serve as a comprehensive reference for TJCSG executives and staff.

CIT recommendations: Concur

AF Representative: Concur

Army Representative: Concur

Marine Representative: Concur

Navy Representative: Concur

---

<sup>3</sup> Alternative 1, 2, and 3 are the top scenarios submitted to TJCSG for decision, where the TJCSG decision becomes the TJCSG BRAC recommendation to the ISG.

**ISSUE # 07-30-04-02: CAPACITY MEASURES for LINEAR OPTIMIZATION MODEL RUNS**

**ISSUE:** The TJCSG previously adopted a set of Linear Optimization Model (LOM) Capacity Measures for each Function (e.g., FTEs and Funding for Research) – the Off-Site group that developed the *Timeline (Best Case)* recommends FTEs be added as a Capacity Measure to the D&A and T&E Functions to facilitate cross-Function analysis.

**POINT OF CONTACT:** Matt Mleziva

**ISSUE SUMMARY:**

- The TJCSG has to approve any changes to the Capacity Measures used in the Linear Optimization Model (LOM)

**CIT RECOMMENDATION:** Add FTEs to the Capacity Measures for D&A and T&E in the LOM.

**AF Position:** Concur

**Army Position:** Concur

**Navy Position:** Concur

**Marine Corps Position:** Concur

**JCS Position:** N/A

---

<sup>4</sup> A WBS is needed to help manage workload.

**Cancel the Capacity Data Call RFCs**  
**Issue 08-10-04-01**

**Issue:** Cancel the Capacity Data Call (Data Call #1) Requests for Clarification (RFCs)

**Point of Contact:** Maj. Ron Mahn

**Issue Summary**

- In May, the Sub-Groups looked at the data from the Capacity Data call
- Sub-Groups created 346 RFCs based on data look
  - 91 Facility Question (Expected Player but no data, Unexpected Player with data in DTAP/Function)
  - 30 Data Issues (Great increase or decrease of data, bad data, etc.)
  - 225 Resource Questions (FTE – No Funding, ACAT - No Funding, etc.)
- Mil Value Metrics 16, 18, 20 require data from Capacity Data Call Questions 693-731, but they are not at the appropriate level of granularity for TJCSG use. The TJCSG reasked 693-731 in the Supplemental Capacity Data Call
- Sub group concerns with data used to create the Supplemental Data Call questions
- Analysis shows the TJCSG Supplemental Data Call will reask all the question (with better instruction and amplification) making RFCs redundant

**Recommendation:** Cancel all RFCs for the Capacity Data Call. Establish effective RFC process for the Military Value and Supplementary Data Calls. First draft of a new RFC process due to CIT NLT on 19 August 2004. POC: Maj. Ronald Mahn.

**Effect if Approved:** Reduced workload among TJCSG, Mil Deps and Fourth Estate. TJCSG, Mil Deps and Fourth Estate begin work on new TJCSG RFC process for subsequent Data Calls.

**Effect if Disapproved:** If answered, RFCs based on FTE's and Funding could be used as cross check to the Supplemental Capacity Data Call questions. Continued additional workload on respondents for limited return. Indicates seriousness of RFC process

Army: Concur

Navy: Concur

Air Force: Concur

Marines: Concur

---

<sup>5</sup> Public Law 101-510, as amended through the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2003, SEC. 2901. (b)

# Joint Centers of Excellence

## Within Capability Areas

- CBNR (RDAT&E center) – Enabling Tech
- Armament/Warheads – W & A
  - Guns/Ammo
    - Conventional
    - EM Guns
  - Missiles/Rockets/Guided Munitions
- Hypersonic Vehicles/Advanced Propulsion - ALSS
- Directed Energy Weapons - W & A
- Ground Vehicles - ALSS
  - Tactical Wheeled Vehicles
  - Tracked Vehicles e.g. Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle
  - Support Vehicles e.g. Trucks, Loaders, Aircraft Ground Equipment, etc.
- Sea Vehicles - ALSS
  - Landing Craft
  - High Speed Transport
- Aircraft - ALSS
  - Fixed Wing
  - Rotary
- Space D&A and /or T&E - ALSS
- C4ISR – C4ISR
  - Network Centric Info Management
- Cyber/info Warfare (protecting & launching attacks) – C4ISR

# Scenarios Across Capability Areas

- Unmanned Vehicles
- Joint Basic Research/Extramural
- Combined Centers for Acquisition, e.g. MOD UK
- Combined Centers for T&E
  - \* Fixed/Rotary Wing Aircrafts (manned/unmanned)
  - \* Armaments
  - \* Electronic Warfare
  - \* Ground Vehicles
- 
- Joint Labs for Non-platform specific systems
- Joint Labs for Platform specific systems

# Consolidation Scenarios

Consolidation of Human Systems/Medical R&DA – (requires across JCSGs coordination)

Consolidation Across Technology Areas

Consolidation across DTAP areas to include elements of other DTAPs, e.g.:

- \* Platforms & Weapons
- \* Materiel & Processes & Sensors/Electronics
- \* C4ISR & Human Systems/Bio Technology

# Rules for Cross-Capability Areas

## Scenarios

1. Review each bin in play and identify all installations that are above a notional size cut off (4% FTEs)
2. All of these locations can be gaining locations
3. Retain those that have unique infrastructure > \$500M
4. Discard installations that have obvious physical constraints
5. Transformative options for unique bed downs

# Example

- Air Platforms and Weapons (RDA)

Air Platforms Research

Wright-Patterson AFB

COMNAVAIRWARCENACDIV\_PATUXENT\_RIVER\_MD

Edwards AFB

REDSTONE ARSENAL

FORT EUSTIS

Rome Laboratory

FORT HUACHUCA

WEAPONS D&A

REDSTONE ARSENAL

NAVSURFWARCENDIV\_DAHLGREN\_VA

PICATINNY ARSENAL

NAVSURFWARCENDIV\_PORT\_HUENEME\_CA

COMNAVAIRWARCENWPNDIV\_CHINA\_LAKE\_CA

Eglin AFB

NAVSURFWARCENDIV\_INDIAN\_HEAD\_MD

Air Platforms D&A

Wright-Patterson AFB

REDSTONE ARSENAL

COMNAVAIRSYSCOM\_PATUXENT\_RIVER\_MD

COMNAVAIRWARCENACDIV\_PATUXENT\_RIVER\_MD

Tinker AFB

NAVAIRWARCENACDIV\_LAKEHURST\_NJ

NAVAIRENGSTA\_LAKEHURST\_NJ

Robins AFB

Hill AFB

WEAPONS Research

Kirtland AFB

REDSTONE ARSENAL

Eglin AFB

COMNAVAIRWARCENWPNDIV\_CHINA\_LAKE\_CA

NAVSURFWARCENDIV\_DAHLGREN\_VA

PICATINNY ARSENAL

NAVSURFWARCENDIV\_INDIAN\_HEAD\_MD

# *When the dust settles...*

- Potential Main Players (Gaining Installations)
  - China Lake, Eglin, Redstone, WPAFB, PAX River (Dahlgren)
- Recommend ? remove Redstone and the attendant part of PAX River as unique rotary wing
- Leaves 4, pick 2 (provided capacity analysis supports)

## DECISION CRITERIA FOR SCENARIO OPTIONS

Issue # 07-30-04-05

**Issue:** Scenario options will primarily fall into two general categories: (1) transformational options proposed by the private sector, OSD, and the TJCSG, and (2) options generated by the Linear Optimization Model. All options, regardless of their origin, must be evaluated for effectiveness and feasibility. Objective decision criteria and subjective military judgment will be used to perform that evaluation. This paper proposes the decision criteria.

**Point of Contact:** Don DeYoung

### **Issue Summary:**

- Options generated by the Linear Optimization Model (LOM) are automatically filtered by quantitative parameters, such as excess capacity and military value. A limited number will be produced due to this inherent selectivity.
- Transformational options are theoretically limited only by imagination, which is appropriate for an innovative endeavor. However, like the LOM-generated options, the transformational options must be evaluated for their effectiveness and feasibility.
- Each option, however it is derived, can be evaluated by decision criteria grouped in two sets: those for *effectiveness* and for *feasibility*.
- Decision criteria for effectiveness are:
  - Do the components of the option possess the required workforce skill set and expertise?
  - Do the components of the option possess the required physical plant and scientific/engineering equipment?
  - Do the components of the option have an established track record of success? If not, does the gaining site have adequate technical and acquisition talent in a related technical area?
  - Do the components of the option possess an average military value equal to or greater than that of the original configuration? If not, is the decrease justifiable in military and economic terms?
  - Can the components of the option satisfy DoD required capacity (based upon their demonstrated historical peak capacity)?
- Decision criteria for feasibility are:
  - Does the installation proposed for a consolidated mission have sufficient FTEs to perform the work or can sufficient FTEs be obtained from local industry or academic partners?

---

<sup>1</sup> The Track System is under construction. CIT members are checking to determine if an existing system exists.

<sup>2</sup> Capture trend information early to help prevent problems

<sup>3</sup> Alternative 1, 2, and 3 are the top scenarios submitted to TJCSG for decision, where the TJCSG decision becomes the TJCSG BRAC recommendation to the ISG.

<sup>4</sup> A WBS is needed to help manage workload.

- Does the installation proposed for a consolidation mission provide all of the essential physical conditions (e.g., weather, geography) essential to the conduct of the new mission element?
- Does the installation proposed for a consolidated mission possess sufficient physical space (i.e., available square footage) and/or buildable acres to accommodate the workload? If not, is leased space an option?
- Keeping in mind the requirement “to provide a fair process”<sup>5</sup>, both the LOM-generated and transformational options must be evaluated by the same objective decision criteria.

**Recommendation:** Evaluate all scenario options — LOM-generated, transformational, and any others — by the effectiveness and feasibility criteria identified above.

**Army Position:**

**AF Position:**

**Navy Position:**

**Marine Corps Position:**

**JCS Position:**

---

15 Jul 04

Issue Paper #07-30-04-06

**Subject: BRAC SCENARIO COORDINATION AMONG JCSGs AND MILITARY DEPARTMENTS**

**Background:** Coordination of scenario development among the JCSGs and Military Departments will be critical to establishing realignment and closure recommendations that are optimized across all military functions and MILDEPs. Per the OSD BRAC Office; “A full exchange of information on each option JCSGs and MILDEPs are considering for scenario analysis is required” and the “Process requires JCSG MILDEP Principals to take the lead on coordination with their respective organizations.” The stated OSD goal is “To identify all potentially viable scenarios for analysis, not eliminate conflicting scenarios.”

While OSD guidance as well as good staff practices require the coordination noted above, processes and procedures are needed to meet the OSD goal.

**Point of Contact:** Col. Walter B. Hamm

**Discussion:** The Scenario Development phase of BRAC 2005 will span a relatively short period of time, during which 7 JCSGs and 3 Military Departments will be developing proposed BRAC scenarios. The OSD Infrastructure Steering

---

<sup>5</sup> Public Law 101-510, as amended through the National Defense Authorization Act of Fiscal Year 2003, SEC. 2901. (b)

Group as well as the MILDEP Secretaries will expect that each of the scenarios will be fully coordinated/deconflicted with appropriate JCSGs and MILDEPs prior to their review. A well structured and DOD wide method for accomplishing that coordination and deconfliction is essential to accomplishing the mission during the limited time available.

Detailed guidance by the OSD BRAC Office is the only mechanism that can ensure consistency of coordination/deconfliction across all 10 JCSGs and MILDEPs. In addition, an essential part of a common methodology is a standardized database for tracking all scenarios being considered within DOD at a given point in time. Without high-level guidance, the uncoordinated or inconsistently coordinated actions of 10 different groups will produce results that are sub-optimal at best.

**Recommendations:**

1) That the Chairman, Technical Joint Cross Service Group, sign a letter to the Chairman, Infrastructure Steering Group, recommending that the OSD BRAC Office provide both detailed guidance and a common data base to manage coordination/deconfliction of BRAC 2005 proposed scenarios.

2) That the Chairman, Technical Joint Cross Service Group, establish internal processes and procedures to facilitate coordination/deconfliction with the MILDEPS and other JCSGs.

3) Chairman, TJCSG approve and sign attached memorandum

**CIT Coordination:**

Air Force

Army:

Navy:

Marines:

---

DRAFT ACTION MEMORANDUM for COORDINATION

MEMORANDUM FOR ACTING UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
(ACQUISITION, TECHNOLOGY AND LOGISTICS), CHAIRMAN,  
INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING GROUP

SUBJECT: BRAC Scenario Coordination Among JCSGs and Military  
Departments

Scenario development and analysis is the final and most significant part of the BRAC analysis process. Coordination of BRAC scenario development

among the JCSGs and Military Departments will be critical to establishing realignment and closure recommendations that are optimized across all military functions and MILDEPs. Coordination must take place prior to initial presentation of scenarios to the ISG, so that only “feasible” scenarios are considered. The OSD BRAC Office addresses this issue in their brief “BRAC 2005 SCENARIO DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS” which assigns responsibility for JCSG-MILDEP coordination to the JCSG MILDEP Principals. However, JCSG-JCSG coordination is not specifically addressed. The brief also notes the OSD goal “To identify all potentially viable scenarios for analysis, not eliminate conflicting scenarios.” This will require extensive discussions vice merely rejecting the conflicting scenarios.

I am confident that the Technical JCSG can complete this coordination, but I am concerned that there may be little consistency in the separate coordination efforts of 7 JCSGs and 3 MILDEPs. This will make the ISG’s task very difficult, given the probable numbers of scenarios and BRAC schedule constraints. A common framework and process is essential for successful DOD wide coordination and deconfliction. An integral part of this must be a common methodology for recording, tracking, and managing all BRAC scenarios being considered at a given point in time.

In an effort to optimize the BRAC scenario development process, I recommend that the JCSGs and MILDEPs be provided detailed guidance for coordination and deconfliction as well as overall management of proposed scenarios.

My staff stands ready to assist in development of the guidance if you desire. My point of contact for this issue is .....

Dr Sega Signature block

{end issue}

Deliberative Document – For Discussion Purposes Only - Do Not Release Under FOIA

# Critical Unresolved Issues (As of 10 Aug 04)

Reference Number	Issue	Issue Paper Author/Date of Submittal to CIT	Required TJCSG Executive Action/Date of Next TJCSG Mtg	CIT Recommendations
07-30-04-05	Decision Criteria for Scenario Options	Mr. Don DeYoung	Needs CIT Recommendation	Army – AF – Navy – Concur Marines –
07-30-04-06	BRAC Scenario Coordination Among JCSGs and Military Departments	COL Walt Hamm	Needs CIT Recommendation	Army – AF – Navy – Marines – Concur

# Critical Resolved Issues (As of 10 Aug 04)

Reference Number	Issue	Issue Paper Author/Date of Submittal to CIT	Required TJCSG Executive Action/Date of Next TJCSG Mtg	CIT Recommendations
07-01-04-01	Defense Agencies Data Input	COL DeSalva	TJCSG to coordinate w/ MilIDeps & JCSGs to insist OSD provide single & complete master database	Army – Concur AF – Concur Navy – Concur Marines – Concur  <b>Finalized for TJCSG approval</b>
07-16-04-01	Dry Run of Optimization & Scenario Analysis -Use FTEs in R -Use FTEs & ACAT# in D&A -Use FTEs & T hrs in T&E	Higgins/Schuette	TJCSG provide any special instructions as needed	Army – Concur AF – Non-Concur – Must use ACAT#s for D&A as agreed by TJCSG Navy – Concur Marines – Concur <b>Over taken by events –refer to 08110401 issue paper</b>
07-16-04-05	Scenario Conflict Adjudication	Mr. Don DeYoung	TJCSG will take a position that it will not realign pieces until all functions are identified.	Army – AF – Navy – Concur Marines – <b>Table it</b>

# Critical Resolved Issues (As of 10 Aug 04)

Reference Number	Issue	Issue Paper Author/Date of Submittal to CIT	Required TJCSG Executive Action/Date of Next TJCSG Mtg	CIT Recommendations
07-16-04-06	Data Quality	Mr. Mathes	TJCSG to establish face-to-face discussions between the TJCSG & Service BRAC offices to work RFCs	Army – Concur AF – Concur Navy – Concur Marines – Concur  <b>Finalized for TJCSG approval</b>
07-16-04-07	Execution Model Update	Dr. Higgins/Dr. Short	Need CIT Recommendation	Army – AF – Navy – Marines – <b>Not an issue at this time</b>
07-16-04-08	Scenario Development: Establishing Optimization Standards	COL Evans	Need CIT Recommendation	Army – AF – Navy – Marines – <b>OBE</b>
07-16-04-09	TJCSG Mgmt Metrics	Mr. Mathes	CIT to Track quality of Capacity & Mil Val Databases, progress of analysis, responsiveness of field RFCs, and status of decision making process	Army – Concur AF – Concur Navy – Concur Marines – Concur  <b>Finalized for TJCSG approval</b>

# Critical Resolved Issues (As of 10 Aug 2004)

Reference Number	Issue	Issue Paper Author/Date of Submittal to CIT	Required TJCSCG Executive Action/Date of Next TJCSCG Mtg	CIT Concur/Non-Concur With Issue Paper
07-16-04-10	Master Plan Changes	COL Buckstad	Master Plan needs to be updated	Army – Concur AF – Concur Navy – Concur Marines – Concur  <b>Finalized for TJCSCG approval</b>
07-16-04-11	TJCSCG BRAC Recommendation Format	COL Buckstad	Absence of OSD guidance, the TJCSCG shall use the recommended format	Army – Concur AF – Concur Navy – Concur Marines – Concur  <b>Finalized for TJCSCG approval</b>
07-16-04-12	WBS Update	COL DeSalva/COL Buckstad	CIT Chair approved the WBS update	Army – AF – Navy – Marines – <b>OBE</b>  <b>Finalized for TJCSCG approval</b>

# Critical Resolved Issues (As of 10 Aug 04)

Reference Number	Issue	Issue Paper Author/Date of Submittal to CIT	Required TJCSG Executive Action/Date of Next TJCSG Mtg	CIT Recommendations
07-30-04-02	Capacity measures for Linear Optimization Model (LOM) runs	Mr. Matt Mleziva	TJCSG approve addition of FTEs to the capacity measures for D&A and T&E in the LOM	Army – Concur AF – Concur Navy – Concur Marines – Concur  <b>Finalized for TJCSG approval</b>
07-30-04-07	Potential Conflict of TJCSG and Supply & Storage JCSCG	Dr. Bob Rohde	Administrative Issue	Army – Concur AF – Navy – Marines – <b>OBE</b>
07-30-04-08	Army Corps of Engineers Laboratories	Dr. Bob Rohde	Administrative Issue	Army – Concur AF – Navy – Marines – <b>OBE</b>