BRAC 2005
Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)
Meeting Minutes of 2 December 2004

Dr. Sega chaired the meeting. The agenda is enclosed in attachment 1. The list of attendees is enclosed in attachment 2. Read ahead materials for the meeting are enclosed in attachment 3. The primary objective for the meeting was to review the methodology used to roll-up the Military Value scores for a single installation, to address data consistency issues associated with scenarios based on Military Value and Capacity, to review the Army Land System Scenario, to review the Recommendation Report format, and to review the BRAC Decision Criteria #6 - #8 scoring plan. The agenda topics are listed below in the order in which they were covered. The key points, decisions and action items from the meeting are as follows:

Opening Remarks

Key Points:

- The TJCSG must submit the plan for submitting a draft Recommendation Report in order to meet the 20 December 2004 ISG suspense date.

Decisions:

- The TJCSG decided to submit 2 or 3 scenarios by 17 December 2004. The goal is three and the commitment is one.
- Chem-Bio, Extramural Program Managers, and Army Land Warfare are possible, candidate scenarios to be completed by 17 December 2004.
- The TJCSG will identify at least one of these three to be completed by 17 December 2004.

Recommendation Report Format – BG Castle

Decisions:

- The TJCSG made a few adjustments to the proposed format. The updated format is enclosed in attachment 4.

BRAC Decision Criteria #6 - #8 Scoring Plan – BG Castle

Decisions:

- The TJCSG approved the scoring plan as presented.
- Any "No-Go" assessments will be elevated to the TJCSG.

Army Land System Scenario Review – Dr. Rohde

Key Points:

- Two scenarios were presented: 1. Joint Soldier/Ground (Land) Systems LCM Center - Single Site Solution, and 2. Joint Soldier/Ground (Land) Systems LCM Center – Two-Site Solution.

Decisions:

- "Joint" will be removed from the title and instead be replaced with "Army".
- The first scenario is already registered as a TJCSG scenario and is TECH-0045.
- The second scenario will be registered as a new TJCSG scenario.

Military Value Roll-Up (Issue Paper) – Dr. Stewart

Key Points:

- Dr. Stewart recommended the TJCSG better understand the impact of the new Military Value data on the scores versus the impact of the zip code roll-up on the scores through sensitivity analyses. It is critical for the TJCSG to understand what errors may be introduced through the rolled-up methodology.
- Dr. Stewart recommended three separate Military Value runs to achieve this.
- Dr. Stewart proposed an approach for performing the sensitivity analysis.
- There is concern that simple addition of Military Value scores for individual organizations at the same installation within a single bin will result in multi-counting of several data elements.
- The Analysis Team indicated there are numerous instances of multi-counting already in the data and therefore, additional multi-counting is
- consistent with the current TJCSG construct.

Decisions:

- The TJCSG approved:
    1. Analysis Team to show the proposed changes to the Scoring Plan (i.e., Appendix A)
    2. Analysis Team to conduct a sensitivity analysis to assess the impact of the zip code roll-up.
        a. Hold FTEs and funding constant.
        b. Double and quadruple the # of organizations.
        c. Assess the variation of Military Value due to the special rules applied in the zip-code roll-up methodology.
    3. Analysis Team to provide three Military Value Runs for 3 separate installations.

a. Military Value scores for the individual organizations at each site using current methodology and baseline data as of 4 Nov 04
b. Same as a. using latest data
c. Assess changes resulting from new data
d. Same as b. using zip code roll-up methodology
e. Assess changes resulting from roll-up

4. Subgroup Leads will:
   a. Review results of 3 MV runs and identify
   a. Major changes
   b. Underlying causes
   c. Reasonableness of changes
   d. Issues with changes
   e. Impacts on current scenarios
5. CIT will review results across bins for consistency and reasonableness

ALSS Data Errors (China Lake and WPAFB)

Key Points:

- The ALSS subgroup noted that data for NAVAIRWARCENWPNDIV China Lake has been changed. These changes rebin data that they had previously reported for air platforms to weapons work. Concurrently, AIRTEVRON Nine at China Lake is reported as Air Platform T&E. As of this data submission, China Lake no longer reports that it is doing any air platform work.
- Since this is certified data this change has in impact on several of ALSS' scenarios. Movements that had planned for China Lake air platform work now have to be rescinded. It will also have an effect on calculating China Lake's MIL VAL. For example, we can't move Wright Patterson's live-fire testing to China Lake because they no longer report the capability, and its MIL VAL would be less than Wright Patterson. It should also have a corresponding increase in its weapons MIL VAL.

Decisions:

- The new China Lake data must be revalidated.
- The ALSS Subgroup will proceed with their approved scenarios based on the previous China Lake data.
- The ALSS Subgroup will include a statement in their data call similar to that of the Weapons and Armaments Subgroup regarding platform integration.
- The Navy Principal will request the Navy BRAC Office to review the recent China Lake data in light of how weapons/platform integration has been applied across the Department.
- The DoD IG will proceed with their review of the process concerns that were raised.

Remaining Scenario Mil Values (Berry, Schuette, Mathes)

- Time did not permit discussion of the remaining scenario Military Values.

Management Matrix – COL Buckstad

- Time did not permit discussion of the Management Matrix.

Scenario Maps – COL Buckstad

- Time did not permit discussion of the Scenario Maps.

The TJCSG will meet again on Tuesday, 7 December 2004, in Crystal City, PT-1, Rm 4600, from 1530-1800 hrs EST.

Action Items:

1. The TJCSG will identify at least one of three candidate scenarios, Chem-Bio, Extramural Program Managers, and/or Army Land Warfare, to be completed by 17 December 2004.
2. The Analysis Team will post each of the existing scenario data call worksheets as PDF files in the Scenario project/ Scenarios Data Call folder by COB 3 December 2004 and post all future worksheets there as well.
3. Ms. Felix will register the Army Soldier/Ground (Land) Systems LCM Center - Two Site Solution scenario in the OSD Scenario Tracker database by COB Friday, 3 December 2004.
4. The Analysis Team will show the proposed changes to the Scoring Plan - Appendix A associated with the proposed zip code roll-up methodology by COB Friday, 3 December 2004.
5. The Analysis Team will conduct a sensitivity analysis to assess the impact of the zip code roll-up.
    a. Hold FTEs and funding constant.
    b. Double and quadruple the # of organizations.

    Assess the variation of Military Value due to the special rules applied in the zip-code roll-up methodology.
6. The Analysis Team will provide three Military Value Runs for three separate installations by COB Friday, 3 Dec 04.
    a. Military Value scores for the individual organizations at each site using current methodology and baseline data as of 4 Nov 04
    b. Same as a. using latest data. Assess changes resulting from new data.
    c. Same as b. using zip code roll-up methodology. Assess changes resulting from roll-up.
7. The Subgroup Leads will review results of the three MV runs and identify:
    a. Major changes
    b. Underlying causes
    c. Reasonableness of changes
    d. Issues with changes

e. Impacts on current scenarios

8. The CIT will review results across bins for consistency and reasonableness.
9. The Navy Principal will request the Navy BRAC Office to review the recent China Lake data in light of how weapons/platform integration has been applied across the Department. He will report his findings to the TJCSG on 7 December 2004.

Approved: _____
Mr. Al Shaffer
Chairman, Capabilities Integration Team

Attachments:

1. Outline -Agenda
2. List of Attendees
3. Read Ahead Materials
4. Final Approved Recommendation Report Format

TJCSG Agenda
2 Dec 04, 0900-1100 hrs EST
Pentagon, Rm 4E987

- BRAC Decision Criteria #6 - #8 Scoring Plan
- Recommendation Report Format
- Management Matrix
- Mil Value Roll Up (Issue Paper)
- ALSS Data Errors (China Lake and WPAFB)
- Remaining Scenario Mil Values (Berry, Schuette, Mathes)
- Scenario Maps
- Army Land Warfare Scenario

Attachment 2
Technical JCSG Meeting
December 2, 2004
Attendees

Members:
Dr. Ron Sega, TJCSG Chairman
Dr. Dan Stewart, Air Force Alternate for Mr. Blaise Durante, Air Force
Dr. John Foulkes, Army
RADM Jay Cohen, Navy
Dr. Barry Dillon, Marines
Mr. Jay Erb, JCS via telephone

Other:
Dr. Bob Rohde, Army
COL Walt Hamm, Marines CIT Rep
Mr. George Ryan, Navy CIT Rep
Mr. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC
Mr. Gary Strack, OSD
Ms. Marie Felix, OSD
COL Bob Buckstad, OSD
Mr. Steve Kratzmeier, Army
Dr. Larry Schuette, Innovative Systems Subgroup Lead
Mr. Brian Simmons, Army
CDR Jim Melone, Navy
Mr. Pete Cahill, Army
Mr. Don DeYoung, Navy
Mr. Bob Arnold, Weapons & Armaments Representative
BG Fred Castle, OSD
Mr. Jerry LaCamera, ALSS Subgroup Representative
COL Eileen Walling, Air Force
Dr. Bill Berry, Enabling Technologies Subgroup Lead

RECOMMENDATION REPORT

- LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL (FROM TJCSG CHAIR TO ISG CHAIR)
- TRANSFORMATIONAL FRAMEWORK SUMMARY & DIAGRAM
- BRAC CRITERIA WEIGHTING SCHEMA
- SCENARIO ANALYSIS PROCESS SUMMARY & DIAGRAM
- SCENARIO AND WEIGHTED CRITERIA SUMMARY MATRIX
- ATTACHMENT #1 (RECOMMENDED SCENARIOS)
  - RECOMMENDED SCENARIO LIST #1 - #N WITH SUMMARY DESCRIPTIONS
  - SCENARIO #1 - #N
    - QUAD CHART
    - STRATEGIC CONCEPT
    - CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS AND DECISIONS
    - DATA ANALYSIS (BRAC CRITERIA #1 - #8 REVIEW)
  - CLOSING REMARKS
- ATTACHMENT #2 (DISCARDED SCENARIO LIST WITH EXPLANATIONS)
- ATTACHMENT #3 (ISSUES)
- ATTACHMENT #4 (RECOMMENDED FUTURE TRANSFORMATIONAL CONCEPTS)
- ATTACHMENT #5 (SCENARIO TRACKING TOOL DETAILS OF SCENARIOS #1 - #N)

BRAC DECISION CRITERIA #6 - #8
SCORING PLAN

- ANALYSIS TEAM MEMBERS
  - MR. BRIAN SIMMONS
  - COL EILEEN WALLING
  - MS. EILEEN SHIBLEY
  - MR. DON DEYOUNG
- BRAC DECISION CRITERIA #6
  - SCORING PLAN: USE "**NUMBERS**" AS GENERATED BY THE TOOL
- BRAC DECISION CRITERIA #7
  - SCORING PLAN: USE "**GO**" OR "**NO GO WITH COMMENTS**"
  - PROCESS: USE COLLABORATION IN A TEAM ENVIRONMENT
- BRAC DECISION CRITERIA #8
  - SCORING PLAN: USE EITHER "**GO**", "**GO WITH COMMENTS**", OR "**NO GO WITH COMMENTS**"
  - PROCESS: USE COLLABORATION IN A TEAM ENVIRONMENT

NOTE: ANY COMMENTS WILL ALSO LIST SERVICE REP(S) AGREEING WITH COMMENTS

Joint Land Systems LCM Scenarios Briefing for TJCSG

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
WASHINGTON DC 20310

[illegible] 2004

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
BETWEEN
THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR ACQUISITION, LOGISTICS AND TECHNOLOGY
AND
THE COMMANDER, U.S. ARMY MATERIEL COMMAND

SUBJECT: Life-Cycle Management (LCM) Initiative

1. **PURPOSE**: The purpose of this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is to formalize the Army's Life Cycle Management initiative. The objective of this initiative is to get products to the Soldier faster, make good products even better, minimize life cycle cost, and enhance the synergy and effectiveness of the Army Acquisition, Logistics and Technology (ALT) communities. It is intended to integrate significant elements of ALT leadership responsibilities and authority to enable a closer relationship between the Army Materiel Command (AMC) Major Subordinate Commands (MSCs) and the Program Executive Officers (PEOs). The PEOs will be able to work as an integral part of the AMC MSCs, while continuing to report directly to the Army Acquisition Executive (AAE); likewise, logisticians in AMC will have enhanced input into acquisition processes to influence future sustainment and readiness. The life cycle management initiative will provide an integrated, holistic approach to product development and system support.

2. **CONCEPT OF OPERATIONS**:

a. The concept of operation is to create Life Cycle Management Commands (LCMC) by aligning AMC systems oriented MSCs (AMCOM, CECOM, JMC, and TACOM) with the PEOs with whom they already work. The following Commands and PEOs will form the respective LCMCs:

Aviation/Missile LCMC (Formerly AMCOM)
PEO Tac Mis
PEO Aviation

Soldier/Ground Systems LCMC (Formerly TACOM)
PEO Soldier
PEO GCS
PEO CS & CSS

Communications/Electronics LCMC (Formerly CECOM)
PEO IEW&S
PEO C^3T

Joint Ammunition LCMC (Formerly JMC in AFSC)
PEO Ammo

Joint Soldier/Ground (*Land*) Systems LCM Center

Single Site Scenario

Scenario

- Consolidate all Soldier/Ground (*Land)* System Life Cycle Assets at Aberdeen MD
  - Picatinny Arsenal, Natick Soldier Center, Detroit Arsenal, Selfridge, Rock Island (*Quantico*)
- Alternative locations/Impacted Activities
  - Combinations of the above
- Potential for adding other service's facilities to Army center

Drivers/Assumptions

- Driver: Technology and LCM Synergy needed to solve the survivability challenge for Light Ground Combat Systems/Soldier/UGV
- Explores greater efficiencies in newly created Army AMC Life Cycle Commands
- Assumptions: Current assets need to be colocated to achieve needed synergy to solve and support a very difficult technical problem

Justification/Impact

- FCS requires a substantial realignment of RD&A assets to attain survivability goals
- Attains full spectrum capability for RDAT&E for Ground Vehicles, Soldier systems, CB, and Gun/Ammo at a single location

Potential Conflicts

- TJCSG scenarios moving all weapons to a single site, or all ground vehicles to sites other than the one proposed.
- Space available at Aberdeen

Joint Soldier/Ground (*Land)* Systems LCM Center

Two Site Solution

Scenario

- Consolidate all Soldier/Ground (*Land)* System Life Cycle Assets at Aberdeen MD and Picatinny Arsenal (two site solution)
  - Natick Soldier Center, Detroit Arsenal, Selfridge, Rock Island (*Quantico*)
- Alternative locations/Impacted Activities
  - Combinations of the above
- Potential for adding other service's facilities to Army center

Drivers/Assumptions

- Driver: Technology and LCM Synergy needed to solve the survivability challenge for Light Ground Combat Systems/Soldier/UGV
- Explores greater efficiencies in newly created Army AMC Life Cycle Commands
- Assumptions: Current assets need to be colocated to achieve needed synergy to solve and support a very difficult technical problem

Justification/Impact

- FCS requires a substantial realignment of RD&A assets to attain survivability goals
- Attains full spectrum capability for RDAT&E for Ground Vehicles, Soldier systems, CB, and at a single location (not guns/ammo)
- Considered for cost analysis purposes; not optimum for synergy

Potential Conflicts

- TJCSG scenarios moving all ground vehicles to sites other than the one proposed.
- Space available at Aberdeen

MV Scores Using SQRT of SUM of Squares

Location	Chem Bio Def			GroundVehicles			Human Systems			Weapons Technology			Materials & Processes			SUMSQ	SQRT
	D&A	Research	T&E	D&A	Research	T&E	D&A	Research	T&E	D&A	Research	T&E	D&A	Research	T&E		
APG	0.2927	**0.4066**	**0.2734**	0.2817	0.0991	**0.7536**	0.191	0.0981	**0.257**	0.2001	0.0851	**0.312**	**0.275**	0.127	**0.2118**	1.376226	1.173127
																0	0
																0	0
Detroit				**0.5755**	**0.8034**	0.1006		0.0746						0.07		0.997237	0.998618
																0	0
																0	0
Picatinny								0.0735		**0.5454**	**0.5278**	0.188	0.0675	0.07	0.09	0.634337	0.796452
																0	0
																0	0
SSC-Natick	**0.3038**	0.2408	0.0405				**0.6143**	**0.634**	0.2329				0.0258	**0.1966**	0.0407	1.026456	1.013142

Military Value
Issue # 12-01-04-01

Issue: The Analytic Team has recommended that the TJCSG roll up Military Value for technical facilities using zip codes as the identifying factor. However, the zip code rollup methodology proposed by the Analytic Team may produce some unintended consequences and not correctly reflect the Mil Value of these facilities.

Point of Contact: Col Eileen Walling

Issue Summary:

Per the methodology presented to the TJCSG, the MV components/attributes for people, facilities/equipment, and operational impact can simply be added for the same zip code (ref: AT briefing to TJCSG 30 Nov 04). However, for the zip code methodology to work correctly, the data from each respondent must be mutually exclusive (i.e. only one respondent can account for the data) in order to add the components/attributes. If the data is not mutually exclusive, the zip code method could result in additional Military Value. Examples: multiple organizations that reside in the same building could each report the same building/square footage of the same unique facilities, the same ACAT programs, the same funding, etc.

Per the same reference, new methodology equations were developed to aggregate the other components/attributes of MV – those dealing with physical environment and synergy. These new equations were used to calculate the aggregated rolled up MVs by the AT at a specific site (i.e. same zip code). However, the specific equations and methodology have not been documented, nor has a sensitivity analysis been conducted to determine the errors associated with the rolled up MVs using this new methodology.

In addition to the above, since the AT has only provided the aggregated rolled up MVs, it is not possible to determine if the changes in MV are due to errors in the new methodology/equations or changes in MV due to new data from the recent influx of RFC data.

If this issue is not analyzed and the unintended consequences fully understood, the entire MV methodology used by the TJCSG will not stand the scrutiny of the BRAC commission and any challenges to our candidate recommendations.

Recommendation:

In order to address this issue, the following actions are required.

1. AT provide the exact equations/methodology used to accomplish the zip code roll up by showing annotated changes in the current MV scoring plan (i.e. Appendix A, Metric Definitions and Scoring Plan).

2. AT conduct a sensitivity analysis using the new methodology/equations. This can be done using a few hypothetical cases, reflective of the current database similar to what was done for the sensitivity analysis conducted on the original MV scoring plan. Specifically, choose a hypothetical site representative of the database in terms of numbers of people, funding, and other MV components such as environmental constraints, special features, etc. Keep the total number of people and funding at the site constant, but break the site into two organizations and then four organizations. Make sure that one of the runs for each breakout retains the same values for the MV components, with only the people and funding changed (i.e. reduced by half, or fourth). By comparing the rolled up MV for the two organizations, and then the four organizations, with the MV for the single organizations, the variation in MV due to the changes in the methodology can be assessed.

3. AT produce the following three MV runs
    a. MVs for the individual organizations at each site using the current methodology and baseline data as of 4 Nov 04
    b. Same as 3a above, except using the latest baseline data (19 Nov 04??)
    c. Same as 3b above, except using the MV zip code rollup methodology.

4. The Subgroups review all the results from the three runs in action 3 above and identify major changes, underlying causes, the reasonableness of the changes, identify any issues, and assess impacts on current scenarios.

5. CIT review the results above across the bins for consistency and reasonableness.

Army Position:

AF Position:

Navy Position:

Marine Corps Position:

JCS Position:

TJCSG Military Value Roll-Up Concerns/Recommendations

2 Dec 04

Roll-Up Methodology

- **Adds People, Facilities/Equipment, and Operational Impact attributes**
- **Requires data to be mutually exclusive**
  - **Could result in multi-counting**
  - **Examples**
    - **Unique facilities and equipment**
    - **Technology Transitions, Rapid Response, etc.**
    - **Sq footage or building usage**
    - **Support for same ACAT Programs**
    - **Funding**
    - **Etc.**

Roll-Up Methodology (Continued)

- Creates special rules for data elements of Physical Environment and Synergy attributes
- Changes baseline Military Value Methodology
  - No documentation
- No sensitivity analysis conducted to assess impact
  - i.e., similar to what was done for baseline Military Value Methodology

Recommended Actions

- **Analysis Team**

1. **Show proposed changes to Scoring Plan (i.e., Appendix A)**
2. **Conduct sensitivity analysis to assess impact of zip code roll-up**
   - **Hold FTEs and funding constant**
   - **Double and quadruple # of orgs**
   - **Assess variation in Mil Value due to special rules**
3. **Provide 3 Military Value Runs**
   1. **MVs for individual orgs at each site using current methodology and baseline data as of 4 Nov 04**
   2. **Same as 1 using latest data**
      - **Assess changes resulting from new data**
   3. **Same as 2 using zip code roll-up methodology**
      - **Assess changes resulting from roll-up**

Recommended Actions (Continued)

- **Subgroups**
  1. **Review results of 3 MV runs and identify**
     1. **Major changes**
     2. **Underlying causes**
     3. **Reasonableness of changes**
     4. **Issues with changes**
     5. **Impacts on current scenarios**

- **CIT**
  1. **Review results across bins for consistency and reasonableness**

Proposed Sensitivity Analysis

	# of Orgs	FTEs	$'s	Changed Data Elements	MV Roll-Up
Case 1	1	1000	$1B	Baseline	TBD
Case 2	1	500	$0.5B	Baseline	TBD
	2	500	$0.5B	w/Changes	
Case 3	1	250	$0.25B	Baseline	TBD
	2	250	$0.25B	w/Changes	
	3	250	$0.25B		
	4	250	$0.25B		

Draft Deliberative Document – for discussion only – do not release under FOIA

ISSUE #12-02-04-02: 22 Nov 04 NAVAIRWARCENWPNDIV China Lake Data Chan

POINT OF CONTACT: Thom Mathes

ISSUE SUMMARY

1. In reviewing the recent data received last Friday and provided to ALSS by the TJCSG's analytic team we noted that NAVAIRWARCENWPNDIV China Lake had made significant changes to its data. These changes basically moved all of the data that they had previously reported for air platforms and rebinned it as weapons work. Concurrently, AIRTEVRON Nine at China Lake is reported as Air Platform T&E. As of this data submission, China Lake not longer reports that it is doing any air platform work – zero.

2. Comparing the data submitted just for question 4277 from 10 Nov 04 to the data we just received on 22 Nov the change becomes abundantly clear.

	10 Nov 04	22 Nov 04
Air Platform Research	10.8	0
Weapons Research	261.6	272.4
	272.4	272.4
Air Platform D&A	374.1	0
Weapons D&A	1090.9	146.0
	1465.0	1465.0
Air Platform T&E	329.8	0
Weapons T&E	444.5	774.3
	774.3	774.3

3. China Lake is responsible for Air Platform work such as Operational Flight Programs for major tactical aircraft including F/A-18, AH-1, etc. Many of the line items they reported (e.g., APG-73 radar lab, APG-79 radar lab) are much more part of the aircraft than the weapon, yet the latest data doesn't reflect it.

SUGGESTED OPTIONS

- Since this is certified data this significant change has in impact on several of ALSS' scenarios. Movements that had planned for China Lake air platform work now have to be rescinded. It will also have an effect on

calculating China Lake's MIL VAL. For example, we can't move Wright Patterson's live-fire testing to China Lake because they no longer report the capability, and its MIL VAL would be less than Wright Patterson. It should also have a corresponding increase in its weapons MIL VAL.

- There is sufficient suspicion related to this event that it ought to be rejected or subjected to an EMJ review by impartial SMEs.