

**BRAC 2005**  
**Technical Joint Cross-Service Group (TJCSG)**  
**Meeting Minutes of 10 February 2005**

Mr. Shaffer 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 all open scenarios for progress toward meeting completing candidate recommendation packages for both TJCSG analyzed and remanded scenarios. There were a few administrative actions to cover as well. 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 – Mr. Shaffer

- An inquiry was received from a congressional member that showed some insight into the BRAC process. As a result, the TJCSG shall:
  - Recertify non disclosure procedures (all TJCSG members)
  - Review all scenarios to ensure that the TJCSG has given a fair and defensible look to all possible movements.

CIT Tasking (Inactive/Terminated Scenario Review/Documentation) – Mr. Shaffer

**Key Points:**

- The TJCSG must document the rationale for terminating or inactivating any TJCSG scenarios.
- Col Walling has been tasked with gathering the ISG draft candidate recommendations packages and posting for the TJCSG Principals Review.

**Decisions:**

- The TJCSG tasked the CIT Service representatives to ensure the rationale to document all inactive/terminated scenarios is adequate and complete.
  - The CIT will meet Monday, 14 Feb to begin this task.
  - The CIT will bring their documentation to the TJCSG for approval as soon as possible.

Status of Remanded Scenarios – CIT Service Reps

Army – Mr. Brian Simmons

**Key Points:**

- The draft candidate recommendation for TECH-0045 is complete.

- Later in the meeting, the TJCSG deliberatively approved TECH-0045a to formally be presented to the ISG as a candidate recommendation.

**Decisions:**

- The TJCSG plans to brief the candidate recommendation for TECH-0045a on 25 February 2005 to the ISG.

Navy – Mr. George Ryan

**Key Points:**

- TECH-0031 was remanded to the Navy.

**Decisions:**

- None

Air Force – Dr. Stewart

**Key Points:**

- The Air Force is pressing on with the COBRA run for USAF-0110. The Air Force is looking at complementary scenarios that could potentially move and close all of Brooks AFB.

**Decisions:**

- The Air Force will present the COBRA results for USAF-0110 at the Tuesday, 15 February 2005, TJCSG Meeting. Also, the Air Force will provide a daily update status for USAF-0112.

COBRA Assumptions Assessment – BG Castle

**Key Points:**

- The CIT reviewed the COBRA assumptions used for each of the scenarios and identified where there may be inconsistencies.
  - During the review, the CIT recognized that the subgroups had applied different personnel reduction figures for different scenarios.
  - A discussion ensued to clarify the standard personnel reduction assumptions.

**Decisions:**

- The TJCSG approved a standard assumption for personnel reduction:

The Subgroups shall apply a standard 15% reduction to the total number of government and on-site contractors being relocated from the donor to the receiver site for all scenarios. Each subgroup may provide rationale to change this standard to the TJCSG for approval.

COBRA Process Documentation – Mr. DeYoung

**Key Points:**

- Mr. DeYoung recommended some changes to the COBRA process to ensure integrity and defensibility of the process.

**Decisions:**

- The TJCSG endorsed most of the recommendations except for the 4<sup>th</sup> one presented, “ensure facilities at gaining locations are not “double-booked”. Also, the first recommendation, COBRA printout to include certifier names from gaining and losing sites, was never discussed. The deconfliction of facility space will be worked by the Service BRAC offices for their solutions.

ALSS Scenario Status – Mr. Mathes

**Key Points:**

- The initial TECH-0013 COBRA baseline used conservative assumptions. The ALSS subgroup scrubbed each assumption at length, and came up with more refined recommendation that provides an achievable payback.
- For TECH-0031, the payback period varies between 7 and 100+ years. The 7-year payback occurs only to the realignment of Detroit Arsenal by relocating Sea Vehicles work done for the watercraft (i.e., TSV, tug boats, landing craft, etc.) to Carderock and Washington Navy Yard.
- TECH-005 and TECH-006 are both held up due to data clarity at Lakehurst

**Decisions:**

- The TJCSG directed the ALSS Subgroup to proceed with drafting the candidate recommendation for both TECH-0013 and TECH-0031.
- For TECH-0005 and TECH-0006, the ALSS will run COBRA for all actions excluding the Navy to see if there is any potential for payback to know whether to continue with the analysis or not. ALSS will apply the TJCSG approved assumptions

- The W&A Subgroup presented the candidate recommendations for TECH-0002 and TECH-0018.

**Decisions:**

- The TJCSG accepted all assumptions presented and decided to have the W&A Subgroup prepare the candidate recommendation package for TECH-0018 and the Picatinny part of TECH-0002. The candidate recommendations will be submitted as four separate packages, to facilitate review up the chain from the ISG to the IEC to the Secretary.
- The TJCSG also decided to inactivate all other W&A scenarios (TECH-0017, TECH-0019, TECH-0043 and TECH-0044) since their payback periods and transformation characteristics are less favorable. However, the scenario data discrepancies will be reconciled to allow for validation of the assumptions.
- The W&A Subgroup will prepare the candidate recommendation for approval by the TJCSG at the Tuesday, 15 February 2005, TJCSG Meeting.

C4ISR Scenario Status – Mr. Mleziva

**Key Points:**

- The C4ISR Subgroup recommended not adopting TECH-0042A Part 9 (to move the underwater sensors from San Diego to Newport RI) as an excursion of TECH-0042 as this excursion did not improve the payback for the scenario due to an increase in annual recurring cost.

**Decisions:**

- The TJCSG approved the termination of the TECH-0042A Part 9 excursion.

Army TECH-0045 COBRA Review – Mr. Simmons

**Key Points:**

- Payback is 39 years.
- For the TECH-0045A excursion, the payback is 8 years; the difference is 45A drops the movement from Picatinny and Detroit.
- The Army recommended:
  1. Deletion of all actions from TECH-0045 with respect to Picatinny (and ARDEC/Adelphi Fuse Detachment) and Detroit/Selfridge.
    - 45A becomes 45
  2. Continue analysis to close and realign Natick and realign PEO Soldier (Ft. Belvoir) to APG.
  3. Terminate TECH-0048 due to high one time cost and Army leadership concern about moving from automotive center of excellence.

- Five separate scenarios were presented regarding Land Network Warfare Life Cycle Management Center.
- The Army recommended:
  1. Support TECH-0035 (Information Systems Research at Adelphi, D&A at Belvoir)
    - Make TECH-0050, 0051 and 0053 inactive.
    - Remove Army portion from TECH-0008/0042.
    - Add Army portions of TECH-0008 and TECH-0042 to TECH-0035.
  2. Brief Army Senior Review Group on 15 February.
  3. Return to TJCSG on 15 February with revised COBRA runs and Army recommendation.

**Decisions:**

- The TJCSG modified and approved the Army recommendations. However, "Ground Vehicles" will be changed to "Ground Systems" in the Transformational Framework chart. Also TECH-0048 will be made inactive.
- For the Army Land Network Warfare Life Cycle Management Center scenarios, the TJCSG decided:
  - TECH-0051 and 0053 will be made inactive.
  - The Army will proceed with building the TECH-0035 package concurrent with the Army vote on Tuesday, 15 February 2005.
  - Dr. Schuette will prepare a candidate recommendation package for TECH-0009 for the Air Force and Navy portions.
  - Dr. Schuette will prepare a separate TECH-0009 COBRA run with only the Army portion.

**Other Information:**

- Today's TJCSG daily teleconference call is cancelled.
- The next TJCSG Meeting will take place on Tuesday, 15 February 2005, from 1100-1300 hrs EST, in Crystal City, PT-1, Rm 4600.
- The OSD Red Team will meet with the TJCSG soon to review the TJCSG process.

**Action Items:**

1. The TJCSG tasked the CIT Service Reps to ensure the documentation of rationale for all inactive or terminated scenarios is adequate and complete. This needs to be completed by COB 18 February 2005. Any TJCSG scenarios made inactive beyond 18 February will be documented as well prior to submittal of the TJCSG Final Report.
2. Col Walling will prepare a summary ISG candidate recommendation package and post them for the TJCSG Principals review.

February 10, 2005

BRAC FOUO

Approved:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mr. Al Shaffer  
Executive Director  
Technical Joint Cross Service Group

**Attachments:**

1. Outline -Agenda
2. List of Attendees
3. Read Ahead Materials

**Attachment 2**  
**Technical JCSG Meeting**  
**February 10, 2005**  
**Attendees**

**Members:**

Mr. Al Shaffer, Alternate for Dr. Ron Segal, Chairman  
Mr. Blaise Durante, Air Force  
Mr. Brian Simmons, Army  
Dr. Barry Dillon, Marines  
Mr. George Ryan, Navy Alternate for RADM Jay Cohen, Navy  
Mr. Jay Erb, JCS

**Other:**

Dr. Dan Stewart, Air Force  
Mr. Don DeYoung, Navy  
Mr. Gary Strack, OSD  
COL Pete DeSalva, Marines  
Mr. Andy Porth, OSD BRAC  
Dr. Jim Short, OSD  
Dr. Larry Schuette, Innovative Systems Subgroup Lead  
Dr. Karen Higgins, Weapons and Armaments Subgroup Lead  
Mr. Matt Mleziva, C4ISR Subgroup Lead  
COL Bob Buckstad, OSD  
Mr. Steve Kratzmeier, Army  
COL Walt Hamm, Marines CIT Rep  
Mr. Al Goldstain, Air Force CIT Rep (Via VTC)  
Mr. Jerry Schiefer, OSD BRAC  
Ms. Marie Felix, OSD  
BG Fred Castle, OSD  
Mr. Pete Cahill, Army  
Mr. Thom Mathes, ALSS Subgroup Lead  
Mr. Walt Bryzik, Army  
Ms. Eileen Shibley, Navy  
COL Steve Evans, Marines  
Dr. Bill Berry, Enabling Technologies Subgroup Lead  
Dr. Bob Rohde, Army CIT Rep

# **TJCSG Agenda**

**10 Feb 05, 1400-1600 hrs EST**

**Pentagon, Rm 4E987**

- CIT Tasking (Inactive/Terminated Scenario Review/Documentation)  
– Mr. Shaffer
- Status of Remanded Scenarios – CIT Service Reps
- COBRA Assumptions Assessment – BG Castle
- COBRA Process Documentation – Mr. DeYoung
- Status of TECH-0020/0032/0047 and 0054 – Dr. Short
- Scenario Status
  - ALSS – Mr. Mathes
  - Innovative Systems – Dr. Schuette
  - W&A – Dr. Higgins
  - C4ISR – Mr. Mleziva
- Army TECH-0009 Timing – Mr. Shaffer

## Attachment 2

### TJCSG Terminated Scenarios

#### **Enabling Technologies Subgroup Terminated Scenarios**

TECH-0021, Joint Chemical-Biological Defense RD&A Center, and TECH-0022, Establish Joint Medical –Biological Defense RD&A Center, were combined to create TECH-0032, Chemical-Biological Defense RD&A Consolidation, and thus both were terminated.

TECH-0023, Establish Joint Chemical-Biological Defense T&E Center, was terminated since little would be gained after application of the TJCSG decision to include any donors with less than 30 FTEs

TECH-0024, Joint Biomedical Development and Acquisition Center, and TECH-0025, Biomedical Research Co-Location, were terminated as similar scenarios incorporating the proposed consolidations/co-locations were part of MJCSG scenarios and redundant scenarios in the two JCSGs would have little value for work effort involved. The MJCSG will run their similar scenarios involving technical issues and report their recommendations to the TJCSG for concurrence/approval.

TECH-0011, Joint Training, Modeling, and Simulation Center, was terminated as the TJCSG thought that little would be gained by the proposed scenario since most of the Training, Modeling, and Simulation Research had been co-located during BRAC 05, and seemed to be working very well in its current form and location.

#### **Air, Land, Sea and Space Systems Subgroup Terminated Scenarios**

TECH-0001 - Establish Joint Centers for Air Platform R, D&A, and T&E at Redstone Arsenal The intent of this scenario was to consolidate all air platform RD&T&E to three core sites, Patuxent River, Wright Patterson AFB, and Redstone Arsenal, while retaining several specialty sites. This scenario was formulated prior to the decision to develop two separate scenarios dealing with consolidation of Rotary Wing, Tech 0005, to two core sites; Patuxent River & Redstone Arsenal and Fixed Wing, Tech 0006 to two core sites; Wright Patterson AFB & Patuxent River. The specific realignments captured in Tech 0001 dealt with consolidating rotary wing work at the same two core sites as Tech 0005 and fixed wing work at the same two core sites as Tech 0006. In effect Tech 0001 represents an aggregation of the same set of proposed realignments as defined in Tech 0005 and Tech 0006, making it redundant to the two scenarios which have been accepted by the TJCSG. The decision to treat rotary and fixed wing as two separate scenarios provides maximum flexibility in making separate recommendations capitalizing on the synergies afforded by consolidating sub-DTAP work to a minimum of sites while also allowing for obtaining the same net affect as Tech 0001 if both Tech 0005 and Tech 0006 are adopted.

TECH-0007, Re-Locate Ground Vehicle RDAT&E at Detroit Arsenal to Selfridge ANGB, was terminated as the TJCSG based upon the thought that TECH-0045, Establish Army Land Warfare Center, would best achieve the end state results desired by the Army.

TECH-0015, Establish Joint Centers for Space Platforms D&A, and TECH-0016, Establish Joint Centers for Space Platforms Research, were terminated as the TJCSG thought that little would be gained by these proposed scenarios since TECH-0014, Establish a Joint Center for Space RDAT&E Into One Core Site (Peterson), and TECH-0009, Defense Research Service Led Laboratories encompass the objectives of both of these proposed scenarios.

TECH-0036, Establish Joint Center for Rotary Wing Air Platform RDAT&E at Redstone, and TECH-0037, Establish Joint Center for Rotary Wing Air Platform RDAT&E at PAX River, were terminated at the TJCSG's direction based on Open Air Range information that shows the single site solution cannot accommodate all of the workload. Also, a single site solution is contrary to the TJCSG overarching strategy.

TECH-0049, Establish a Joint Center for Space RDAT&E Into One Core Site (Schriever AFB), was created as an alternate to TECH-0014, Establish a Joint Center for Space RDAT&E Into One Core Site (Peterson AFB), based on inaccurate information that Peterson AFB would not have adequate acreage available to accommodate the workload. Schriever AFB is in relatively close proximity to Peterson AFB, hence the reason for selection of Schriever AFB as the alternate site. However, the Air Force confirmed Peterson AFB does in fact have adequate acreage to accommodate all of the workload. Therefore the TJCSG terminated TECH-0049, as it was no longer necessary.

### **Weapons and Armaments Subgroup Terminated Scenarios**

TECH-0003, Re-Locate DoD Directed Energy Research to One Location (Kirtland AFB), was terminated per TJCSG direction because the donor organizations < 30 FTEs.

TECH-0004, Re-Locate DoD Directed Energy T&E and selected weapon T&E to One Location (WSMR), was terminated per TJCSG direction because the donor organizations < 30 FTEs.

TECH-0012, Re-Locate W&A RDAT&E to 3 Core & 2 Specialty Sites with Air Launched Weapons from PAX River & Pt. Mugu to China Lake, was terminated per TJCSG direction because Govt FTEs at PAX River NAWC are <30. Also, the extent of W&A air launched weapons workload at Point Mugu is primarily T&E. Overall, the scenario lacked transformative change and led to a small net effect.

TECH-0027, Re-Locate W&A RDAT&E to 3 core sites and 2 Specialty Sites; Retain/Re-locate Surface Ship Integration at Dahlgren, was incorporated into the TECH-0002, Re-Locate W&A RDAT&E to 3 core sites and 2 Specialty Sites, baseline. Therefore,

TECH-0027 was terminated.

**Innovative Systems Subgroup Terminated Scenarios**

None

# Remanded Scenario Recommendations

## Army

TECH-0051 – Physical Capacity Issue

TECH-0053 – 100 Year Payback

TECH-0035/0050/0052 – Need Discussion

TECH-0045 – Delete AF&N Actions

## Navy

TECH-0028 – In Process

TECH-0031 – Inactive if unacceptable payback

## Air Force

USAF-0112 – In Process

# Remanded Scenario Recommendations

Scenario	Army Receiving Location(s)	Possible Closure	Payback
8	Adelphi(R), Monmouth(D&A)	Rome	N/A
42	Adelphi, Belvoir	Monmouth	N/A
9	APG(R)	Adelphi	N/A
35	Adelphi(R), Belvoir(D&A)	Monmouth	4
50	Adelphi(R-), Belvoir(D&A,R+)	Monmouth	3
52	APG(RD&A)	Adelphi, Monmouth	7 (w/error) →8 or 9
45A	APG(RD&A)	Natick	7

# COBRA Assumptions

**Concern** – Reductions vary by scenarios, should we be more consistent

**Standard Assumptions**

- 15% of What?
  - Gross sq ft/person – 300 or 310 for S&T
  - 10% on support personnel for “collocation”
  - Articulate which of the standard assumptions are used
- #5** – Further explain why not 15% reduction on Ft. Rucker

**#5 & #6**

- Change cantonment to enclave
- 250 T of equipment (EMJ and 3014) What is the assumption?

**#8** – Assumptions should include all moving costs for Monmouth

**#20** – Monterrey to Stennis

- Assume no MILCON and explain
- Recruiting & training cost and associated assumptions?

**W&A**

- 15% reduction is mission support contractors???
- Allowance of \$200K/yr for savings of mission support contractors should not be allowed

# COBRA Assumptions

Scenario	Description of reduction	Reduction %
20	Subgroup Calculated number	14.86%
32	15% of admin. Admin = 30% of population	4.50%
40	15% of Admin. Admin = ~36% of Population moved	~5.5%
47	15% of admin. Admin = 40% of population	6.00%
54	No Reductions	0.00%
5 pt 2	15% of admin. Admin = 30% of population	4.50%
6 Pt 2	No Reduction	Only 9 moving
6 Pt 3	15% reduction Govt & Contractors (Screen 9)	15.00% Reduction in single digits.
8/42 Pt 1	15% of admin. Admin = 30% of population	4.50%
8/42 Pt 2	15% of admin. Admin = 30% of population	4.50%
8/42 Pt 3	15% of admin. Admin = 30% of population	0.00%
8/42 Pt 4	15% of admin. Admin = 30% of population	4.50%
8/42 Pt 5	15% of admin. Admin = 30% of population	4.50%
8/42 Pt 7	Subgroup Calculated number	14.89%
8/42 Pt 8	Subgroup Calculated number	14.38%
8/42 Pt 9	15% of admin. Admin = 30% of population	4.50%
9	AF reduced by Service, USA 15% of Admin. Admin = ~36% of Population moved	~5.5%
13	15% of admin. Admin = 30% of population (Civilian only)	4.25%

# CHANGES TO COBRA PROCESS

- **Objective: To conduct a COBRA process that has integrity and defensibility**
  - **Official COBRA print-outs show names of certifiers from “gainers” and “losers,” and signature of the sub-group analyst**
  - **Briefings include list of disallowed MILCONs -- with rationale**
  - **Briefings include list of all other disallowed costs -- with rationale**
  - **Ensure facilities at gaining locations are not “double-booked”**
  - **Do QA on COBRAs by having additional analyst(s) review**
  - **Proposals retroactive to all recommendations previously approved**



## Recommendation re TECH-0042A Part 9

---

- TJCSG approved excluding SPAWAR San Diego as an Excursion
- Do Not Adopt
  - One-Time Moving costs do drop by \$6M, *but*
  - Recurring Annual Costs go up
    - Annual personnel savings turn to a cost
  - Reason is the 5 less civilian positions eliminated equates to about \$300K annually less savings
- Proceed with TECH-0042A (Maritime) as approved on 8 Feb

