25 February 2005

BRAC 2005 Discussion Topics

Observations of Trends:

- Seems to be no plan as to how to present to the Commission
  - Need to operate under a "One BRAC" concept:
    - How to develop the final product? Offer a common approach for briefings – consistency is key.
    - Need to go over all little decisions so no one can say "I don't know anything about that"…everyone needs to be on same page.
    - Resolution of conflicting CRs
    - Tough questions are dodged – need to prepare more for commission presentation
  - Different JCSGs use different terminology.
  - There is no overall measure of success being tracked or reported.
  - Overall, DoD needs to build the presentation with the same level of detail and consistency as any other presentation for Congress.
- Recommendations are not consistently tied back to strategy.
  - There needs to be obvious link between overall BRAC 2005 goals, JCSG and MilDep strategies and guiding principles.
  - Justifications on quad-chart are weak and generic.
  - Supporting explanation for use of military judgment, especially over-rides of military value, are consistently weak. There is a lot of hand-waving going on when it comes to military judgment. "Military judgment" is that judgment involving subjects that are peculiarly within the expertise of military professionals. Subjects such as cost and "buildable acreage", therefore, cannot be subjects of "military judgment" such as to overcome military value quantitative analytical determinations, since they are within the expertise of other professionals too.
- Weights determining military value are inconsistent – and mix function value with installation value - will there be an overall ranking?
- Military Judgment is used frequently to override military value results. However, majority of judgment factors used are economic and business related rather than military unique. Need more guidance on what military judgment includes.
- Surge capabilities requirements are inconsistent and have no common definition.
  - Commission needs to be briefed on why JCSGs were allowed individually to define surge and how they subsequently did so.
- Under Threshold Actions:
  - Justifications for including under threshold actions within program are lacking or very weak.
  - Others are dropping from consideration some under threshold activities, while including others.
- Informal policy was established to exclude some ranges from consideration. Policy needs to be documented, or better yet, all ranges considered.
- Need a consistent definition for privatization. Currently there is a mixing of privatization of functions and privatization of installations. Should apply careful legal review to each privatization candidate recommendation to ensure proper terminology is used.
- Databases are still being changed and/or updated after CRs developed. No policy published on when to lock base data and gain specific ISG approval for corrections.

- Transformation rationale, when used, is consistently vague and unsupported. Need more explanation of how transformational options were developed, used, and how they fit into strategy.
- Many consolidations have long paybacks and high MILCON requirements for new construction with weak justifications for receiving site selection and clear exclusion of other service potential receiving site consideration.
    - A payback of Never or 100+ years without a very strong argument/justification will threaten the credibility of the BRAC process.
    - Many realignments lack ties to force structure requirements or military value improvement and appear to only justify new MILCON.
- There seems to be limited interaction among groups – especially when they have contingent/enabling/following CRs.
- Joint Basing recommendations need more backup in terms of implementation
    - Funding: Who pays for what?
    - How will different service standards be reconciled?
- Overseas unit relocations
    - Need better justification of need for realignments that make room for returning overseas units.
    - Should be following actions rather than driving requirements.
    - Different people are interpreting Nicole Bayert's 06 December 2004 finding differently.
- Have not been able to get the Intelligence JCSG presentation scheduled. We have requested an unclassified version of the presentation.

Possible Actions:

- Commission Presentation
    - Create working group to put presentation standards together.
    - Develop strategy for presentation to commission: Who and what.
    - Develop common approach and consistent briefing format.
    - Standardize terminology in presentations.
- Strategy Linkage to Recommendations
    - Put strategy development block on common process chart.
    - Create consistent format for strategy presentation.
    - Require explanation of strategy links in quad justification block.
- Military Value
    - Develop common matrix for all military value determinations with weights and approve for use.
- Military Judgment
    - Provide legal guidance as to what can be included in consideration factors when groups are exercising military judgment.
- Surge Requirements
    - Request groups to tie surge requirements to 1-2-4-1 strategy and develop matrix to align surge requirements and approve for use.
    - DoD should issue overarching discipline on how groups should be using common terms and approaches to surge.
- Thresholds
    - DoD should not use term "under threshold" in recommendation language.

    - If groups consider some “under threshold” activities or functions, then, for consistency, they ought to consider all “under threshold” activities or functions.
- Database
    - Lock changes to database and require ISG approval for necessary corrections.
    - Date for locking should be established soon.
- Overseas unit relocations
    - Overseas actions should inform BRAC.
    - Need strong, well understood rules on what BRAC can pay for in the moves.
        - Any cost or savings from outside U.S. Territory are not covered in BRAC.
        - All realignments from an U.S. base to another location are covered under BRAC.
        - Should be clear on whether BRAC funds can be used to build new facilities for overseas units.