14 March 2005

BRAC 2005 Discussion Topics

Observations of Trends:

- Integration of Military Department recommendations with JCSG recommendations and with each other has yet to begin. This process will be time consuming and the overall DoD story needs to be pulled together. (DoD strategy plus group strategies plus BRAC rules gives results).
- Universe – the entire process is undermined, if the Department cannot say confidently and convincingly that all installations, functions, and activities were considered.
- Measure of success – PRV does not capture everything. Need an overall score card. Amount of lease space eliminated, infrastructure capacity reduced, etc. need to be included.
- Definitions
    - Enclaves – Size of enclaves differ. How small is small? (AF ECS-Expeditionary Combat Support units)
    - Transformational – groups are using this as justification in very different ways. Some are using "transformational" to support new mission development or recapitalization vice enabler of excess capacity reduction.
- Consistency of Approach
    - There is no consistency in approach taken in military value analysis.
        - Overall, some groups imbed military judgment within the military value calculation, while others apply military judgment to the results of military value calculation (i.e. – *ex ante* vs. *ex post* application of military judgment.)
        - USAF does military value analysis by platform rather than by installation mission or function. Since military value is not based on installation value for support of total force structure, there are several military values for a base depending on which platform one is examining. USAF would have been more consistent by using installation functions and/or missions.
        - USA did not calculate military value of Guard and Reserve or perform COBRA analysis on them.
    - There is no consistency in approach taken in capacity analysis.
        - USAF defines capacity based on the difference between actual squadron size and optimum squadron size.
    - There is no consistency in approach taken to determine surge requirements.
    - Transformational options – groups are citing these as guidelines, but they seem to be available only in a draft form. Some guidance should be put out on the use of these options.
- Documentation: It appears that some additions and deletions of candidate recommendations are being done outside of the deliberative process before submission to ISG.
- Misuse of BRAC (i.e. never or 100+ year paybacks)
    - Standing-up new BCTs
    - JSF bed-down
    - Bed-down of returning overseas troops
    - Guard/Reserve Center reconstruction

- Examination of Range Capacity
    - No one is really looking at reducing excess range capacity.
    - Current candidate recommendations imply that "DoD does not have any excess ranges".
- Intelligence JCSG Presentation

Possible Actions:

- Definitions
    - Send out common definition of an enclave and limit the size without higher approval. The groups need to have a benchmark such as "less than 31 people" to help them define small.
    - Send out criteria to be satisfied for an action to be considered transformational in accordance with SecDef guidance.
- Differing Approaches
    - Surge – capture different approaches into on DoD matrix.
    - Military Value Analysis – Include military judgment as qualitative portion of military value analysis
    - Capacity Analysis – carefully review Air Force use of capacity analysis and ensure it is converted to mission or function support capacity.
    - Transformational Options
        - Either decide on a formal list and publish it or take them off the table and direct groups to stop citing them.
- Misuse of BRAC
    - Consolidate candidate recommendations to eliminate negative NPVs and extremely long paybacks. Ensure candidate recommendations meet BRAC requirements for period of accomplishment, reduce overall excess capacity in line with the Force Structure Plan, and raise average military value.