BRAC 2005 Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG)

Meeting Minutes of October 8, 2004

The Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), Mr. Michael W. Wynne chaired this meeting. The list of attendees is attached.

Mr. Wynne began the ISG by discussing his meeting with the Secretary of Defense about the Base Closure process to date. He stated that he informed the Secretary about the need to have an Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC) meeting in the near future. He added that the Secretary wanted to know how the Combatant Commanders were going to be informed about the BRAC process. In response, the ISG agreed to convey to the Combatant Commanders an overview of the process, highlighting the Joint Cross Service Group (JCSGs), Military Department Strategies, and providing illustrative examples of some scenarios would be appropriate. Mr. Wynne and the ISG also briefly discussed the agenda for the proposed IEC meeting. The ISG agreed that the IEC should be briefed on representative scenarios being examined by the JCSGs and Military Departments.

Mr. Wynne then turned the meeting over to Mr. Pete Potochney, Director of the OSD BRAC Office. Mr. Potochney reviewed the BRAC process to date using the attached slides. Mr. Potochney reminded the ISG of the two approaches for scenario development and analysis: Data Driven and Strategy Driven (Military Judgment) - Data Verified that comply with the BRAC statute. He also noted that the ISG agreed that JCSGs and Military Departments would use the quality checklist discussed at the last ISG meeting when briefing scenarios and candidate recommendations. In addition, JCSGs and Military Departments will provide more detailed information for candidate recommendations in the format at attachment 3.

Mr. Potochney then reviewed the status of scenarios residing in the ISG scenario-tracking tool. He noted that a preliminary categorization of the existing scenarios revealed that many of the scenarios did not contain sufficient information to facilitate assessment of where scenarios overlap or conflict with other scenarios. After discussion, the ISG agreed to empower the BRAC DASs to enforce scenario specificity to enable de-confliction and ISG oversight. As part of the discussion, Mr. Wynne emphasized the need for both JCSGs and Military Departments to develop specific scenarios and register them in the ISG scenario-tracking tool as soon as possible.

The ISG also discussed metrics that might be used to quantify JCSG, Military Department or DoD-wide BRAC recommendations by function. The ISG emphasized that these metrics are not goals of the analysis, but rather a method to quantify results.
Mr. Wynne then turned over the meeting to Mr. Charles Abell, Chairman of the Education and Training JCSG, who briefed the ISG on his group’s scenarios. The ISG and Mr. Abell agreed to the following:

- Flight training issues related to different service training doctrines are being worked within the JCSG and will be reviewed by the ISG.
- The scenarios presented are not based on data, but on strategy—data will validate the scenarios.
- Reciprocal scenarios for flight training consolidation scenarios will be analyzed.
- Lessons learned from prior Interservice Training Review Organization studies have been used to inform the scenario development process.
- Consolidating professional development education to one government facility will be evaluated as a scenario complementing the scenario to privatize professional development training.

Following Mr. Abell’s presentation, Dr. Craig College, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Infrastructure Analysis, briefed the ISG on Army scenarios using the attached slides. Some highlights from Dr. College’s briefing are:

- Army strategy supports the Army vision of having a campaign quality Joint and Expeditionary Army positioned to provide relevant and ready combat power to Combatant Commanders from a portfolio of installations that projects power, trains, sustains and enhances readiness and well-being of the joint team.
- The Army is working closely with JCSGs to develop its scenarios and has scenarios that are operationally driven and that complement JCSG scenarios to enable the Army to close installations that have low military value scores.
- Both the Joint Action Scenario Team and the reserve Joint Process Action Team evaluations are part of the Army scenario development process.
- Many Army scenarios that appear to be duplicative of JCSG scenarios in fact reflect how the Army is incorporating JCSG scenario approaches into their analysis of what scenarios it should analyze.

After the Army briefing, Ms. Anne Davis, the Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy for Base Closure, briefed the ISG on Navy scenarios using the attached slides. Highlights from her briefing include:

- The Department of Navy’s organizational structure parallels the overall DoD BRAC structure.
- Department of Navy operational flag officers and senior civilians are involved in each step of the Navy process.
• Department of Navy overall approach is to balance efficiency against force protection and single points of failure.
• The scenario development process is rigorous and fully incorporates the actions of the JCSGs.
• Lower military value facilities will be closed consistent with overall Navy objectives (i.e. some lower military value facilities may remain open if facilities are necessary to support overall objectives).

After the Navy briefing, Major General Gary Heckman, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff of the Air Force for Plans and Programs, briefed the ISG on the Air Force approach to scenario development. Highlights of General Heckman’s presentation include:

• Overarching principles drive the Air Force scenario development process.
• Air Force has developed an analytical cueing tool that will rank facilities according to military value within nine categories (fighter bases, tanker bases, bomber bases, etc.)
• Guard and reserve components are participating in the Air Force goal of integrating guard and reserve forces with active forces.
• Base structures will reflect the Air Force goal to create cohesive units that support 10 Air and Space Expeditionary Forces.

As part of the Air Force briefing, Mr. Wynne stressed some concepts that are important for the BRAC process to succeed:

• The DASs are responsible for initial reconciliation of scenarios and the ISG will review the DAS’s recommendations.
• Services should continue to plan on a 48-hour turnaround from question clarification to field response for scenario data calls with the services performing quality reviews of the data.
• JCSGs should accelerate their process to register scenarios as soon as possible.
• ISG members must ensure their IEC members are kept current on what is happening in the BRAC process because the IEC role will increase over time.
• The Secretary expects BRAC sensitive material to remain close hold.

Approved: ______________________
Michael W. Wynne
Acting USD (Acquisition Technology and Logistics)
Chairman, Infrastructure Steering Group

Attachments:
1. List of Attendees
2. Briefing slides entitled “BRAC 2005 Briefing to the ISG” dated October 8, 2004
3. Sample form: “Candidate Recommendation #_____________”
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BRAC 2005

Briefing to the
Infrastructure Steering Group

October 8, 2004
Purpose

- Process Overview
- Scenario Development & Analysis - Quality
- Quantifying the Results
- Registered Scenarios - Status
- Scenario Briefings
  - Education and Training JCSG
  - Army
  - DoN
  - Air Force
Process Overview

Joint Cross-Service Groups

| Capacity Analysis | Military Value Analysis | Scenario Development |

Military Departments

| Capacity Analysis | Military Value Analysis | Scenario Development |

Timeline:

- **CY 2003**
  - O: Capacity Data Call
  - N: MV Briefs to ISG
  - D: BRAC Report
- **CY 2004**
  - J: JCSG Recommendations Due to ISG 20 Dec
  - F: Mil Value Data Call Issued
  - M: JCSG Recommendations Due to ISG 20 Dec
  - A: MV Briefs to ISG
  - M: MV Briefs to ISG
- **CY 2005**
  - J: Start Scenario Data Calls
  - F: MilDeps Recommendations Due 20 Jan
  - M: Commissioner Nominations Deadline

**Important Dates**

- **20 Dec**: JCSG Recommendations Due to ISG
- **20 Jan**: MilDeps Recommendations Due

**Key Actions**

- Final Selection Criteria
- Capacity Responses to JCSGs
- Mil Value Responses to JCSGs
- MV Briefs to ISG

**Deconfliction**

- Scenario Deconfliction
Scenario Development and Analysis

Data Driven (Quantitative Assessment)

Capacity Analysis Results (Data)
Military Value Analysis Results (Data)
Force Structure Plan Capabilities or Current Usage

Optimization Tool
Military Judgment

Proposals
Scenario Analysis
Candidate Recommendations

Military Value Analysis Results (Data)
Capacity Analysis Results (Data)

Scenario Analysis
Force Structure Plan Capabilities

Proposals
Scenario Analysis
Candidate Recommendations

Force Structure Plan Capabilities

Strategy Driven (Military Judgment) – Data Verified

Ideas
Proposals
Scenario Analysis
Candidate Recommendations
Scenario Quality Check

Each of the following must be completed before submittal as a candidate recommendation:

- Strategy
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- De-conflicted w/ JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/ MilDeps
- COBRA Analysis
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- JCSG/MilDep Recommended

Sequence depends on whether scenario is strategy or data driven
# Proposed Scenario Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Principles:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transformational Options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Item 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Item 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strategy
- COBRA
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- JCSG/MilDep Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/MilDep
**Candidate Recommendation:** Fully describe the candidate closure or realignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Explain the reasons for the candidate recommendation (i.e., force structure reductions; mission consolidation, collocation, or elimination; excess capacity; jointness; etc)</td>
<td>✓ Overall effect on military value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Relative military value against its peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Military judgment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Criterion 5 (COBRA) results</td>
<td>✓ Criteria 6-8 (Economic, Community and Environmental)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy  ❇ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification  ❇ JCSG/MilDep Recommended  ❇ De-conflicted w/JCSGs

❇ COBRA  ❇ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification  ❇ Criteria 6-8 Analysis  ❇ De-conflicted w/MilDeps
# Quantifying the Results
(By function, JCSG/MilDep, or DoD wide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Amount</th>
<th>Post BRAC Amount/% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square Feet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if available)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One Time Costs__________ Recurring Costs__________
One Time Savings__________ Recurring Savings__________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Not Ready for Categorization</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Enabling</th>
<th>Conflicting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DoN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Force</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed &amp; Training</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;SA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply &amp; Storage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>137</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenarios in Tracking Tool

- Determine those specific installations that must be retained to ensure access to space launch through all inclinations (Air Force)
- Base fighters at the optimum number of installations based on MCI rating and theoretical capacity (Air Force)
- Categorization
  - Independent?
  - Enabling?
  - Conflicting?
Scenarios

- A scenario is a description of a potential closure or realignment action that has been declared for formal analysis by a deliberative body. Includes detail on transfer of unit(s), missions(s), &/or work activity and locations involved.

- Basic Writing Rules:
  - Be short, precise, and succinct
  - Begin with an action verb (close, realign, etc.)
  - Specify losing sites by name
  - Identify specific gaining location(s)
  - State what is being relocated where
  - Not include acronyms or military jargon
  - Avoid rationale or justification
**Recommendation**

- For both JCSGs and MilDeps, empower the DASs to enforce scenario specificity in the tool to enable de-confliction and ISG oversight.
Education & Training Joint Cross Service Group

Principles ➔ Strategy ➔ Scenarios

Infrastructure Steering Group Meeting
October 8, 2004

Mr. Charles S. Abell
Chair, E&T JCSG
Principles

1. Increase / Enhance “Jointness”
2. Improve Efficiency & Effectiveness
3. Preserve Service Core Competences
4. Reduce Infrastructure Footprint
Strategies

- Flight Training Subgroup
  - Move to / toward common UFT platforms at fewer joint bases
  - Co-locate advanced UFT functions with FTU/FRS
  - Preserve Service & Joint combat training programs

- Professional Development Education Subgroup
  - Transfer appropriate functions to private sector
  - Create Joint “Centers of Excellence” for common functional specialties
  - Re-balance Joint with Service competencies across PME spectrum
Strategies

- Specialize Skill Training Subgroup
  - Establish “Joint Centers of Excellence” for common functions
  - Rely on private sector for appropriate technical training
  - Preserve opportunities for continuing Service acculturation

- Ranges Subgroup (Two Functions: Tng & T&E)
  - For Training — do not propose losses and gains
  - Establish cross-functional/cross-service regional range complexes
  - Highest capability: ground-air-sea
  - Preserve irreplaceable “one-of-a-kinds”
  - Create new range capabilities for emerging Joint needs
# Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Scenarios</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Scenarios</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected Scenarios</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Strategy driven with minimal data analysis
## Disestablish and realign T-1 Training

### Scenario
- Disestablish and realign Advanced Undergraduate Flight Training (T-1) at Heavy Lift/TACAMO FRS/FTU
- Gain: Little Rock, Altus, Tinker
- Lose: Columbus AFB, Laughlin AFB and Vance AFB

### Drivers/Assumptions
- BRAC guidance to exploit transformational options and reduce base/infrastructure requirements
- Transformational Option: Exploit mission commonalities and consolidate Advanced UPT Multi-Engine Jet with FTU training
- Assumes program would not disrupt current training levels and preserves common skills within current programs

### Justification/Impact
- Reduced cost of aircraft maintenance
- Optimize current asset utilization
- Exploits Joint Opportunity
- QoL improvement (reduces PCS)

### Potential Conflicts
- Service culture
- May constrict student track/re-track training opportunities
- Loss of redundancy
- Locates Advanced students with operational squadrons (Moody)

| ✓ Strategy | ☐ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification | ✓ JCSG Recommended | ☐ De-conflicted w/JCSGs |
| ☐ COBRA | ☐ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification | ☐ Criteria 6-8 Analysis | ☐ De-conflicted w/Services |
T-1 Consolidation

Retain at Randolph for Pilot Instructor training and P-cola for NFO training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Now</th>
<th>Then</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laughlin AFB</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altus AFB</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vance AFB</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinker AFB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus AFB</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little Rock AFB</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randolph AFB</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAS Pensacola</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Consolidate Rotary Wing Training

### Scenario

- Consolidate Rotary Wing Phase of Undergraduate Flight Training at Ft Rucker using a single platform
- Gain: Ft Rucker
- Lose: NAS Whiting South

### Drivers/Assumptions

- BRAC guidance to exploit transformational options and reduce base/infrastructure requirements
- Transformational Option: Exploit RW commonalities
- Joint program would not disrupt current training levels and preserves common skills within current programs

### Justification/Impact

- Reduced cost of aircraft maintenance
- Optimize current asset utilization
- Exploits Joint Opportunity

### Potential Conflicts

- Service culture
- Loss of redundancy
- Phase out current UHPT aircraft to single aircraft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Capacity Analysis / Data Verification</th>
<th>JCSG Recommended</th>
<th>De-conflicted w/JCSGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COBRA</td>
<td>Military Value Analysis / Data Verification</td>
<td>Criteria 6-8 Analysis</td>
<td>De-conflicted w/Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Consolidate Rotary Wing Training

### Scenario
- Consolidate Rotary Wing Phase of Undergraduate Flight Training at Whiting using a single platform
- Gain: NAS Whiting North and South and NAS Corpus Christi
- Lose: Ft Rucker and NAS Whiting North (T-34)

### Drivers/Assumptions
- BRAC guidance to exploit transformational options and reduce base/infrastructure requirements
- Transformational Option: Exploit RW training commonalities
- Joint program would not disrupt current training levels and preserves common skills within current programs
- Corpus can accommodate T-34 program

### Justification/Impact
- Reduced cost of aircraft maintenance
- Optimize current asset utilization
- Exploits Joint Opportunity

### Potential Conflicts
- Service culture
- Loss of redundancy
- Phase out current UHPT aircraft to a single aircraft

| ✓ Strategy | ☐ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification | ✓ JCSG Recommended | ☐ De-conflicted w/JCSGs |
| ☐ COBRA | ☐ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification | ☐ Criteria 6-8 Analysis | ☐ De-conflicted w/Services |
# Privatize PDE Functions at AFIT and NPS

## Scenario
- Disestablish PDE Function at Naval Postgraduate School and Air Force Institute of Technology and privatize.
- Gaining Installation: None
- Losing Installations: Wright-Patterson AFB and NAVPGSCOL Monterey, CA

## Justification/Impact
- Eliminates need of education program management at NPS and AFIT
- Realize savings through privatizing education function to civilian colleges & universities

## Drivers/Assumptions
- Principle: Recruit and Train
- Principle: Organize
- Transformational Options: Privatize Graduate-Level Education

## Potential Conflicts
- Military Specific Graduate Degrees
- Military Specific Support Spaces (TS Level Spaces for example)
- Partnership for Peace Program at Monterey, CA
- DMRI at Monterey, CA
- Cost of Privatization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>☑️ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification</th>
<th>☑️ JCSG Recommended</th>
<th>☑️ De-conflicted w/JCSGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COBRA</td>
<td>☐️ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification</td>
<td>☐️ Criteria 6-8 Analysis</td>
<td>☐️ De-conflicted w/Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Establish Joint Center of Excellence for Logistics/Supply Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Establish Joint Center of Excellence for Logistics/Supply; Consolidate like courses and collocate similar schools</td>
<td>- Principles: Organize and Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gaining installation: Fort Lee, VA</td>
<td>- Transformational Options: Establish Centers of Excellence for Joint or Inter-service education and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Losing installations: Lackland AFB, TX; Athens, GA, NTTC Meridian, MS; Camp Lejeune, N.C.</td>
<td>- Establish “joint” officer and enlisted specialized skill training (initial skill, skill progression &amp; functional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Uses Inter-service Training Review Organization as the baseline</td>
<td>- Unique service training standards and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Eliminates redundancy, leased space/cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Train as we fight “jointly”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Army Logistics Mgmt College &amp; Combined Arms Support Command at Fort Lee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strategy  ☑  Capacity Analysis / Data Verification  ☑  JCSG Recommended  ☑  De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- COBRA  ☐  Military Value Analysis / Data Verification  ☐  Criteria 6-8 Analysis  ☐  De-conflicted w/Services
Establish Joint Center of Excellence for Supply/Logistics Training

Indicates SST locations
Establish Western T&E OAR Complex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Consolidate T&amp;E capabilities and workload requiring open-air ranges for T&amp;E to a western U.S. complex of ranges for air, sea, land, space, armament/munitions, C4ISR, EW, and CB Defense.</td>
<td>- Service management and operation of Complex to ensure coordination and access as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gaining Activities: Edwards AFB, China Lake, Pt Mugu, Vandenberg AFB, Nellis AFB, UTTR, DPG, YPG, Ft. Huachuca, WSMR</td>
<td>- Promotes and supports systems “born joint.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Retain difficult/expensive to replace/unique facilities at existing sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Associated technical activities should be collocated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Eliminates duplication, fosters interoperability of systems, and provides capabilities for T&amp;E of advanced systems, family of systems, system of systems, and weapons.</td>
<td>- Coordination with training range sub-working group and TJCSG required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Specialty capabilities outside of Complex may need to be retained for special geographic or climatic features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Non-collocation of operational units for operational testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strategy
- COBRA
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/Services
Establish a Gulf Panhandle Range Complex

Proposal
- Establish a Gulf Panhandle Range Complex incorporating NAS Pensacola, Eglin AFB, Ft. Benning, Ft. Rucker, Moody AFB, Tyndall AFB, Coastal Systems Station Panama City, Gulfport CRTC & associated ground, sea and air maneuver space
- The proposal maintains current Service ownership and command & control of included installations and sites
- The proposal establishes an executive agent for DoD to coordinate joint use of the complex
- This proposal will utilize Camp Shelby ground maneuver space

Drivers/Assumptions
- Transformational Options #39/40
- Joint training environment with range space sufficient to support:
  - ESG with live fire capability.
  - CSG with live fire capability.
  - BCT/UA with live fire capability.
  - Joint SOF
  - AF Ready Aircrew Program (RAP) tasking
- Supersedes Sea and Sea-Air Combinations
- Will not disrupt current training or T&E missions
- Will not disrupt current or proposed Rotary Wing training at Ft Rucker

Justification/Impact
- Supports all Service and Joint training tasks
- Optimizes use of range capacity at all sites
- Expands on existing informal relationship
- Opportunity to achieve OSD T2 common range infrastructure goals
- Opportunity to train in diverse conditions

Potential Conflicts
- Servicisms (Cultural approach to scheduling/use)
- Mission expansion (T&E).
- Current training missions

✓ Strategy ✗ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification ✗ JCSG Recommended ✗ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
✗ COBRA ✗ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ✗ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✗ De-conflicted w/Services
**Establish a Joint Urban Ops Training Center of Excellence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Establish a Joint Urban Operations Training Center of Excellence at a suitable installation proposed for closure by one of the Services</td>
<td>- Transformation Option #40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Privatize the management, operation and maintenance of the facility (GOCO)</td>
<td>- A suitable site meeting the following criteria will be proposed for closure:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide a “turn key” facility meeting all Service and Joint Urban Operation live training requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establish an OSD executive agent to coordinate use and oversee contractor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Impact area for live-fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Runway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Within 100 miles of coastline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Small cantonment area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Minimal encroachment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Justification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establishes urban ops training center with minimal construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supports all Service and joint urban ops training tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide urban ops training capability without degrading service’s capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Full financial savings from closure of selected installation will not be realized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Service intent to fully close selected installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Installation will be closed from most perspectives – e.g., ability to support missions (other than live urban training), quality of life, military personnel support, etc; however, the installation would remain on DoD books with minimal DoD/Govt staff for oversight and QA/QC of contractor support operations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strategy  ❑ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification  ❑ JCSG Recommended  ❑ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- COBRA  ❑ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification  ❑ Criteria 6-8 Analysis  ❑ De-conflicted w/Services
Army BRAC Analysis Strategy

Cooperation, Integration
Army Vision for BRAC 2005

“A campaign quality Joint and Expeditionary Army positioned to provide relevant and ready combat power to Combatant Commanders from a portfolio of installations that projects power, trains, sustains and enhances the readiness and well-being of the Joint Team.”
### Military Value Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Quartile</th>
<th>Second Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ft Bliss</td>
<td>Ft Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Lewis</td>
<td>McAlester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Hood</td>
<td>AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Stewart /</td>
<td>Hawthorne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter AAF Ft</td>
<td>AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bragg</td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuma PG</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dugway PG</td>
<td>Redstone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Carson</td>
<td>Arsenal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Benning</td>
<td>Ft Eustis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Sands MR</td>
<td>Ft Rucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Huachuca</td>
<td>Ft Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft AD Hill</td>
<td>Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft AP Hill</td>
<td>Ft Monmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Belvoir</td>
<td>Ft Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toodle AD</td>
<td>Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra AD</td>
<td>Bluegrass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane AD</td>
<td>Deseret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Sill</td>
<td>Chem Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Irwin</td>
<td>Walter Reed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Drum</td>
<td>AMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Polk</td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen PG</td>
<td>Rucker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schofield</td>
<td>Leonard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barracks</td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Sill</td>
<td>Huachuca</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft</td>
<td>Ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Military Value Portfolio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third Quartile</th>
<th>Fourth Quartile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ft Meade</td>
<td>Ft Myer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Gillem</td>
<td>Ft Leavenworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Island Arsenal</td>
<td>Newport Chem Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT Sunny Point</td>
<td>Ft Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pueblo Chem Depot</td>
<td>Lake City AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ft Detrick</td>
<td>Ft Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soldier Sppt Center</td>
<td>Lake City AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan AAP</td>
<td>Louisiana AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Kelley</td>
<td>AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlisle</td>
<td>Corpus Christi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lima Tank Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scranton AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USAG Selfridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft Buchanan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ft Shafter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holston AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tripler AMC</td>
<td>Lease - Rosslyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riverbank AAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lease - Bailey’s Crossroads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lease Army Research Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lease - Crystal City Lease-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hoffman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lease- ARPERCEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Army Links into JCSG Scenario Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Army</th>
<th>JCSG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administration &amp; HQs (16)</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Army (15)</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materiel &amp; Logistics (11)</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Forces (06)</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDT&amp;E (08)</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (44)</td>
<td>♦</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- HSA
- E&T
- S&S
- Industrial
- (E&T)
- Technical
- Medical/Intelligence
Administration & Headquarters

JCSG Functional Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Army MVI – MVP</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Close Fort Monroe</td>
<td>• Single location Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close Fort Shafter</td>
<td>• Close Leased Space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close Fort Gillem</td>
<td>• Consolidate Mob Platforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Minimize Leased Space</td>
<td>• Consolidate/Privatize Corrections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Objectives**

• Collocate functions and headquarters in “Joint campuses” to enhance interoperability and reduce cost.

• Unite multi-location

• Single location Headquarters

• Close Leased Space

• Consolidate Mob Platforms

• Consolidate/Privatize Corrections

• Collocate
  - Missile & Space Agencies
  - MILPER/CIVPER Agencies
# Create Army Human Resources Center at Fort Knox

## Scenario
- Realign HRC leased space (Alexandria VA, Indianapolis IN and St. Louis MO) and owned space occupied by CHRA at APG by consolidating and re-locating to Fort Knox.
- Realign Fort Monroe, VA, by re-locating Army Accessions Command and Cadet Command and collocating with Army Enlisted Recruiting Command and HR Command at Fort Knox.

## Justification/Impact
- Creates an HRC Ctr for Excellence and supports DoD HR goals to include: the Defense Integrated Human Resource System (DIMHRS), Continuum of Service concept, and increasing Total Force effectiveness.
- Cost avoidance of $24M annually (FY 04$s).
- Key Relationship indicators do not support continued presence in the NCR.
- Sufficient admin space exists at Fort Knox.
- Facilitates closure of two leased sites.

## Drivers/Assumptions
- Principals: Recruit and Train; Quality of Life; Organize.
- Transformational Option: Consolidate Active and Reserve Military Personnel of the same service.
- Transformational Option: Eliminate leased space US-wide.
- Transformational Option: Consolidate HQs at single locations.
- Transformational Options: Eliminate stand-alone HQs.

## Potential Conflicts
- Not currently a Military Personnel Center location. HRC portion of the scenario requires ~2,925 civilians in primarily personnel-related GS-Series (GS-201/203).
- Availability of civilian workforce with personnel experience for HRC.
- Moved ACC and Cadet CMD, but not rest of TRADOC.

### Strategy
- COBRA
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification

### JCSG
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs

### De-conflicted w/Services
- De-conflicted w/Services
TRADOC HQ to Fort Eustis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Moves Training and Doctrine Command’s Headquarters from Fort Monroe to Fort Eustis</td>
<td>▪ Transformational Options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Eliminate locations of stand-alone HQs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Army Objective:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Create multifunctional, multi-component installations that provide better level of service to the Joint Team at a reduced cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Keeps TRADOC HQ in the Tidewater Area to strengthen its’ partnership with Joint Forces Command for concept development, experimentation, and training.</td>
<td>▪ Multiple proposals adding activities to Fort Eustis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closes a single focused installation (Ft. Monroe).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy  □ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification  □ JCSG Recommended  □ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
□ COBRA     □ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification  □ Criteria 6-8 Analysis  □ De-conflicted w/Services
## Close Fort Monroe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Moves Training and Doctrine Command’s Headquarters from Fort Monroe to Fort Eustis</td>
<td>- Transformational Options:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Moves Army Accessions Command and Cadet Command to Fort Knox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Closes Fort Monroe</td>
<td>- Eliminate locations of stand-alone HQs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Fort Monroe is not in the Army MVP.</td>
<td>- Army Objective:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Create multifunctional, multi-component installations that provide better level of service to the Joint Team at a reduced cost.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification/Impact

- Closes a single focused installation (Ft. Monroe)

### Potential Conflicts

- Requires coordination with HSA.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Capacity Analysis / Data Verification</th>
<th>JCSG Recommended</th>
<th>De-conflicted w/JCSGs</th>
<th>COBRA</th>
<th>Military Value Analysis / Data Verification</th>
<th>Criteria 6-8 Analysis</th>
<th>De-conflicted w/Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Army

MVI - MVP
- Close Carlisle
- Close Fort Leavenworth
- Close Presidio of Monterey

Army Objectives
- Provide sufficient area and facilities (with varied terrain, climate, and airspace) to support institutional training, combat development, and doctrine development.
- Consolidate, collocate or disperse training to enhance coordination, doctrine development, training effectiveness, and improve operational and functional efficiencies.
  Consolidate Training into “Centers of

Education and Training

JCSG

Transformational Options
- Collocate Army War College and Command and General Staff College at a single location.
- Joint Logistics Training Center of Excellence
- Collocate Service Professional Military Education (PME) schools at the intermediate and senior levels.
- Establish Centers of Excellence for Joint or Inter-service
# Land Warfare University (War College & CGSC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ▪ Consolidate the War College with CGSC at a single installation. | ▪ Transformational Options:  
  • Collocate Army War College and Command and General Staff College at a single location.  
  • Consolidates institutional training at an at a single installation to support force stabilization.  
| | ▪ Army Objective:  
  • Consolidate, collocate, or disperse training to enhance coordination, doctrine development, training effectiveness, and improve operational and functional efficiencies. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ▪ Promotes the concept of an Army Land Warfare University by placing officer operational & strategic together at a single installation. | ▪ Service culture with Joint solution  
  ▪ Enclave requirement for the USDB (with closure of Fort Leavenworth) |
| ▪ Closes Carlisle and Fort Leavenworth | ▪ JCSG Recommended  
  ▪ De-conflicted w/JCSGs  
  ▪ Criteria 6-8 Analysis  
  ▪ De-conflicted w/Services |

- Strategy  
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification  
- COBRA  
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification  
- JCSG Recommended  
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs  
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis  
- De-conflicted w/Services
# CSS Center (Fort Lee)

## Scenario
- Moves the Transportation Center & School (Fort Eustis) and Ordnance Center & School (Aberdeen/Redstone) to Fort Lee (with the Quartermaster Center & School, the Army Logistic Management College, and CASCOM) creating a CSS Center.

## Alternative Locations:
- Fort Eustis
- Redstone Arsenal

## Drivers/Assumptions
- **Transformational Options:**
  - Collocate or consolidate multiple branch schools and centers at single locations based on warfighting requirements, training strategy, and doctrine, to gain efficiencies.

## Army Objective:
- Consolidate, collocate, or disperse training to enhance coordination, doctrine development, training effectiveness, and improve operational and functional efficiencies.

## Justification/Impact
- Consolidates CSS training and doctrine development at a single installation, which is consistent with the MANSCEN model currently in place at Ft. Leonard Wood promoting training effectiveness and functional efficiencies.
- Maintains current JLOTs training capabilities.
- Creates space at Eustis for other activities.

## Potential Conflicts
- High MILCON costs.
- Must be closely coordinated with E&T JCSG.

## Strategy
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs

## Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- COBRA
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- De-conflicted w/Services
# Materiel and Logistics

## MVI, MVP:

- **Close:** Letterkenny Army Depot, Watervliet Arsenal, Lone Star, Riverbank, Mississippi, Kansas, and Louisiana Army Ammunition Plants

## Army Objectives

- **Realign and consolidate** the Army organic industrial base, in partnership with industry, to provide Joint, responsive, flexible, worldwide logistics support from JCSG Functional Analysis:

## JCSG Functional Analysis:

- Consolidate similar commodities under Centers for Industrial Technical Excellence.
- Partnership Expansion: government personnel work in contractor-owned/leased facilities.
- Integrate by consolidating multiple functions associated w/ munitions and armaments at the same site.
# Munitions & Armaments

## Munitions Production

### Scenario
- Preserve and optimize Munitions Production and metal parts capability while minimizing excess capacity.
- Retain capabilities at Crane, Indian Head, Holston, Iowa, Lake City, McAlester, Milan, Pine Bluff, Radford, Scranton, and Yorktown.
- **Realign workload Kansas, Lone Star, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Riverbank.**

### Drivers/Assumptions
- **Transformational Options:**
  - Reshape and integrate critical munitions and armaments capability to sustain peacetime and wartime Joint operational requirements in the most effective and efficient manner.
- **Principle:**
  - Consider the value of preserving the capability to support surge, mobilization, continuity of operations, evacuations for natural disasters, or conduct core roles and missions (e.g., sea-based operations, combined arms, etc.).

### Justification/Impact
- Retains artillery, bomb, CAD/PAD, energetics, medium/small caliber, missiles, mines, metal parts, pyro/demo, tank, and torpedo Joint capability.

### JOINT Sites
- Avoids “Single Point Failure”

### Potential Conflicts
- Avoids “Single Point Failure”
- Indian Head falls into the Industrial JSCG and the Technical JSCG
- Industrial JSCG recommends limiting Indian Head and Yorktown munitions production to LRIP production required to support their R&D efforts.

### Strategy
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- JSCG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/Services
Munitions & Armaments
Armaments (Alt 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preserve and optimize Armaments capability while minimizing excess capacity.</td>
<td>Principles:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retain core capability at Watervliet Arsenal</td>
<td>• Consider the value of preserving the following critical industrial capabilities: castings and forgings of ground components; white phosphorous-based munitions; chemical and biological defense equipment; the manufacture of gun tubes, mortars, and cannon tubes; and rubber track and road wheels that are required by law, not commercially available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Rock Island Arsenal and realign workload to Watervliet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Lima Tank Plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitize Watervliet to accommodate Rock Island’s workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retain core capability at Watervliet (cannons, gun tubes, mortars, and chrome plating)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close Lima Tank Plant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitize Watervliet to accommodate Rock Island’s workload</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strategy
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- COBRA
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/Services
Operational Forces

MVI – MVP: Identifies opportunities to:
- Relocate IGPBS forces
- Realign Operational Forces associated with Modularity
- Realign Special Operations Forces
- Make greater use of RDT&E Installations for training

Army Objectives
- Locate Army forces and materiel to enhance deployment and redeployment of the Joint Team.

E&T JCSG Functional Analysis
- Consolidate testing at Western Open Air Range Complex
- Consider value of Regional Training Complexes
- Establish regional Cross-Service and Cross-Functional ranges that will support Service
## Transform Yuma PG and Consolidate RDTE

### Scenario
- Station Operational Army Forces at Yuma PG.
- Realign selected RDTE missions to Dugway PG, WSMR and other Service installations.

### Potential Installations:
- **Army:** Dugway PG, WSMR, Fort Hunter-Liggett, Fort Bliss, Fort Wainwright, Fort Knox, Fort A.P. Hill
- **Joint:** Luke AFB, Nellis AFB, Camp Pendleton

### Justification/Impact
- Traditional Army training installations have a shortage of available training land.
- Yuma PG has over 1 M acres of open air range and training land.
- Creates opportunity for Operational testing with Operational Army Forces.
- Proximity to MCAS Yuma and Goldwater Range Complex creates joint training opportunities.

### Drivers/Assumptions
- **Principles:**
  - Recruit and Train; Organize.
- **Transformational Option:**
  - Locate Units of Action at installations capable of modular formations.
  - Establish regional Cross-Service and Cross-Functional ranges.
  - Collocate MTOE units and RDTE on single installations.
  - Consolidate RDTE organizations.

### Potential Conflicts
- Realignment of other RDTE missions to Yuma.
# Realign Special Operations Forces

## Scenario
- Realign Special Forces Groups.
- Potential Installations:
  - Army: Yuma PG, WSMR, Fort Stewart, Fort A.P. Hill
  - Joint: Eglin AFB, Nellis AFB, Camp Lejuene

## Drivers/Assumptions
- Principles:
  - Recruit and Train; Organize.
- Transformational Option:
  - Locate SOF to best support specialized training, training with other Service SOF and wartime alignment deployment requirements.
  - Collocate SOF units where they reduce infrastructure requirements and enable improved training opportunities.

## Justification/Impact
- Traditional Army training installations have a shortage of available training land.
- Consolidates new, modular civil affairs units.
- Enhances inter-Service SOF training.

## Potential Conflicts
- Realignment of other-Service units.
- Stationing of other Operational Army Forces.

---

### Strategy
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- COBRA
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification

### JCSG
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis

### De-conflicted
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/Services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Army Objectives</th>
<th>Technical JCSG Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consolidate Army RDT&amp;E organizations to capitalize on technical synergy across DoD, academia and industry.</td>
<td>• Reduce excess capacity &amp; reduce the number of technical sites through combined R&amp;D, Acquisition, T&amp;E Centers aligned for functional and technical efficiency &amp; synergy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Options</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Co-locate functions and headquarters in “Joint Campuses” to enhance interoperability and reduce costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Combined Land Warfare Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Scenario</strong></th>
<th><strong>Drivers/Assumptions</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Create Combined Center(s) for Land Warfare R, D&amp;A, and T&amp;E</td>
<td>- Transformational Option:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Impacted Activities: <strong>Army</strong>: Detroit Arsenal, Natick Soldiers Center, Picatinny and APG; Potential minor impacts on other service activities at USMC: Quantico; Navy: NSWC-Corona and Pax River; AF: Tyndall, Robbins, and Hanscom AFB</td>
<td>- #32 Evaluate Joint Centers for ... technologies use by more than one Military Department ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- #33 Consolidate within each Service...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Other:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Collocate RDAT&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Analysis based upon Linear Optimization Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Reconstitution of Intellectual Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Simultaneous displacement of RDAT&amp;E infrastructure for FCS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification/Impact
- Consolidates survivability efforts for light combat systems

### Potential Conflicts
- JCSG Recommended
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- De-conflicted w/Services

- Strategy
- Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- COBRA
- Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
# Combined Weapons & Armaments (W&A) and Platform Integration Centers

### Scenario

- Combine weapon system platform integration, targeting, mission planning with Weapons & Armaments R, D&A, and T&E at combined weapons centers & specialty capability sites* [each may be Combined or Service Aligned]

*Receiver sites: Redstone, Eglin, China Lake*

*W&A Donor sites & Platform Integration Donor sites: see map next slide*

*Specialty Capability Sites: e.g., guns/ammo (Picatinny), directed energy (Kirtland), underwater/surface specialties such as Newport, Point Mugu/Port Hueneme, Panama City, Dahlgren, Indian Head (receivers & donors)*

### Drivers/Assumptions

- Transformational Option:
  - #32 Evaluate Joint Centers for ... technologies use by more than one Military Department ...
  - #33 ...consolidate within each Service...

- Other:
  - Combined centers aligned for functional and technical efficiency & synergy
  - System of systems strategy fundamental to Network Centric Warfare

### Justification/Impact

- Combined Centers responsible for platform integration
- Favorable Service experience with integration by the weapons community (e.g., in-service platforms)
- Reduces cycle times by integrating R, D&A, and T&E

### Potential Conflicts

- Influence of E&T JCSG Open Air Range on the T&E function
- Conflicts with service business models & organizational structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Capacity Analysis / Data Verification</th>
<th>JCSG Recommended</th>
<th>De-conflicted w/JCSGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COBRA</td>
<td>Military Value Analysis / Data Verification</td>
<td>Criteria 6-8 Analysis</td>
<td>De-conflicted w/Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

• Cooperation
  – Army is sharing information and cooperating with JCSG procedures.
    • Army JCSG representatives have MVI, MVP and Army scenario interests.
  – Army acknowledges JCSG prerogatives to work functional issues.
    • Handoff of Army ideas to JCSGs for scenario development is generally smooth.

• Integration
  – DoD process is evolving
  – Army stands ready to identify conflicts to resolve and opportunities to enhance Joint/Army scenarios.
Department of the Navy
Strategy/Initial Scenarios

Infrastructure Steering Group Meeting
08 October 2004
DON BRAC Approach

BRAC 2005 Organization

- **SECDEF**
  - Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC)

- **SECNAV**
  - ACMC, VCNO & SA for BRAC Co-Chairs
  - Infrastructure Evaluation Group (DON IEG)

- Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG)
  - Chaired by USD (AT&L)

- Joint Cross Service Groups (JCSGs)
  - Supply & Storage
    - Chaired by DLA
  - Technical
    - Chaired by OSD
  - Education & Training
    - Chaired by OSD
  - Headquarters & Support
    - Chaired by USA
  - Medical
    - Chaired by USAF
  - Intelligence
    - Chaired by OSD
  - Industrial
    - Chaired by OSD

- **DON**
  - Analysis Group (DAG)
  - Functional Advisory Board (FAB)
  - Infrastructure Analysis Team (IAT)

**Decision-making body**
- Develop DON recommendations for approval by SECNAV, CNO & CMC
- Ensure operational factors considered in any recommendations that affect DON installations

**Decision-making body**
- Analyze and provide proposed recommendations for DON unique functions

**Ensure DON leadership is thoroughly briefed and prepared on JCSG matters**
- Report directly to IEG and coordinates with DAG and IAT
- Coordinate DON position on JCSG issues with IEG
- Articulate DON position on JCSG issues to JCSGs

**Surface/Subsurface**
- Aviation
- Ground
- Reserve Centers
- Recruiting Management
- Regional Support
- Recruit Training
- Officer Accessions
- Unique PME
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Department of the Navy
Infrastructure Analysis Team

Overarching Strategy

• Continue to rationalize infrastructure capabilities to eliminate unnecessary excess
• Balance effectiveness of fleet concentration with AT/FP desire for dispersion/redundancy
• Leverage opportunities for total force integration and joint basing
• Accommodate changing operational concepts
• Facilitate evolution of force structure and infrastructure organizational alignment
Scenario Development

PHASE ONE
- Capacity Analysis
- Military Value Analysis
- Optimization parameters
- Scenarios
  **Goal:** Technically feasible alternatives based on data analysis

**DAG Outbrief:** IEG Concurrence

PHASE TWO
- Capacity data – refined look
- Mil Val data – refined look
- Principles, objectives, considerations, transformational options - active incorporation
- Business rules/outcomes
- Refined/additional scenarios (revisit Phase One scenarios)
- Alignment assessment
  **Goal:** More mature alternatives based on refined data and objectives

**DAG Outbrief:** IEG Approval
- DAG Review of Scenario Description
- Post To OSD Tracking Tool

PHASE THREE
- Capacity Data – combined look with JCSG’s
- MilVal data- combined look with JCSG’s
- Principles, objectives, considerations, transformational options-combined look with JCSG’s
- JCSG analysis/linkages
- Consolidated scenarios (revisit Phase Two scenarios)
- Alignment assessment
  **Goal:** Scenarios that synthesize DON & JCSG data analysis & objectives

**DAG Outbrief:** IEG Approval of Amended/Consolidated Scenarios

Draft Deliberative Document - For Discussion Purposes Only - Do Not Release Under FOIA
**Scenario Divergence**

**Excess Capacity Reduction**
- 0: Significant capacity reduction
- 1: Some capacity reduction
- 2: Little or no capacity reduction

**Principles, Objectives and Considerations Alignment**
- 0: Operationally aligned
- 1: Aligned but independent of operational considerations
- 2: Minimal alignment
- 3: No apparent alignment

**Transformational Options**
- 0: Resulting from a Transformational Option
- 1: Not resulting from a Transformational Option

**Function/Scenario Alignment**
- 0: Aligned with other functions/scenarios
- 1: Not aligned with or independent of other functions/scenarios
- 2: Conflicts with other functions/scenarios

**Expansion Capability/Flexibility**
- 0: Significant ability to increase footprint
- 1: Limited ability to increase footprint
- 2: No ability to increase footprint

---

**Alignment Matrix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>0-2</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>7-8</th>
<th>9-10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Green</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Yellow</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Military Value (Losing Activity)**
### Scenario

- Close NAVSTA Pascagoula
  - Relocate Ships (2 FFGs) to NAVSTA Norfolk or NAVSTA Mayport
  - Consolidate Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity with SIMA Norfolk or SIMA Mayport

### Drivers/Assumptions

- **Principle:** Deploy and Employ
- **DON Objective:** Maximize use of capacity in fleet concentration areas while maintaining fleet dispersal and viable AT/FP capability

### Justification/Impact

- Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation
- NAS Key West and Pensacola allow for presence in Gulf Coast
- Mayport better supports ships’ mission in support of JIATF South operations

### Potential Conflicts

- Impact with loss of support of Pre-Comm units at Ingalls
- With NAVSTA Ingleside scenario, no homeported operational Surface presence in Gulf Coast
- Coast Guard tenant
- Requires Industrial JCSG coordination (SIMA)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Close NAVSTA Ingleside</td>
<td>• Principle: Deploy and Employ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Relocate MHC/MCM forces to NAVSTA San Diego and NAVPHIBASE Little Creek (50% split)</td>
<td>• DON Objective: Maximize use of capacity in fleet concentration areas while maintaining fleet dispersal and viable AT/FP capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Relocate MINEWARTRACEN (MWTC) to San Diego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Consolidate SIMA with SIMA San Diego and SIMA Norfolk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation</td>
<td>• With NAVSTA Pascagoula scenario, no homeported operational Surface presence in Gulf Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Realigns MINEWAR (MIW) forces to Fleet concentration areas for protection (Homeland Security)</td>
<td>• Single site MWTC will not avail all MIW sailors to local training opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enhances shift to organic MIW by realignment to Fleet concentration areas</td>
<td>• Disposition of COMINEWARCOM and HM-15 (currently at NAS Corpus Christi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coast Guard tenant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Requires E&amp;T (MWTC) and Industrial (SIMA) JCSG coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification □ JCSG Recommended □ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
☐ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification □ Criteria 6-8 Analysis □ De-conflicted w/Services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Close NAVSTA Norfolk SSN berthing function  
  – Relocate SSNs to SUBASE New London | • **Principles**: Recruit and Train, Deploy and Employ.  
• **DON Objectives**: Optimize access to critical training facilities and align DON infrastructure to efficiently and effectively support Fleet Response Plan and Seabasing concepts |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Saves $$ by consolidating submarine support function  
• Sufficient capacity for 11 additional SSNs in New London  
• Synergy of large SSN force collocated with NAVSUBSCOL and submarine maintenance capability | • Single site East Coast SSN forces |

- ✓ Strategy  ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification  
- ☐ COBRA  ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification  
- ☐ JCSG Recommended  ☐ De-conflicted w/JCSGs  
- ☐ Criteria 6-8 Analysis  ☐ De-conflicted w/Services
**Department of the Navy**  
**Infrastructure Analysis Team**

# Close NAVSTA Everett  
*(IAT-0005)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **• Close NAVSTA Everett**  
  – Relocate forces to NAVSTA Bremerton (CVN, T-AE) and NAVSTA San Diego (DDG, FFG)  
  – Consolidate Intermediate Maintenance Facility with IMFAC Bremerton and SIMA San Diego  
  – Consolidate Naval Reserve Center at NRC Subase Bangor | **• Principle:** Deploy and Employ  
**• DON Objective:** Maximize use of capacity in fleet concentration areas while maintaining fleet dispersal and viable AT/FP capability |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **• Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation**  
**• NAVSTA Bremerton has capacity to berth additional CVN** | **• Loss of deep water nuclear port**  
**• NAVSTA Bremerton ability to homeport additional CVN (support infrastructure)**  
**• Coast Guard tenant**  
**• Requires Industrial JCSG coordination (IMFAC/SIMA)** |

- Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- JCSG Recommended ✓ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- Criteria 6-8 Analysis ✓ De-conflicted w/Services
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**Department of the Navy**  
**Infrastructure Analysis Team**

**Close SUBASE San Diego**  
(IAT-0006/6A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Drivers/Assumptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - **Close SUBASE San Diego**  
  - Relocate SSNs to NAVSTA Pearl Harbor or NAVSTA San Diego  
  - Consolidate IMFAC Pt. Loma at IMFAC Pearl Harbor or SIMA San Diego | - **Principles:** Deploy and Employ.  
- **DON Objectives:** Maximize use of capacity in fleet concentration areas while maintaining fleet dispersal and viable AT/FP capability |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation</td>
<td>- No submarine support capability at NAVSTA San Diego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Relocation of SSNs to Hawaii may affect capacity for transient ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Requires Industrial JCSG coordination (IMFAC/SIMA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification  
☐ COBRA ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification  
☐ JCSG Recommended ☐ De-conflicted w/JCSGs  
☐ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ☐ De-conflicted w/Services  
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### Scenario

- Close CBC Gulfport, MS
  - Relocate 4 NMCBs, 22nd NCR, 20th SRG, Naval Construction Training Center (NCTC) and associated equipment/material to MCB Camp Lejeune, NC
  - Relocate METOC Prof Dev Ctr to Stennis Space Center, MS
  - Consolidate NMC Reserve Center with another in area

### Drivers/Assumptions

- **Principle:** Deploy and Employ
- **DON Objective:** Maximize use of capacity in fleet concentration areas while maintaining fleet dispersal and viable AT/FP capability

### Justification/Impact

- Reduces Excess Capacity. Saves $$ by closing entire installation
- Collocates NMCB function with supported operational forces and maintains East/West coast distribution
- Increase training efficiencies

### Potential Conflicts

- Additional construction required
- Competing for space on Camp Lejeune with USMC force structure reshaping and potential JCSG scenarios
- Requires coordination with E&T JCSG (NCTC, METOC Center)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✓ Strategy</th>
<th>✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification</th>
<th>JCSG Recommended</th>
<th>De-conflicted w/JCSGs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>❑ COBRA</td>
<td>✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification</td>
<td>Criteria 6-8 Analysis</td>
<td>De-conflicted w/Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario</td>
<td>Drivers/Assumptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close four Naval Recruiting Districts</td>
<td>• Principles: Organize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Indianapolis</td>
<td>• Transformational Options:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Omaha</td>
<td>Minimizes leased space and consolidates HQs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Buffalo</td>
<td>CNRC realigns subordinate recruiting stations under proximate NRDs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Montgomery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification/Impact</th>
<th>Potential Conflicts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduces excess capacity</td>
<td>• Distance may increase between managers and stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Eliminates leased space cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conforms with existing CNRC transformation plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ✓ Strategy
- ✓ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- ☐ COBRA
- ✓ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification
- ☐ JCSG Recommended
- ☐ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ☐ Criteria 6-8 Analysis
- ☐ De-conflicted w/Services
# Scenario

- **Close 15 Naval Reserve Centers**
  - Cedar Rapids, IA
  - Asheville, NC
  - Evansville, IN
  - Adelphi, MD
  - Tuscaloosa, AL
  - Duluth, MN
  - Pocatello, ID
  - Lexington, KY
  - Cape Girardeau, MO
  - Lincoln, NE
  - LaCrosse, WI
  - Marquette, MI
  - Horseheads, NY
  - Sioux City, IA
  - Central Point, OR

- **Close 3 Naval Marine Corps Reserve Centers**
  - Moundsville, WV
  - Reading, PA
  - Peoria, IL

# Drivers/Assumptions

- **Principle:** Organize
- **Transformational Options:** Collocate/consolidate across military departments
- **DON Objectives:** Minimize leased space; maximize use of existing capacity
- **Consideration:** Reserve should be located to leverage pooled equipment & training facilities

# Justification/Impact

- Reduces total excess capacity.
- Leverages opportunities for joint basing and training.
- Conforms with NAVRESFOR 50 State Review Study.

# Potential Conflicts

- Retention concerns for reservists with longer travel distances.

---

- ✅ Strategy  ✅ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification
- ❋ COBRA  ✅ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification

- ❋ JCSG Recommended  ❋ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
- ❋ Criteria 6-8 Analysis  ❋ De-conflicted w/Services
Next Steps

- Continue scenario development
- Use joint data to identify additional opportunities
- Coordinate scenarios with JCSGs to align with operational movements
- Develop consolidated data calls
Air Force MilVal Approach Briefing to ISG

8 Oct 04
Overview

- Strategy
- Analysis Process
- Air Force Proposals
- AF to JCSG Proposals
Strategies
Principle-Driven

1. Maintain squadrons within operationally efficient proximity to DoD-controlled airspace, ranges, MOAs, and low-level routes
2. Optimize the size -- # of aircraft / crew ratios -- of our squadrons
3. Better meet needs of the Air Force by maintaining/placing ARC units in locations that best meet the demographic and mission requirements unique to the ARC
4. Mobility basing that optimizes proximity to mission
5. Ensure long-range strike bases provide flexible strategic response and strategic force protection
6. Retain enough capacity to bed down worldwide AF forces
7. Ensure joint basing realignment actions (when compared to the status quo) increase the military value of a function, or decrease the cost for the same military value of that function

Identify “Best of Breed” Bases
Judge Remaining Bases for Overall Military Utility
Principles

Some are Imperative

1. Ensure unimpeded access to polar and equatorial earth orbits
2. Preserve land-based strategic deterrent infrastructure as outlined by the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START)
3. Ensure continuity of operations by maintaining airfield capabilities within the NCR to support the POTUS, Special Airlift Missions, and foreign dignitary visits
4. Provide air sovereignty basing to meet the site protection and response time criteria stipulated by NORTHCOM and PACOM
5. Support global response by U.S. forces by keeping sufficient sovereign U.S. mobility bases along deployment routes to potential crisis areas

Must be part of any solution set
Mission Compatibility Indices
To identify ‘best of breed’

**Fighter**
1. Whiskey AFB
2. Delta AFB
3. Mike AFB

**Bomber**
1. Tiger AFB
2. Rhino AFB
3. Echo AFB

**UAV/UCAV**
1. Victor AFB
2. Lion AFB
3. Mouse AFB

**SOF/CSAR**
1. Tango AFB
2. Sierra AFB
3. Charlie AFB

**C2ISR**
1. Foxtrot AFB
2. X-Ray AFB
3. Romeo AFB

**Tanker**
1. Hotel AFB
2. India AFB
3. Otis AFB

**Airlift**
1. Juliet AFB
2. Mike AFB
3. Oscar AFB

**Space Ops**
1. Lima AFB
2. Papa AFB
3. Quebec AFB

**ARC**
1. AFB
2. AFB
3. AFB

**MCIs measure all bases for all missions**
Analysis Process
Installation Analysis Phase

Step 1
154 Bases

Step 2a
Capacity Analysis

Step 2b
Rate installations for Mil Value (Crit 1 – 4) By MCI

Step 2c
Imperatives

MAJCOM
End State: Determine Theoretical Capacity (assigned MDS)

IEB
End State: MCI Results

BCEG
End State: Identify Mission Essential Bases

Overlay Force Structure
End State: Start Point for deliberation

AF Imperatives – Bases
• Base A
• Base B
• Base C
• Base D
• Base E
• Base F
• Base G
Overview

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Scenarios</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF to JCSG Proposed Scenarios</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered Scenarios</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rejected Scenarios</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Short Title

### Proposals based on AF Principles or Imperatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Space</td>
<td>Determine those specific installations that must be retained to ensure access to space launch through all inclinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POTUS Support</td>
<td>Determine AF installation(s) best suited to support POTUS, SAM, foreign dignitary visits, and Continuity of Operations capabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeland Defense</td>
<td>Determine airfields and installations sufficient to support air sovereignty/air defense mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legacy Fleet Consolidation</td>
<td>Consider realigning / consolidating current force structure at as few locations as practicable (B-52 / B-1 / A-10 / F-16 / F-15)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Proposals based on MCIs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fighters</td>
<td>Base fighters at the optimum number of installations based on MCI rating and theoretical capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombers</td>
<td>Base bombers at the optimum number of installations based on MCI rating and theoretical capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2ISR</td>
<td>Base C2ISR assets at the optimum number of installations based on MCI rating and theoretical capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airlift</td>
<td>Base airlifters at the optimum number of installations based on MCI rating and theoretical capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space Ops</td>
<td>Base space ops assets at the optimum number of installations based on MCI rating and theoretical capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### AF Proposals

**Approved**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposals based on MCIs</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOF / CSAR</td>
<td>Base SOF/CSAR at the optimum number of installations based on MCI rating and theoretical capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tankers</td>
<td>Base tankers at the optimum number of installations based on MCI rating and theoretical capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAV / UCAV</td>
<td>Base UAV / UCAV assets at the optimum number of installations based on MCI rating and theoretical capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic Co-Location</td>
<td>Analyze consolidating Total Force presence among multiple installations when locations are within ? proximity of each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Title</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-35 Initial Training Location</td>
<td>Determine an F-35 initial training location (Ed &amp; Trng JCSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Helicopter Training</td>
<td>Consolidate DoD basic helicopter training (Ed &amp; Trng JCSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Armament RD&amp;A</td>
<td>Consolidation of air armament RD&amp;A in a joint center of excellence (Tech JCSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Warfare RDAT&amp;E, Joint Center of Excellence</td>
<td>Consolidation of EW RDAT&amp;E in a joint center of excellence (Ed &amp; Trng, and Tech JCSGs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2 RDAT&amp;E, Joint Center of Excellence</td>
<td>Create a Consolidated Joint C2 RDAT&amp;E Management HQ with Joint C2 RDAT&amp;E Centers for Land, Maritime and Air/Space reporting to it (Tech JCSG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Proposals

**AF to JCSGs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short Title</th>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Force Depot Maintenance Commodity Realignment</strong></td>
<td>Consolidate commodity workloads at single ALC IAW established Technology Repair Centers (TRCs): Avionics; Instruments; Other commodities (I JCSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air Force Consolidated ICP</strong></td>
<td>Consolidate AF ICP operations under single point C2. Single ICP orchestrates activities at 3 commodity centers (S&amp;S JCSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TF-34 Centralized Intermediate Repair</strong></td>
<td>Regionalize 12 total AD, ANG, and AFRC TF-34 ILM workcenters currently at individual A-10 bases into Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities (CIRFs) (I JCSG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALQ-131 Centralized Intermediate Repair</strong></td>
<td>Regionalize 12 total AD, ANG, and AFRC ALQ-131 ILM workcenters currently at individual fighter bases into Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities (CIRFs) (I JCSG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Analysis Process**

**Steps**

1. **Step 1**
   - 154 Bases

2. **Step 2a**
   - Capacity Analysis
   - End State: MAJCOM
     - Determine Theoretical Capacity (assigned MDS)

3. **Step 2b**
   - Rate installations for Mil Value (Crit 1 – 4) By MCI
   - End State: IEB
     - MCI Results

4. **Step 2c**
   - Imperatives
   - End State: BCEG
     - Identify Mission Essential Bases

5. **Step 3**
   - BCEG
     - Overlay Force Structure
     - End State: Start Point for deliberation
     - Apply TOs, Considerations, Principles, Imperatives
     - End State: Proposals

6. **Step 4**
   - BCEG
     - Refine Proposals
     - JCSGs
     - SVCs
     - Other Considerations (6-8)
     - End State: Scenarios

7. **Step 5**
   - BCEG
     - Analyze Scenario
     - JCSGs
     - COBRA
     - Formal Interaction
     - (JCSG/AIR SRLDRS/Mil Deps)
     - End State: Candidate Recommendation

**Proposal's for JCSG consideration flow through BCEG to the AF Principal on the affected JCSG**

**Timeline:**
- August
- September
- October
- November
- December

**UNCLAS Integrity - Service - Excellence**
Candidate Recommendation: Fully describe the candidate closure or realignment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Military Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Explain the reasons for the candidate recommendation (i.e., force structure reductions; mission consolidation, collocation, or elimination; excess capacity; jointness; etc)</td>
<td>✓ Overall effect on military value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Relative military value against its peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Military judgment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Payback</th>
<th>Impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Criterion 5 (COBRA) results</td>
<td>✓ Criterion 6-8 (Economic, Community and Environmental)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

✓ Strategy   ☐ Capacity Analysis / Data Verification   ☐ JCSG/MilDep Recommended   ☐ De-conflicted w/JCSGs
☐ COBRA       ☐ Military Value Analysis / Data Verification ☐ Criteria 6-8 Analysis ☐ De-conflicted w/MilDeps