

DCN: 2163

17 February 2005

Education and Training JCSG Briefing Notes

Date: Monday, February 14, 2005

Time: 10:30-12:00

Place: 2D201

JCSG Chairman: Mr. Charles S. Abell, PDUSD(P&R)

JCSG Executive Secretary: Mr. Robert Howlett

JCSG Key Attendees:

- **Mr. Charles S. Abell**, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel & Readiness)
- **Col James Briggs, USAF**, POC, Specialized Skills Training Subgroup
- **BG Maffey**, Professional Development Education Subgroup
- **Mr. Tom Macia, USA**, POC, Ranges Subgroup
- **CAPT Gene Summerlin, USN**, POC, Flight Training Subgroup
- **Nancy Weaver**, E&T JCSG

Red Team Attendees:

- Honorable H.T. Johnson
- Honorable Robin Pirie
- General Leon Salomon
- Mr. John Turnquist

Subject: Candidate Recommendation Briefing by Education and Training JCSG to BRAC Red Team

Presenter: Nancy Weaver

Items of Import:

- Analytical process is really parallel rather than linear and steps are overlapping.
- Final military value report is pending.
- Final capacity report is pending.
- The JCSG received no documented surge capability requirements.
- Candidate recommendations are based on 5 guiding principles, strategy did not consider closing ranges; JCSG viewed their job as to make ranges better, not close them, and thus they did not look for excess ranges.
- Optimization model gave alternatives and/or options, not the optimal solution

Questions that arose:

- Where is your strategy? *Later in brief.* (Salomon)
- Were there common definitions for professional development statistics? Such as student-to-teacher ratios? And were these included in military value? *Yes* (Salomon) How did you deal with ITRO? (Salomon)
- Have you found corrupt data? *Yes* (Johnson) How do you know that someone is not “cooking the books”? *JCSG members were given latitude for judgment, and could ask for clarification when necessary.* (Salomon)

- Did the services concur with surge capability military judgments on percentage? *There was no formal doctrine and did not go back to services for concurrence.* (Salomon)
- Did guiding principles have weights or priority? *No.* (Salomon)
- Did any part of strategy link to reducing excess capacity? *Overall BRAC goals were taken as given, which guided the development of guiding principles, which in turn drove sub-strategies for E&T sub-groups.* (Pirie)
- How do you take care of ranges that should not exist in first place? *We only looked at larger ranges, those big enough to do joint training, and left it up to services to decide which installations to close. We only looked at how to better use what we have- these are the “one of a kind” CRs.* (Johnson)
- If you are closing the NPS or AFIT, what happens to other functions? *Move other functions out via other recommendations from services.* (Johnson)
- On slide 32, CR – 0039, why is payback so long? Is this recommendation just modernizing a facility? What about Fort Eustis – isn’t there diver training there? What would be left at Truman Annex? *We looked at it and found that Panama City did not have same facilities as Truman Annex, so moving was beneficial. What’s left is a Navy/Intel JCSG problem.* (Johnson and Salomon)

Informal observations provided at briefing:

- Strategy
 - Slide and discussion need to be moved to beginning of presentation
 - Needs to be obvious link between overall BRAC 2005 goals and strategy/guiding principles
 - The more pervasive your strategy is, the better – try to tie strategy/guiding principles to justifications as much as possible. This will strengthen your recommendations and give them consistency.
 - Double check justification on following CRs: 0003, 0022, 0029, 0030
- Military Value:
 - Process to develop weights needs to be more explicit and better justified
 - Be careful not to mix comparisons of military values of installations and functions
 - Support for military judgment needs to be strong when moving functions to installation that has lower military value.
- Universe: Be careful how you say what you did and did not consider. You must, by law, consider all ranges equally. Look at them all, and then have a reason - linked to strategy - as to why the smaller ranges were not considered.
- Policy:
 - Some CRs are resulting in job loss of less than 300 which means they can be done outside of BRAC, you need to have some supporting argument as to why to include them in BRAC.
 - Surge numbers need to be supported and verified – everyone needs to know where they came from and acknowledge them.
- Justifications are reasons that should be tied to strategy
- Have an example of a CR was deleted and why.
- For privatization recommendations you should remove the military value comparison form the discussion as it is confusing.

Additional observations to consider:

- E&T – 0003: Justification is not consistent with strategy.
- E&T – 0029: Statement of “Engineering Branch Courses” is not a justification, but rather a statement of fact.
- E&T – 0039: One time costs seem to be high for this CR. Need to explain benefits better to make high costs understandable.