



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY  
 OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY  
 (INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT)  
 1000 NAVY PENTAGON  
 WASHINGTON, D.C. 20350-1000

2 March 2004

## MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

Subj: DON comments on the Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report

We have conducted a detailed review of the draft Education and Training (E&T) Joint Cross-Service Group (JCSG) Military Value Report, and provide the following recommendations to make the report a more complete product.

Major Concerns:

1. The deliberative process has resulted in a lack of understanding and resolution on the graduate level flight training issue for the Flight Training subfunction.

2. The Ranges subgroup needs to develop an integrated methodology for Training and Test and Evaluation Ranges. The presentation of military value scoring plans for the two functions should allow for a more easily understood side-by-side comparison. For example, the Training Ranges military value scoring plan has 14 attributes while the Test and Evaluation Ranges military value scoring plan only identified 5 attributes. Using the current presentation, it is not clear how the attributes relate to each other and is therefore difficult to understand appropriate differences in the weighting plans. Additionally, cost of services can be a significant factor in choosing a range for training, and it is not clear if that should be addressed differently in the military value scoring plan.

3. Consistency of analysis supports the integrity of the BRAC process. We anticipate the Services and the E&T JCSG will use evaluations of ranges in their processes, perhaps from different points of view. The issue of how we will avoid the perception of competing analysis and promote complementary analysis between the JCSGs and the Services needs to be actively discussed.

Specific Recommendations:

1. The E&T JCSG report includes an imperative to retain unique/one-of-a-kind assets or capabilities. As it stands, the imperative implies a prohibition on closing one-of-a-kind facilities, regardless of the requirements. We recommend that this imperative be recast to show the intent of the imperative is to preserve capabilities or access to capabilities vice preserving facilities. Stated thus, this imperative may also be applicable to other JCSGs.

2. There are irregularities in the definitions of subfunctions in the JCSG. For example, USAF Air Battle Managers (ABMs) are included in the Flight Training undergraduate subfunctions even though they do not fly in training aircraft at the undergraduate level. At the graduate level, ABMs are integrated with the crew training for AWACs and JSTARS, Air Force unique platforms. Therefore, this function is unique to the Air Force and does not fit into the same categories of training as the other subfunctions in Flight Training. In Specialized Skills subgroup, there are different definitions of Functional Training between the Air Force and Navy, resulting in an imbalance of the number and

types of training being considered in the JCSG. We recommend that the JCSG review the training functions in the Flight Training and Specialized Skills subgroups for consistency.

3. The PDE subgroup places military value on a school's "proximity to DC." This metric appears to run counter to the Headquarters and Support JCSG's intent to move activities away from the National Capitol Region. We recommend that the JCSG discuss the metric weight of "proximity with DC" with the Headquarters and Support JCSG, and, if necessary, seek guidance from the ISG.

4. The SST and PDE subgroups have utilized numerous metrics to measure quality of life. The number of metrics is disproportionately large compared to the weight assigned to quality of life and will dilute the value of the questions. For example, SST has 19 questions for QoL for a maximum of 12.96 points. In PDE, the FTE subfunction has 19 questions for a total of 10 points. We recommend that SST and PDE review the Quality of Life questions to ensure they are appropriately proportionate to attribute weight.

My office stands ready to further clarify these issues and assist in implementation of the recommendations as necessary.



Anne Rathmell Davis  
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy  
Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis