Draft Deliberative Document - Not Release under FOIA

HSA JCSG 29 April 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Methodologies For Resolving Data Issues

1. There were many challenges associated with the data supporting the Major Administrative and Headquarters (MAH) Subgroup military value modeling. Despite our best efforts, several data issues were not able to be resolved through routine certification channels. Since the execution of the military value models requires a data point in every cell, we applied analytical and military judgment to attempt to obtain the fairest value possible for missing data. Our intent was to represent the missing data with values that would neither reward nor punish entities for which there was no data. There were also issues remaining with Installation Management at the time of the final military value report. The purpose of this memorandum is to highlight each case where we applied analytical and military judgment.

2. MAH Installations.

a. Questions 1959, 1901, and 319 were used to build several communications and information technology-based metrics. Several Navy installations were not able to provide answers because of proprietary issues with the contractor supporting the installations. In these cases, the Navy LNO provided a memorandum which gave instructions on how to answer the questions. The file name of this memorandum is "Navy REconcilof IT- Comm Questions 1901 1959 319_I.jpeg."

b. Question 1960 for the Army National Guard Readiness Center, the certification memorandum and accompanying spreadsheet identify question 1960 as 1961. This is an error. The responses are clearly for 1960, so we will apply the data as appropriate.

c. For Question11, the Navy provided the same ORG CODE for Camp Smith and Kanehoe, but indicated the two needed to be separated. However, the methodology for separating the data was not obtained. As a result, the single value for the ORG CODE (CG_MCB_HAWAII) for the Facility Condition Code was used for both installations, to ensure fairness.

3. MAH Activities.

a. For the space profile for the National Guard entities, at the time of the final runs of military value, certified data existed for the aggregate National Guard footprint in leased space, but we had no certified data breaking out the allocation of space to the subcomponents—National Guard Bureau (NGB), Army National Guard (ARNG), and Air National Guard (ANG). We did have information for the number of personnel in each subcomponent. In order to run the final military value model, we summed the total

number of personnel and divided it into the total leased square footage to get an estimated average square footage of leased space per person. We then used this average to estimate the breakout of the aggregate leased space based on the number of personnel in the subcomponent. The results of this methodology were 112,902 square feet for the NGB, 34,990 for the ARNG, and 148,358 for the ANG. These estimates were used to run the final military value runs.

b. Question 1912. The intent of this question was to have the leased space manager answer questions that provided a sense of compliance with AT/FP requirements. The questions were initially sent to Washington Headquarters Services (WHS) as leased space manager for leased space within the DC Area. Questions were also sent to entities with leased space outside of the DC Area. After the receiving data back from respondents, there were approximately 40 locations that did not have responses. We resent this list to WHS, to the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) through the Army Liaison Officer (LNO), and directly to the entities that occupied the leased space. Despite our repeated attempts, we still had several locations that we were unable to obtain answers for. Based on responses we determined that the locations are not within the inventory of WHS or ACE; they could be leased by the entities themselves, directly to General Services Administration (GSA), or though other arrangements. Because of this situation, we were unable to obtain responses for these locations. In order to run the military value model, we needed data scores for these locations. To be conservative, we applied analytical judgment, and assessed values of 0.0 for these entities—meaning they did not comply with AT/FP requirements. The locations that this methodology applies to are as follows: 1560 Wilson Boulevard ((A)SAF/AQ – Acquisition); 13501 Ingenuity Drive, APL Co-Lab Building (STRICOM); 3045 Technology Parkway (STRICOM); 22299 Exploration Pk Dr, Ste 300 (DFAS); 1590 Adamson Parkway (US Army Reserve Command (USARC)); 1000 Exploror Blvd (MDA); 106 Wynn Drive (MDA); 1250 Academy Parkloop (MDA); 1555 The Boardwalk, Suite 5 (MDA); 4901 Corporate Drive (MDA); 499 Boeing Blvd (MDA); 620 Discovery Drive (MDA); 631 Discovery Drive (MDA); 650 Discovery Drive (MDA); 655 Discovery Drive, (MDA); 1710 SAIC Drive (MDA); 2100 Washington Blvd (MDA); 2110 Washington Blvd (MDA); 2120 Washington Blvd (MDA); 2611 Jefferson Davis Highway (MDA); 4725B Eisenhower Ave (MDA); 9861 Broken Land Parkway (MDA); and 1010 North Glebe Road (MDA).

In addition, MDA occupies 139,000 GSF of space and reports the building is occupied by 9.5 percent DoD. SPAWAR occupies and additional space of 15,200 GSF of the same building at 2451 Crystal Drive. We do not have any information suggesting that there are any additional DoD tenants, so we will apply a judgment based value of 0.8 on this building, since based on the information we have available, it appears that less than 25 percent of the building is occupied by DoD.

There is also a leased space that belongs to SAF/AA, and it reported 4695 GSF of leased space. However, the entity reported as "N/A" for a building number and street address. In addition, no AT/FP posture was reported for the location. Because the street address and building were not available, we could not obtain AT/FP data from other sources. This activity will be given a value of 0.0 for its AT/FP posture.

c. The activity "Navy Hometown News" was a late addition to the military value scope, and all of the required data was not received through certified sources at the time of the final military value run. The metric values were derived through a combination of input from the OSD CAD, Subject Matter Experts (SME) and military and analytical judgment. The SME input was based on conversations with the Navy LNO, and through information derived from Scenario Data Calls. The judgment-based data was constructed to ensure fairness when comparing this activity to its Army and Navy counterparts. Specifically, responses to 1909 and 1910 were set to having no statutory requirements governing the location, and mission category was category 4, located outside DC Area.

d. For Question 1911, the response from Army in a secondary source (MAH_MV Questions for LNOs.xls) for (A)JAG School and (A)PEO STRICOM was "Not in DC." This response was translated to a "NO" in terms of a metric score for statutory requirement to be in the DC area.

e. Responses from (A)NAVSISA MECHANICSBURG PA and (A)NAVSUPSYSCOM MECHANICSBURG PA, are found in a secondary source data file (1909 1910 update Navy 6 Apr 052.xls). The respondents both answered with a certified response of "N/A." Based on our judgment, we are translating this to a score of "NO" for the statutory requirement metric, based on our judgment.

f. The DIA CAF reported no GSF at (Bolling AFB). The certified response was "The DIA CAF has not yet relocated to the DIAC, but is scheduled to do so by the end of FY05." This response cannot be used to run the military value models. As a result, a judgment value of 1.0 was used. This is because we wanted to be able to run the models, but we did not want to give them any unwarranted credit by using an arbitrary number. Giving them any other number of GSF on an installation would have provided an artificial benefit. The value of one allows us to run the model without artificially benefiting the nonrespondent.

g. **NETC and** NETPDTC did not respond to 1911. The secondary source file "Navy Missing 2 Mar from LTC Hill.xls," does not provide an answer to 1911, but does verify the location of both activities as in Pensacola. As a result, we applied judgment and scored both entities as "outside of the DC Area."

h. There were several OSD locations that were present in older versions of the database that have been removed from subsequent versions. SME input suggests these sites remain valid locations. As a result, the data from the older databases (2 Feb 05) will be used, much like a secondary source. The following locations are affected: 2461 Eisenhower Avenue #8566, 6900 Georgia Avenue, and 1010 North Glebe Road, OSD entities (CTR).

4. Installation Management. The Installation Management subgroup also had two unresolved data issues.

a. Facility Condition Code. For Dobbins Air Reserve Base, the secondary source provided by the USAF (NAS Atlanta_Dobbins_final.xls) provided a response of "N/A," and it stated "This data does not exist for Dobbins because we did not do an installation readiness report at Dobbins." As a result, a judgment-based value of C2 was used. This value is the best available that neither rewards nor penalizes Dobbins for a non-useable response.

b. DISN PoP. The Installation Management Military Value score for COMNAVMARIANAS was locked as of 12 April 2005. On Friday 15 April it was determined that an error in computing the score for COMNAVMARIANAS existed as a result of an incorrect answer to Capacity Data Call question number 326. This question requested a yes or no answer from DISA regarding whether or not a DISN Point of Presence exists on an installation. A yes answer was recorded for COMNAVMARIANAS after email from the questions author and discussion between COL Carla Coulson and Mr. David Bullock (certification authority at DISA) on 11 April determined that this would be the most accurate response. Subsequent conversation between Mr. Bullock and COL Coulson on 15 April 2005 determined that a no answer would stand as the certified response based on strict interpretation of the question and the status of the Navy as it exists today. Subsequent to the determination that the DISN POP response was incorrect, it was determined by the HSA that no correction was warranted since based on lock down of the data base. This determination was based on DISA confirmation that a response provided six months from the present would result in a yes answer.

5. Questions or issues can be addressed to the undersigned by phone at 703.696.9448, ext. 148, or email at Christopher.Hill@wso.whs.mil.

CHRISTOPHER M. HILL
LTC, AR
Operations Research Analyst