



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY
INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT
110 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0110

dcn: 10178

SAIE-IA

25 February 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR Mr. Peter Potochney, Director, OSD BRAC Office, OUSD (ATL)

SUBJECT: Technical JCSG Military Value Analysis Report and ISG Briefing

1. I appreciate the opportunity to review the draft Military Value (MV) Analysis Report. In general, we found the report sufficiently detailed to understand the MV approach; the approach is generally sound and adequate to the task.
2. The Vice Chief of Staff, Army expressed concern at the ISG about the coordination of effort on ranges. The Army continues to support Mr. Wynne's decision to give the E&T JCSG the lead on the analysis of ranges. We request that the E&T and Technical JCSGs coordinate efforts in the analysis of ranges, especially with regard to determining military value. The Army will require that a coordinated approach be reflected in the final MV Analysis Reports to secure our concurrence.
3. Additionally, to offer our concurrence, we will need to review the final and complete list of questions and data elements (Appendix C) that will be included by the TJCSG in Data Call #2. It would be particularly helpful to identify what portion of the data elements required for the MV Analysis were already acquired in Data Call #1.
4. The complexity of some questions and the resulting data requirements may be more than installations can accurately support. We provide examples in the attachment, and recommend that the TJCSG review their MV approach with this in mind.
5. TABS looks forward to continuing to work with the TJCSG on MV and other efforts.

Encl
as


Craig E. College
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Infrastructure Analysis)

CF:
VCSA
ASA (I&E)
Dr. John Foulkes, Army Rep, Technical JCSG

Specific Comments

1. It remains unclear to us if the max score for every attribute and metric is 1. That appears to be the case, and that is an important characteristic so that the proposed weighting scheme works as envisioned by the TJCSG.

2. Also key to getting results that discriminate among facilities is the variability of your metrics and attributes. Attributes that vary between .9 and 1 or .95 and 1 are not nearly as valuable for discriminating as those that vary between .5 and 1 or 0 and 1. ORSA theory strongly suggests reducing the weights or completely eliminating those characteristics with little variability. Particularly in the Operational Impact area, we question the degree of variability the data may exhibit. Army recommends that:

- TJCSG review these and other metrics now and modify weights as appropriate
- TJCSG reserve the opportunity to modify weights when the actual data come in

3. Does a facility answer these questions for each of the 12 grouped areas or just for its major area of activity or for those areas it believes its supports? The report is unclear on this issue; our multi-functional activities will need to know to answer the question as intended.

4. The S(ppa) metric's current denominator is the installation's population. TABS suggests using the professional population instead, which would more accurately capture the intent of the metric

5. Pending the actual questions to be used in Data Call #2, several concepts in the report are insufficiently clear to engender data that will be of use to TJCSG. For example:

p. 21 Uniqueness. Can we define “a validated DoD unique technical capability?” Nearly all our capabilities are unique in some aspect. What is unique? How variable are these data apt to be? Can a local activity director “game” his answer?

p. 21 Bounding Parameters. We don't see a finite list, standardized unit of measure, or commensurate method to compare the data from this question. The text implies TJCSG will sum all BPs without regard to number or unit of measure. One particularly tight BP at one installation may be much worse than 10 relatively non-binding BP's at another. The concept requires much additional work for us to support.

p.25 Future War fighting Capability. What weights will be applied to the DTAP Area and Sub-Areas? How were these derived? Why is total funding weighted so low and FTEs so high? In-house FTEs seems to be much less important than the throughput of the facility – whether completed in-house or contracted.

p.31 Proximity. The CUST element is not well-defined. What level or type of organizations constitute customers or users? Do respondents need to know the results of Data Call #1 to assess OF? Do respondents know TJCSG's assignment of S&T, D&A, or T&E to other sites?

p.32. Dual-Use Capacity. Define use and technical infrastructure. If a university holds a conference at one of our facilities and trains at the lab or a range, does that count as “use of technical infrastructure?”