



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

DCN: 10183

2 March 2004

SAIE-IA

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

SUBJECT: Education and Training 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 previously expressed concern at the ISG about the coordination of effort on ranges. Army continues to support Mr. Wynne's decision to give the E&T JCSG the lead on the analysis of ranges. Additionally, VCSA desires a single set of MV attributes be created by the two JCSGs for ranges. We request that the E&T and Technical JCSGs coordinate efforts in the analysis of ranges, especially with regard to determining military value. To concur with the final report, the Army would require that a coordinated approach be reflected in the final MV Analysis Reports.
3. Also, to offer our concurrence, we will need to review the final and complete list of questions and data elements that will be included by the E&T JCSG 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 discussion related to the weights given to each of the OSD criteria by the various E&T JCSG sub-groups raised some interesting points. The Army believes that the weights can vary and that for ranges, criterion 2 can receive a higher weight. We will be interested in seeing the E&T JCSG's proposed response to Mr. Wynne's question concerning the relative weights of criterion 1 and criterion 2 in the Ranges sub-group.
5. Some questions and the resulting data requirements may be more than installations can accurately support. We provide examples and specific comments in the attachment, and recommend they review their MV approach with this in mind.

6. TABS looks forward to continuing to work with the E&T JCSG on MV and other efforts.



CRAIG E. COLLEGE
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army
for Infrastructure Analysis

Encl

CF:
VCSA
ASA (I&E)
MG Buford Blount, Army Rep, Education and Training JCSG
Dr. John Foulkes, Army Rep, Technical JCSG

Specific Comments

REFERENCE: E&T Joint Cross Service Group Military Value Analysis

1. **Normalized Scores** - It remains unclear whether the max score for every attribute and metric is the same number. That is an important characteristic so that the proposed weighting scheme works as envisioned by the E&T JCSG. It appears that most metrics have a max score of 1. We recommend the JCSG verify this characteristic as they finish their work.

2. **Attribute Consistency** - We support the use of different attributes and weights for each function identified by the E&T JCSG sub-groups. However, we do not yet support the use of different metrics for Quality of Life by three of the subgroups. If the JCSG believes Quality of Life is an important attribute, we recommend the JCSG develop a common set of metrics and limit the number of questions asked to measure Quality of Life. We look forward to working this issue with the JCSG in advance of the final report.

3. **Metric and Attribute Variability** - 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. Decision Analysis theory strongly suggests reducing the weights or completely eliminating those characteristics with little variability. Recommend the E&T JCSG review the metrics now and modify weights as appropriate or reserve the opportunity to modify weights when the actual data come in.

4. **Number of Attributes and Metrics** - The four E&T JCSG subgroups may have too many attributes and metrics with too little weight. For example, there are 55 Undergraduate Fixed-wing Flight Training metrics; 21 have weights less than 1.5%, 35 are less than 2%. PME/JPME did much better: 28 metrics and only 9 have less than 1.5 or 2 percent. Specialized Skills Training proposes 53 metrics; 28 are less than 1.5% weights, 37 are less than 2%. Ranges proposes 52 metrics, 15 at less than 1.5% or 2%. While there is some scope for different approaches to weighting metrics and attributes, in general pursuing too many metrics (in the name of completeness) means that many metrics will add little or no discriminatory insight to the MV model. We recommend that at least three sub-groups relook the number of metrics being used. We look forward to working the issue with the JCSG in advance of the final report.

5. **Specific Metric and Question Comments.**

a. **Flight Training – Undergraduate Fixed-Wing**

- (1) Question 2, Environment. This question should be scored so that a facility that receives full credit on Question 1 also receives full credit on Question 2. This is currently not in the scoring matrix.

- (2) Question 4, Quality of Life. Low, medium and high Cost of Living (COL) indices are not well-defined. The splits can be regarded as subjective. Recommend the JCSG score one point for the lowest reported COL index, zero for the highest and linearly interpolate in between.
- (3) Question 5, Quality of Life. We are unaware of a local school quality index that is consistently applied across CONUS. Army is very interested in the source of data for this metric.
- (4) Question 1-4, Ground Training Facilities. Here, and in many other questions, respondents are asked to rate a particular aspect as adequate. There is no definition of adequate. If the mission is being accomplished, on what basis do we expect an installation to self-report inadequate facilities.
- (5) Many of these issues present themselves in the other sub-functions of the Flight Training Sub-group.

b. Specialized Skill Training.

- (1) Cost of Living Index. Same comment applies as in the Flight Training section above.
- (2) Population Density. The high/medium/low issue is raised here, as well. Why is the population density an issue? Why does low score highest? This metric will have to be justified well to withstand scrutiny.
- (3) Number of Military Housing Units. Army recommends the metric be redefined as housing units divided by some measure of military population. Is quantity all that matters? Or, is quantity per user more important?
- (4) COL Index and Local School Index. See comments under Flight Training above.
- (5) C1/C2/C3 Questions. Army assumes that the JCSG will use the DoD ISR ratings to answer these questions since the Navy does not use C-ratings and the Army and Air Force approaches are inconsistent.