



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

DCN: 10184

SAIE-IA

14 April 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR Mr. Peter Potochney, Director, BRAC Office, OUSD (AT&L)

SUBJECT: Intelligence 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.
2. The Army opposes weighting each of the five functions. Each function should be evaluated initially independent of the other four functions. This is consistent with the efforts of the other JCSGs.
3. The number of metrics for each function seems sufficient to the analytical task; however, attribute and metric weights should be adjusted once the weights for each function are dropped. Additionally, if Selection Criteria 1-4 are weighted 40, 20, 10, 30, respectively, we do not understand the weighting scheme presented in Appendix A. For example, in "Acquisition", the selection criteria weights (4.5, 2.4, .25, and 4.5) do not reflect the weights of 40, 20, 10, 30.
4. The crime rate and unemployment rate metrics under the Sustainability Function uses one minus the crime/unemployment rate to determine an installation's score, this process will place all installations within a very tight band, probably between .9 and 1.0. This approach will not provide enough variability in the metric to distinguish between locations and significantly reduces the metric's value. Recommend both of these metrics be treated as follows: the installation with the lowest rate gets the maximum points, the highest rate gets the minimum points, and the other installations are evaluated with a linear function between the min/max values.
5. We support the potential need to modify metrics and weights after actual data is received. Actual data may not give the variability to distinguish between facilities based metrics, current weighting and the scoring plan. Modifications to the weights and metrics may be required to differentiate between facilities.
6. Questions are appropriately documented and easy to trace to the scoring plan. The questions appear to be easily understood and answered. The Data Call #1 questions needed for military value are annotated to avoid duplicate questions to the field.

SAIE-IA

SUBJECT: Intelligence JCSG Military Value Analysis Report and ISG Briefing

7. TABS looks forward to continuing to work with the Intelligence JCSG on MV and other efforts.



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

CF:

VCSA

ASA (I&E)

Mr. Terry Ford, Army Intelligence member to JCSG