



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, G-8
700 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0700
HSA-JCSG-GC-IM-005

DCN:6350

Deleted: 1

HSA JCSG

Date 21 Sep 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Assumptions Made for 21 Sep 2004 Run of Installation Management (IM) Military Value Model

Deleted: ning

1. This memorandum addresses the methodology/assumptions made by the IM Team for the 21 Sep 2004 running of the IM Military Value Model. For the 21 Sep run, 43 (3.5%) of the 1200 data elements involved in running the model were not available. Of the data available, 95.5% was certified. The IM Team was of the opinion that not all the "certified" data was correct and adjusted some data based on military judgment and experience. These changes are for a one time run and the correct data is being obtained by the services for future runs. Also, the IM Team is of the opinion that it will be very difficult breaking out specific data for some Navy and Army installations because of business models used by Chief Naval Infrastructure (CNI) and the Installation Management Agency (IMA). CNI manages regionally by activities and IMA, which also manages by regions, has consolidated the management of some installations, Ft Story and Ft Eustis being an example. Based on these findings, the IM Team used military judgment for the following data applications:

a. For installations responding to mobilization requirements with a "N/A," a value of zero was given. The exception to this rule was Air Force bases with an active runway. For those bases, a value of one was given. This decision was coordinated with the Mobilization Team.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5"

b. For installations responding to the SPIRNET availability with a "N/A," a value of zero was given. This decision was coordinated with Col William Higgins, author of the question.

c. The data for Ft Myer/Ft McNair, Ft Shafter/Tripler, COMNAVDIST Washington and NAVSTA Pearl Harbor/NAVSHPYD Pearl Harbor was aggregated. These activities with the exception of Ft. Shafter/Tripler are managed by single organizations and must be considered one installation for military value purposes. For Ft Shafter and Tripler, the responses from the Army concerning these installations were aggregated, and the IM Team felt any attempt at this time to break down the data by installations for these specific installations would result in faulty data/logic.

Deleted: were

Deleted: T

Deleted: Services c

Deliberative Document – For Discussion Purposes Only
Do Not Release Under FOIA



d. For Navy installations/activities in the Hampton Roads area data was distributed on a pro rata share from the Naval Region to the appropriate naval installations. The IM Team felt confident in correctly capturing the IM requirements of given Navy fence lines based on complete supporting data which established the base line for distribution of the staffing data.

Deleted: ,

Deleted: t

Deleted: .

2. The results of this running of the IM Military Value Model were briefed to HSA members on 21 Sep 2004.

Encl

Ryan F. Ferrell, Jr
Installation Management, Team Chief
HSA JCSG