

ACQUISITION,
TECHNOLOGY
AND LOGISTICS**THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE**3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010**MAR 11 2004****MEMORANDUM FOR: CHAIRMAN, EDUCATION & TRAINING JOINT CROSS
SERVICE GROUP****SUBJECT: Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG) Comments on the Education & Training
Joint Cross-Service Group Draft Military Value Report**

The ISG has reviewed the draft Education & Training Joint Cross-Service Group (E&T JCSG) Military Value Report, briefed to it on February 24, 2004.

The ISG appreciates the military judgment and dedicated effort that your members, as the experts in their field, put into the report. As you prepare your final report for formal coordination, please consider the following comments, consolidated from those submitted on behalf of ISG members. For your convenience, the original comments are also enclosed. Please note that the general process comments provided by the military departments are for ISG consideration rather than for your direct response. If the judgment of your group is not to incorporate any of the following suggestions, please provide a brief rationale in the memorandum transmitting your final report. Your final report is due to the OSD Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) office on or before March 25, 2004. Additionally, please plan to attend the April 2, 2004, ISG meeting (1030-1230) and be prepared to respond to any questions about your final report.

General Comments

To the extent possible, your final report should be a complete, stand-alone document that contains the reasons for selecting attributes and metrics and assigning weights and scores, supported by official records of deliberation. Similarly, if your analysis relies on questions from the initial data call, the text of those questions should be identified as such in each section of the report.

The report should also reflect the rationale to support all aspects of the scoring plan, including the assignment of attributes, metrics, weights, and scoring. Similarly, the report should clarify how an attribute applies the criteria, how a metric measures an attribute, and how a question will provide the needed input to a metric. While the rationales seem apparent for most of the subgroups, it is not clear for the Ranges subgroup.



Your approach to military value would benefit from a sensitivity analysis using notional data to determine the viability of the weights, scoring, and formulas in the report. A sensitivity analysis should reveal where the JCSG might get skewed and unintended results, giving you the information you need to make modifications now. Please include a discussion of the results of this analysis in your final report.

Similarly, it is unclear whether your scoring plan allows for valuing those attributes you consider important. For example, metrics 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. Review your metric scoring and consider whether it will allow you to discriminate among installations but still capture the factors that are important to defend your analysis.

The February 12, 2004, Federal Register notice providing the draft final selection criteria makes a number of commitments related to how the Department will interpret and apply the final selection criteria. Please review this notice to determine whether you should build such commitments into your military value approach.

The complexity of some questions and the resulting data requirements may be more than installations can accurately support. Please review the questions and resulting data requirements to determine the ability of an installation or facility to answer them within the time available.

Your final report should include a complete set of questions for the second data call that your JCSG will need to support the military value scoring plans. The questions should clearly distinguish between those questions that have already been asked in the first data call and those that will be included in the second data call. Each JCSG must also review the totality of its questions to ensure that redundant questions (questions that will result in the same response) are eliminated. The second data call will provide an opportunity to include questions to support your capacity analysis that were either omitted in the first data call or, based on what you have learned through feedback from the query process, clarify existing questions to ensure that data received is consistent with your capacity analysis framework. These additional capacity-related questions should be included in a new section to your report.

As was done for the first data call, an Input Question Tool (IQT) will be provided to each JCSG through the Data Standardization Team (DST). Each JCSG and military department is required to submit its final questions in this tool, with appropriate amplification and references, no later than 7 days after submission of its final report. The DST will provide guidelines for inputting questions in this tool (e.g., restrict tables to nine total columns, avoid submitting multiple questions in a single question). The DST review will vary from the one conducted for the first data call. The primary focus of this review will be on clarity; format (i.e., correct use of tables); and, to a smaller extent,

duplication. Merging questions across JCSGs and the Military Departments is not the intent of this review.

In reviewing other military value reports, the ISG has noticed the use of various dates for defining the data input boundary (e.g., POM 06, FY 03). To ensure that data received is consistent for analysis, we will be issuing policy that will define the “cutoff” dates that should be used in your analysis.

The ISG is generally concerned about the coordination of effort on ranges. Please recall the ISG’s decision, ratified by the Secretary of Defense, that the E&T JCSG was to have the lead on the analysis of ranges. Within the E&T JCSG a discrete subgroup on ranges, with members from the Technical JCSG, was established. At its last meeting, the ISG also agreed that while the military value of ranges (one for the training function and one for the test and evaluation function) could have more than one score, ranges should have only one set of data questions and only one group (the ranges subgroup of the E&T JCSG) should be responsible for the analysis. The E&T and Technical JCSGs need to coordinate efforts to analyze ranges, especially in determining military value. Specifically, the Ranges subgroup needs to develop an integrated methodology for Training and Test and Evaluation Ranges. The presentation of military value scoring plans for the two functions should allow for a more easily understood, side-by-side comparison. For example, the Training Ranges military value scoring plan has 14 attributes, while the Test and Evaluation Ranges military value scoring plan identified only 5 attributes. Using the current presentation, it is unclear how the attributes relate to each other and is therefore difficult to understand appropriate differences in the weighting plans. Additionally, the cost of services can be a significant factor in choosing a range for training, and it is not clear whether that cost should be addressed differently in the military value scoring plan. Your final report should set out this coordinated process.

As discussed at the ISG, your final report should clearly explain why each subgroup places so much weight on criteria 1 and 2 and very little weight on criteria 3 and 4, particularly the minimum weight assigned to criterion 4 by the Ranges subgroup. Please reconsider the current distribution of weights in light of the ISG discussion.

The extent to which your group should evaluate graduate-level pilot training has engendered extensive debate and is the subject of the ISG’s reconsideration. Your draft report, however, correctly reflects the current guidance regarding graduate pilot training, and should continue to do so until the ISG advises otherwise.

Specific Comments

1) Selection Criteria. Update the selection criteria throughout the report to reflect the proposed final criteria published in the Federal Register on February 12, 2004.

2) Quality of Life Metrics

- a) Three of the subgroups use different metrics for quality of life. For example, in considering distance to the nearest airport, the Flight Training and Professional Development Education (PDE) subgroups use a minimum Cat III airport, while the Specialized Skills Training (SST) subgroup uses the term major airport and defines it as “not regional airport.” If the JCSG believes that quality of life is an important attribute within military value, consider developing a common set of metrics.
 - b) The SST and PDE subgroups use a disproportionately large number of metrics when compared to the weight assigned to quality of life. Specifically, SST poses 19 questions on quality of life, for a maximum of 12.96 points. In PDE, the FTE subfunction includes 19 questions, for a total of 10 points. This approach could dilute the value of the questions. Please review the quality of life questions to ensure that they are appropriately proportionate to attribute weight.
 - c) The metrics used to capture quality of life are not well defined. For example, cost of living uses a subjective low, medium, and high standard without any guidance regarding what qualifies as low, medium, or high. If this metric is retained in the final report, consider scoring one point for the lowest reported cost of living index and zero for the highest, and linearly interpolate in between. Similarly, some questions ask for responses based on the “local school quality index”; however, we are not aware that such an index is used consistently across the United States.
 - d) Please reconsider using the number of military housing units as an indicator of quality of life.
- 3) Number of Attributes and Metrics. Your subgroups may be using too many attributes and metrics with too little weight. For example, Undergraduate Fixed-wing Flight Training has 55 metrics: 35 of those have weights less than 2%, and 21 of the 35 have weights less than 1.5%. PME/JPME proposes: 28 metrics, with 9 having less than 1.5 or 2 percent weight. Specialized Skills Training proposes 53 metrics, with 37 having less than 2% weight, and 28 of those 37 having less than 1.5 % weight. Ranges proposes 52 metrics, with 15 at less than 1.5% or 2 %. While approaches to weighting metrics and attributes can vary in scope, in general, the use of too many metrics (in the name of completeness) could mean that many metrics will add little or no discriminatory insight to the MV model. Therefore, consider reducing the number of attributes and metrics that carry limited percentages of weight.
- 4) Adequacy of Facilities. Many questions ask respondents to rate a particular facility as adequate without defining what adequate means (e.g., Flight Training – Undergraduate Fixed Wing, Questions 1-4, Ground Training Facilities). The answers

to these types of questions may yield little discrimination among facilities because respondents are unlikely to self-report inadequacies without an objective standard. Similarly, many questions ask respondents to rate facilities as C-1, C-2, or C-3, even though the Navy does not use C-ratings and the Army and Air Force approaches to those ratings are inconsistent (e.g., Specialized Skills Training, Training Facilities/Resources). Consider explaining to respondents how to convert their different rating systems to one that will provide comparable results, similar to the method that the Supply and Storage JCSG used.

- 5) Maximum Metric Scores. The JCSG's weighting plan appears to set the maximum score for every metric at 1, but the report is not entirely clear. Clarify maximum metric scores in the final report.
- 6) Professional Development Education.
 - a) The ISG was concerned about the weight placed on the location of professional development education facilities. Except to the extent this attribute is relevant to obtaining instructors/speakers, it seems that such education could occur anywhere. Please reconsider the weight of the location attribute and revise your report accordingly.
 - b) Additionally, the metric "distance to DC" appears to conflict with metrics the Headquarters and Support JCSG's will use in its analysis of the National Capital Region. Please reconsider the use of this metric in relation to the Headquarters and Support JCSG draft report and the intent of the Secretary's November 17, 2002, memorandum entitled "Land Acquisition and Leasing of Office Space in the United States," (attached) which expresses concern regarding the concentration of Defense activities in the National Capital Region.
- 7) Imperative. The report includes an imperative to retain unique/one-of-a-kind assets or capabilities. As it stands, the imperative implies a prohibition on closing one-of-a-kind facilities, regardless of the requirements. Consider revising this imperative to show that its intent is to preserve capabilities or access to capabilities as opposed to the preservation of facilities.
- 8) Flight Training Subfunctions. The definitions of flight training subfunctions appear to show irregularities. For example, USAF Air Battle Managers (ABMs) are included in the Flight Training undergraduate subfunctions even though they do not fly in training aircraft at the undergraduate level. Please review the training functions in the Flight Training subgroup for consistency.
- 9) Specialized Skill Training, Population Density. Clarify the role of population density and fully explain the rationale for its inclusion.

- 10) Taxiways. As discussed at the ISG, the report should clarify that taxiways are captured in any references to runways, aprons, and hangars.
- 11) Flight Training, Undergraduate Fixed Wing, Question 2, Environment. Consider whether this question should be scored so that a facility that receives full credit on Question 1 also receives full credit on Question 2.
- (12) Attachment 4
- (a) E&T JCSG Range Subgroup military value questions (sub-attachment 1), page 10. Line 1 has a typographical error. The word “mast” should be replaced with the word “mass.”
 - (b) Page 26, Question 1-1-1.a. The word “personnel” should be placed between “range” and “fall.”

If you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact Peter Potochney, Director, Base Realignment and Closure, at 614-5356.



Michael W. Wynne
(Acting USD (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics)
Chairman, Infrastructure Steering Group

Attachments: As stated

cc: Chairman, Technical Joint Cross-Service Group
Military Department BRAC Deputy Assistant Secretaries



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

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.
- . Some questions and the resulting data requirements may be more than installations an 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.



Encl

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

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.



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY
(INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT)
1000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20350-1000

2 March 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

Subj: DON comments on the Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report

We have conducted a detailed review of the draft Education and Training (E&T) Joint Cross-Service Group (JCSG) Military Value Report, and provide the following recommendations to make the report a more complete product.

Major Concerns:

1. The deliberative process has resulted in a lack of understanding and resolution on the graduate level flight training issue for the Flight Training subfunction.
2. The Ranges subgroup needs to develop an integrated methodology for Training and Test and Evaluation Ranges. The presentation of military value scoring plans for the two functions should allow for a more easily understood side-by-side comparison. For example, the Training Ranges military value scoring plan has 14 attributes while the Test and Evaluation Ranges military value scoring plan only identified 5 attributes. Using the current presentation, it is not clear how the attributes relate to each other and is therefore difficult to understand appropriate differences in the weighting plans. Additionally, cost of services can be a significant factor in choosing a range for training, and it is not clear if that should be addressed differently in the military value scoring plan.
3. Consistency of analysis supports the integrity of the BRAC process. We anticipate the Services and the E&T JCSG will use evaluations of ranges in their processes, perhaps from different points of view. The issue of how we will avoid the perception of competing analysis and promote complementary analysis between the JCSGs and the Services needs to be actively discussed.

Specific Recommendations:

1. The E&T JCSG report includes an imperative to retain unique/one-of-a-kind assets or capabilities. As it stands, the imperative implies a prohibition on closing one-of-a-kind facilities, regardless of the requirements. We recommend that this imperative be recast to show the intent of the imperative is to preserve capabilities or access to capabilities vice preserving facilities. Stated thus, this imperative may also be applicable to other JCSGs.
2. There are irregularities in the definitions of subfunctions in the JCSG. For example, USAF Air Battle Managers (ABMs) are included in the Flight Training undergraduate subfunctions even though they do not fly in training aircraft at the undergraduate level. At the graduate level, ABMs are integrated with the crew training for AWACs and JSTARS, Air Force unique platforms. Therefore, this function is unique to the Air Force and does not fit into the same categories of training as the other subfunctions in Flight Training. In Specialized Skills subgroup, there are different definitions of Functional Training between the Air Force and Navy, resulting in an imbalance of the number and

types of training being considered in the JCSG. We recommend that the JCSG review the training functions in the Flight Training and Specialized Skills subgroups for consistency.

3. The PDE subgroup places military value on a school's "proximity to DC." This metric appears to run counter to the Headquarters and Support JCSG's intent to move activities away from the National Capitol Region. We recommend that the JCSG discuss the metric weight of "proximity with DC" with the Headquarters and Support JCSG, and, if necessary, seek guidance from the ISG.

4. The SST and PDE subgroups have utilized numerous metrics to measure quality of life. The number of metrics is disproportionately large compared to the weight assigned to quality of life and will dilute the value of the questions. For example, SST has 19 questions for QoL for a maximum of 12.96 points. In PDE, the FTE subfunction has 19 questions for a total of 10 points. We recommend that SST and PDE review the Quality of Life questions to ensure they are appropriately proportionate to attribute weight.

My office stands ready to further clarify these issues and assist in implementation of the recommendations as necessary.



Anne Rathmell Davis
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy
Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON DC

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

MAR 04 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR CHAIRMAN, INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING GROUP (ISG)

SUBJECT: Commentary on Education & Training Joint Cross Service Group (E&T JCSG)
Military Value Analysis Report

- References:
- (a) OSD-ATL/BRAC 19 Feb 04 e-mail: Review and Approval of JCSG Military Value Report
 - (b) E&T JCSG Military Value Analysis Report

We are providing our initial comments on Reference b per ISG guidance; further comments may be provided later. Before discussion of these comments, we have identified several cross-cutter issues that we believe affect more than one of the JCSGs.

a. Lack of Military Imperatives. JCSG reports lack clearly articulated military imperatives and/or guiding principles. Absent these, there is no "bounding" of the JCSGs functions substantiating the reason for their existence, i.e., military requirement.

b. Confusion between capacity and military value. There is confusion between capacity and military value and a tendency to define military value in terms of what the infrastructure could support efficiently (capacity-based) versus a capability assessment. Military value should be defined in terms of tangible improvement in operational capability effectiveness through an efficient combination of functions (mission-value based) and not be limited by infrastructure.

c. Military Value Analysis. Each of the JCSG discussions of military value should include the following: the fact that their military value determinations should be based upon DoD military requirements, that a primary task to the JCSG is to determine where joint consolidation or restructuring can either add tangible military value to the Services or provide the same military value at a tangible net savings, and that JCSG will provide military value recommendations (or when driven by imperatives, basing recommendations) to the Services for incorporation to the overall Service-wide recommendations. Military value weighting schemes for JCSGs should indicate how the schemes would produce the above deliverables.

d. Selection Criteria Interpretation. The Federal Register Notice of 12 Feb 04 makes a number of "promises" related to how we will interpret and apply the final selection criteria. Also, each Service and JCSG is interpreting the Selection Criteria to facilitate its analysis. How can the ISG be reasonably assured that these interpretations

are compatible? Without a sufficient and consistent methodology to match requirements to capability, military value remains undefined.

e. Attributes. Each Service and JCSG uses different descriptions of attributes that comprise military value; one JCSG has a different attribute set for each of its subgroups. We recognize the attribute "buckets" cannot be fully congruent, but in several instances, the same attribute is described in several different ways. As this may prove problematic later in the BRAC process as we make comparisons and tradeoffs between and among Services and JCSGs, we recommend that the attributes be more standardized. Here's a proposed strawman:

- Installation mission infrastructure...e.g., in the case of the AF, things like runway and ramp and space launch
- Installation combat service support infrastructure...e.g., in the case of the AF, mobilization and base operations
- Production and throughput...e.g., sorties or students
- Installation physical maneuver space...e.g., in the case of the AF, airspace
- Installation non-physical maneuver space...e.g., in the case of the AF, electromagnetic spectrum and bandwidth
- Ranges...land, sea, air
- Beneficial Relationships/Synergy...operational, professional, joint/interagency
- Geographical/Environmental Factors...e.g., encroachment, weather, topography, proximity to mission and joint operations

f. Terminology. We need to achieve a common understanding of the terms we're using, to include imperative, principle, military value, attribute names, and synergy.

g. Ensure that MilVal questions in no way duplicate those in the capacity data call.

h. Facility Conditions. The various JCSGs are using different methods and approaches to assess the condition of facilities on DoD installations. Therefore, there needs to be a consistent approach across all JCSGs to assess the condition of facilities.

Guiding Principles. Where there are principles that shape military value, the E&T JCSG military value analysis report should clearly state them. There are several statements and assumptions in the report that should be converted to guiding principles. We have included them with the remainder of our comments at the attachment. Headquarters AF POCs are Brig Gen Michael Lynch, AF/XO, 697-9991, or Lt Col Anne Fitch, SAF/IEBJ, 693-0320.


MICHAEL A. AIMONE, PE
Deputy Assistant Secretary
(Basing & Infrastructure Analysis)

Attachments:
Additional AF E&T JCSG Military Value Analysis Report
Comments

cc:
DASA (IA)
DASN (IA)
PDUSD-P&R (Chair, E&T JCSG)
SAF/MR (AF E&T JCSG Principal)
AF/CV
SAF/IE

Education & Training JCSG Military Value Analysis Report Headquarters Air Force Comments

Guiding Principles. Recommend the following statements and assumptions be converted to principles:

- Page 2, Para 3.b.i.: Installations with larger capacities (particularly Airspace) are of comparatively greater Military Value for flight training.
- Page 2, Para 3.b.ii: Managed training areas (particularly Airspace) would be extremely hard to reconstitute if lost to the BRAC process.
- Quality of life is a recruiting and retention issue that has military value.
- The military requirement to achieve culturalization early in one's military career means we cannot contract out major parts of early military training: basic training, officer accession training, entry level technical schools, undergraduate pilot training, junior officer PME.
- Service professional military education benefits from day-to-day interaction among advanced, intermediate development education, and senior development education training.
- Page 14, Para b.iv : Exploit best practices - establishing centers of excellence and outsourcing to alternate providers has value only where Military Value is effectively and efficiently enhanced.
- Page 14, Para b.v (revised): Minimize redundancy - consolidate SST instruction when standardized joint individual instruction and standards exist and you can either tangibly raise military value or produce the same military value at a tangibly lower cost. Common functional areas have the most value across Service training where Services are engaged in common operations. Gains from reduced costs and increased efficiency must be offset against possible reduction in readiness. (e.g. consolidate training at fleet concentration centers)

General comments - not tied to a specific page/paragraph number

- There is no consistency between the E&T and the Headquarters & Support Activities (H&SA) JCSGs in quality of life and other metrics, e.g. distance to nearest airport: in the E&T report the Flight Training and Professional Development Education subgroups specify a minimum Cat III airport, Specialized Skills Training subgroup uses the term major airport and defines as "not regional airport", while H&SA simply uses the term "major airport".

- Some metrics/questions lack justification making them difficult to understand their need

- Inconsistent use between E&T subgroups in defining what makes a facility adequate

Section 1: Flight Training Subgroup Military Value Analysis

Page 1, Para 1.b.ii: Air Force does not believe F-35 graduate training should be within the scope of the JCSG (ISG issue)

Page 2, Para 1.c Add to end of sentence “and fixed wing graduate training other than C-12, V-22, and C-130J.” (ISG issue)

Page 2, Para 3.b.: Switch subparagraphs i and ii or add “particularly Airspace” to para i to read: “Installations with larger capacities (particularly Airspace) are of comparatively greater Military Value for flight training”.

Page 3, Para 4.a.iii: Recommend that E&T JCSG use common attributes among subgroups and among JCSGs to maximum extent possible as different analytical constructs may prove incompatible during scenario development.

Section 2: Professional Development Education Subgroup Military Value Analysis

Page 10, Para 4.c.ii.1: Disagree with rationale for Location attribute as new technologies (VTC, Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL), etc.) can replace distance.

Section 3: Specialized Skill Training Subgroup Military Value Analysis

Page 14, Paras 3 a and b: Need to restate as principles if germane or useful as indicated below; otherwise, delete.

Page 14, Para 3.a. Delete Assumptions.

Page 14, Para 3.a.i: Delete as there is no value added.

Page 14, Para 3.a.ii. First Sentence: Delete as this is a capacity assumption, not military value. Second Sentence: Comment: Is bigger always better? If so, it's a principle.

Page 14, Para 3.a. iii. Paragraph meaning is unclear. Clarify or delete.

Page 14, Para 3.a. iv. Paragraph meaning is unclear. Clarify or delete.

Page 14, Para 3.b.i: Comment: This is an unreasonable assumption given BRAC's 2025 planning horizon

Page 14, Para 3.b.ii: Delete as this is no value added.

Page 14, Para 3.b.v. Revise first sentence to read: “Minimize redundancy - consolidate SST instruction when standardized joint individual instruction and standards exist and you can either tangibly raise military value or produce the same military value at a tangibly lower cost.”

Page 14, Para 3.b.v. last sentence: Comment: Creation of a single credible source for training of any key capability could create a tempting terrorist target, a single point of failure. Some “redundancy”, i.e. the ability to reconstitute a training capability, is essential.

Section 4: Ranges and Collective Training Subgroup Military Value Analysis

Page 19, Para 3)a: Two military value ratings are acceptable if there isn't a third military value for Air Force unique.

Page 24, Para 6)c: Title should read: Facility Range Imperatives

Page 24, Para 6)c.i: Comment: Imperative is too vague as written as it does not address whether the range, although unique, is still needed, i.e. the range's existence still needs to be justified.

Attachment 1

General Comment: Note which of the Military Value questions are resident in data call #1 and which must be asked during the Military Value data call.

Environment: The Accident Potential Zone question justifications are incorrect. The percentage of incompatible land doesn't prevent encroaching - only zoning and other restrictions can impact physical encroachment .

Managed Training Areas: Questions 1 and 2 of the Managed Training Areas section are duplicates of questions asked by the Ranges subgroup in the data call #1. Also several of the data elements in the remaining questions can be obtained from the ranges capacity call or are duplicative of the range Military Value analysis. Removing or combining similar questions in a process as done for the capacity data call may address this issue.

Ground Training Facilities Questions: Add a new question #7 that would be the old #6. The new #6 would be "List any unique training facilities (firefighting/altitude chamber/centrifuge)."

Attachment 4

E&T JCSG Range Subgroup Mil Val Questions (Sub-Attachment 1)

Page 10: Line 1 has a typo. The word "mast" should be replaced with the word "mass".

Page 26, Question 1-1-1.a.: The word "personnel" should be placed between "range" and "fall".

Last chart "E&T Ranges Subgroup - Test and Evaluation OAR Function": The Weights presented are not the most current as they do not include the cost metrics for personnel, physical plant, and encroachment. These are required for Criteria 4 and need to be included in the Military Value Report attachment.



SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
1000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1000

NOV 17 2002

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (ACQUISITION,
TECHNOLOGY AND LOGISTICS)
UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)
GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
DEFENSE
DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT
CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

SUBJECT: Land Acquisition and Leasing of Office Space in the United States

I am concerned with the acquisition of real property throughout the United States and particularly with the concentration of Defense activities in the Washington, DC, area. I am therefore revising and expanding the existing land acquisition moratorium policy, currently reflected in memoranda from the Deputy Secretary of Defense dated September 13, 1990, and December 1, 1994. This memorandum supercedes those memoranda and any other memoranda inconsistent with the guidance reflected herein.

Effective immediately, no major land acquisition proposals within the Washington, DC, area may be made public through a request for proposals, notice of intent to perform environmental analysis, request for legislation or budget line item, press release, or other official notice without my approval or that of the Deputy Secretary. All previously approved or announced major land acquisitions within the Washington, DC, area for which binding documents have not been executed, as of the date of this memorandum, may not proceed until approved by me or the Deputy Secretary, after review by the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics) (USD(AT&L)). In addition, no major land acquisition proposals outside the Washington, DC, area may be made public, in the manner discussed above, without the approval of the USD(AT&L).

National Guard major land acquisitions which are to be funded in whole or in part by Federal funds are subject to the moratorium. Civil Works programs managed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers shall not be subject to the moratorium. Renewals of existing leases, withdrawals, permits, or other use agreements (other than those at bases being closed or realigned) are not subject to the moratorium.



U07802 / 02

Additionally, effective immediately, no proposals for relocating into or within the Washington, DC, area that exceed \$500,000 in relocation costs may be made public, in the manner discussed above, without approval by me or the Deputy Secretary. Requests for approval of such relocations shall be submitted to the Director, Washington Headquarters Services (WHS), who shall submit such requests for my approval, through USD(AT&L). All previously approved or announced relocations that have not occurred as of the date of this memorandum may not proceed until approved by me or the Deputy Secretary, after review by the USD(AT&L).

Finally, the authority of the Director, WHS to administer the DoD Administrative Space Management Program within the National Capital Region, granted by DoD Directive 5110.4 and specifically described in DoD Instruction 5305.5, is hereby expanded to the Washington, DC, area.

A major land acquisition is defined as the purchase, withdrawal from public domain, lease or permit from individuals or government entities, or any other type of use agreement involving more than 1,000 acres, or land whose estimated purchase price or annual lease price exceeds \$1 million. The Washington, DC, area is defined generally as the geographic area that falls within 100 miles of the Pentagon.

The USD(AT&L) shall issue such instructions or implementing memoranda as may be necessary to implement this policy, including a specific delineation of those jurisdictions to which it applies. In implementing these policies, USD(AT&L) shall obtain the coordination of the USD(Comptroller) and the DoD General Counsel before submitting actions for approval as described herein.



cc:

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs
Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness)
Under Secretary of Defense (Policy)
Director, Defense Research and Engineering
Assistant Secretaries of Defense
Inspector General of the Department of Defense
Director, Operational Test and Evaluation
Assistants to the Secretary of Defense
Directors of Defense Agencies
Directors of DoD Field Activities