DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
(INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT)
1000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20350-1000
DCN:5497

MN-0081
IAT/JAN
19 March 2004

MEMORANDUM

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 4 MARCH 2004

Encl: (1) 4 March 04 IEG Meeting Agenda
(2) DON comments on the Technical JCSG Military Value Report of 24 Feb 04
(3) DON comments on the Medical JCSG Military Value Report of 26 Feb 04
(4) DON comments on the Industrial JCSG Military Value Report of 1 Mar 04
(5) DON comments on the Supply and Storage JCSG Military Value Report of 1 Mar 04
(6) DON comments on the Headquarters and Support Activities JCSG Military Value Report of 1 Mar 04
(7) DON comments on the Education and Training JCSG Military Value Report of 2 Mar 04
(8) Recording Secretary's Report of IEG Deliberations on 4 March 2004 with enclosures

1. The eighteenth meeting of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) was convened at 0937 on 4 March 2004 in the Infrastructure Analysis Team (IAT) conference room located at Crystal Plaza 6, 9th floor. The following members of the IEG were present: Mr. H. T. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Installations and Environment (ASN(I&E)), Chair; Ms. Anne R. Davis, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis (DASN(IS&A)), Vice Chair; RADM Christopher E. Weaver, USN, Commander, Navy Installations, serving as alternate for VADM Charles W. Moore, Jr., USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4), Member; Thomas R. Crabtree, Director, Fleet Training (N7), U.S. Fleet Forces Command, serving as alternate for VADM Albert H. Konetzni Jr., USN, Deputy and Chief of Staff, U.S. Fleet Forces Command, Member; Ms. Carla Liberatore, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (I&L), serving as alternate for LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (I&L), Member; RADM Mark T. Emerson, USN, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Aviation (AVN), serving as alternate for LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Aviation (AVN), Member; Mr. Michael F. McGrath,

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 4 MARCH 2004

Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research Development Test & Evaluation (DASN(RDT&E)), Member; Col Carol K. Joyce, USMC, Staff Director, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower Analysis and Assessment (DASN(MA&A), serving as alternate for Dr. Russ Beland, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower Analysis and Assessment (DASN(MA&A), Member; Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service (NAVAUDSVC), Representative; Mr. Thomas N. Ledvina, Navy Office of General Counsel (OGC), Representative; Ms. J. Page Turney, Wilcox Fellow, Navy Office of General Counsel (OGC), observing; Mr. David W. LaCroix, Senior Counsel, Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN, Recorder; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC, Recorder.

2. Additionally, the following members of the IAT were present: Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff, CAPT Christopher T. Nichols, USN, Operations Team Lead; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Carl Deputy, USN; LtCol Terri Erdag, USMC; LtCol Robert R. Mullins, USMCR; LCDR Daniel Frost, USN; LCDR Brian D. Miller, USNR; and LCDR Steven J Cincotta, USN. All attendees were provided enclosures (1) through (7). Ms. Davis presented the minutes from the 26 February 2004 IEG meeting for review and they were approved.

3. Ms. Davis provided updates on the following matters:

(a) <u>ISG Military Value Reports.</u> DoN comments, provided as enclosures (2) through (7), were signed by DASN(IS&A) and forwarded to the OSD BRAC Director after coordination with DoN ISG members and JCSG principals. The Army has comments of similar tenor; the Air Force comments, while not yet provided, are expected to be generic, and less specific. OSD will consider and forward the comments to respective JCSG Chairs in 14 days. Within 30 days, JCSG Final Military Value Reports are due to OSD. On 30 March 2004, the OSD BRAC Director is expected to forward the reports to the ISG for coordination followed by a 2 April integration meeting (except the Intelligence JCSG). After integration, the final reports will be submitted to the IEC for formal coordination. Then, the Military Value data call will be issued. DoN policy imperatives will be formally requested through a SECNAV tasker after the SECNAVNOTE is signed. The IEG chair, noting the importance of issuing DoN policy imperatives prior to the 2 April integration meeting, will help expedite the issuance of the SECNAVNOTE.

TAB 1

Infrastructure Evaluation Group

4 Mar 2004
0930-1230
Crystal Plaza 6

Meeting called by:	Chairman	Recorder:	Capt Noel

----- Agenda Topics -----

Review and approve minutes of IEG Meeting of 26 Feb 04	Ms. Davis
Status Updates:	Ms Davis

- ISG/JCSGs
  - 7 day informal comments to OSD
  - 14 day comments to JCSG Chair
  - 30 day JCSG Final MV report to OSD
  - 30 Mar ISG Coordination
  - 2 Apr Integration meeting (except Intel)
  - Formal coordination of MV Reports

- FY04 Report — Ms Davis

- Deliberative Session — All
  - Surface/Subsurface MV Approach

Administrative

- Next meeting Friday 19 Mar 04, 0930-1230
- Meeting location Crystal Plaza 6, 9th Floor

Other Information

Draft minutes of 26 Feb 04 IEG meeting provided.

TAB 2

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

24 February 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

SUBJECT: DON comments on the Technical Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report

We have conducted a detailed review of the draft Technical Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report, and provide the following recommendations to make the written report a more complete product:

Major Concerns:

1. As discussed at the ISG meeting, we need to develop a process for establishing consistency of terminology and Military Value attributes/metrics/weights/scores assignment across the Technical JCSG and like areas of other JCSGs. This will become particularly important during the scenario phase as inter-JCSG negotiations become necessary and during review by higher level and external organizations.

Examples: Although the terminology is different, there is good correlation between the weights and scores assigned to the "people" and "synergy" attributes of both the Technical and Industrial JCSGs, which may well be reviewing elements of the same activities. However, Education and Training ranges and Test and Evaluation ranges have very different analytical constructs, which may create difficulties if we try to analyze the potential for use of one type of range by the other function. A single set of questions with a common analytical construct would be preferable to allow comparability and use by both the Technical and E&T JCSGs.

2. Essential elements of the report need to be completed. These include 10 of 26 questions, certain weights and scores, and the "future war fighting concepts group" assessment upon which certain weights and scores are based.

3. We need to ensure there is rationale to support all aspects of the scoring plan, including assignment of attributes, metrics, weights and scoring. Many different function/capability combinations have similar criteria and attribute weights, and many similar capability/attribute combinations have widely different scoring, with no explanation in the body of the report. To the extent possible, we should strive to have these reports be complete, stand-alone documents that contain the reasons for selecting attributes and metrics and assigning weights and scores, supported by official records of deliberation.

Example from the scoring plan waterfall charts: Air, Land, Sea, Space Capability – Research function – Criteria 1 – Attribute 5 (Synergy) – Metric 3 (Proximity) is scored

as 40%. In the Weapons and Armaments Capability Area, the same combination of Function/Criteria/Attribute/Metric is scored as 20%. There is great similarity within the elements of these two capability/function/criteria/attribute/metric sets, but no explanation of the difference in scores.

4. The Technical JCSG should conduct sensitivity analyses using notional data to determine the viability of the weights, scoring and formulas in the Military Value Report. It is unclear whether their scoring plan values those attributes they consider important. Sensitivity analyses should point out where skewed and unintended results might occur.

Specific Recommendations:

1. In paragraph 1.2, strike the phrase "the Joint Staff and Marine Corps chose not to be active participants in the CIT." We understand this to be factually incorrect, as both organizations are now represented at CIT meetings.

2. Map "Future Warfighting Concepts" to validated plans/guidance. The current list of future technologies/capabilities is not sufficiently justified by other official studies and plans.

3. Ensure workload metrics are used that are meaningful to BRAC deliberations. In questions where "Total Funding Executed" is requested, "In House Funding Executed", "Out-of-House (Other Government Activity) Funding Executed", and "Contractor Funding Executed" should also be requested, so analysis can provide a complete picture of an activity's/organization's military value. (Note: Final questions numbers and terminology were not available at the time of these comments).

4. Ensure metrics to measure and compare program accomplishment are complete. In questions measuring program accomplishment (ACAT programs, ACTDs, ATD's, UNS, and Rapid Response projects), the measurement is limited to numbers of programs. Because program scope can vary widely, another factor, such as cost or FTEs expended, should be used as an additional, discriminating measure.

5. Reconsider assigned weights for Selection Criteria #4 as a whole. This Selection Criteria appears not to have been well understood, and thus results in less consideration than the other 3 criteria (para 2.2.d). There are technical areas under consideration in which the cost of operations and the manpower implications could be significant factors.

6. Delete the question requesting funding plans for "high value warfighting capabilities/technology." The detail level required to map future year funding plans to these technologies is not available in all Military Departments in auditable form.

7. Delete the questions under the heading of "bounding parameter." This has been the subject of much discussion related to the scoring and weighting of physical

structures and equipment, with no agreement reached. This metric contains greater risk for skewing an analysis than any other, even if consensus is reached on weighting and scoring.

8. Data gathering and analysis should be planned for the lowest level that will be significant for BRAC actions across all Military Departments. Presently, the data gathering and analysis construct goes no lower than the function/capability level. Plans should be adjusted based upon an understanding of the distribution of functions/sub-functions and capabilities across the Military Departments to allow discrimination between the many "technical facilities." In some cases, functional/capability level is sufficient; in others, sub-function or lower is required. A symmetrical construct will not allow the analysis required.

Example: The "Research/Weapons" function/capability area has several significant sub-areas that need to be visible and analyzed separately to allow BRAC decisions, i.e., Aviation Weapons Systems, Undersea Weapons Systems, Sea Surface Weapons Systems, and Land Weapons Systems.

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

Anne R Davis

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

TAB 3

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

26 February 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

SUBJECT: DON comments on the Medical Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report

We have conducted a detailed review of the draft Medical Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report, and provide the following recommendations to make the written report a more complete product.

Major Concern:

1. Military Value is currently being measured in the report by the following subgroups – Education and Training, Market, RD&A, and Infrastructure. These subgroups do not easily lend themselves to analysis in the BRAC process. As a specific example, Infrastructure is an input, not a product or a function, and might be more appropriately rolled into each of the other sub-group functions. For example, once combined with Infrastructure, Medical/Dental Market Requirements may be more appropriately entitled Medical/Dental Services. We understand the MJCSG is aware of this issue and is working on a solution. Related to this issue are the following:

- Medical and Dental Market Requirements should be evaluated in a consistent manner. Currently 100% of the weight for the Dental Market is placed within the mission criteria. In comparison, the Medical and Veterinary Market sections place 35% and 30% of the Military Value weights on the cost criteria, respectively. While dental care is provided specifically for the active duty population and is an element of readiness, it is not clear that civilian care is not a viable option for some in-garrison dental care, particularly because "civilian capacity" is one of the two dental market attributes described. Thus, it is not clear why the cost criteria is not weighted in the Dental Market.

- While the Military Value Report details the military value of the Veterinary Market, the only question (DoD #540) in the Capacity Data Call is a yes/no question about whether or not an activity provides veterinary support. From a modeling standpoint, this will make it difficult to define what veterinary services can be closed or realigned based on military value if no measures of capacity and requirements are available. If the Military Value of the Veterinary Market is to be defined, additional capacity/requirements concerning veterinary support appear appropriate.

Specific Recommendations:

1. In Appendix A, the Metric – Student Enrichment to MHS is associated with questions asking "Would the level of services offered at your treatment facility decrease if graduate education programs were eliminated from your facility?" It is reasonable to assume all activities will answer

yes to the question, which will not provide a significant level of differentiation in the model. Additionally, these questions could be criticized as subjective, particularly because the weight of the question is greater than the other questions in this metric. Rather than a yes/no answer, a scaled question allowing the responses to be calculated in a linear manner should be utilized to allow a measure of differentiation between the respondents.

2. In Appendix B, the Eligible Population metric questions should total to 100.

3. In Appendix D, the Infrastructure sub-group did not list the specific capacity data element to be used. While the report indicates that the information is contained in the Capacity Data Call, for purposes of documenting the scoring plan for military value, the specific question should be identified.

- Attribute – physical capacity and condition
  - Metric – equipment (Pages D-5, D-13, and D-21)
    - Probable Capacity Data Element – equipment condition?
- Attribute – throughput
  - Metric – exam rooms (Page D-10)
    - Probable Capacity Data Element – number of exams per provider?
- Attribute – operational/mission responsiveness
  - Metric – contingency beds (Page D-17)
    - Probable Capacity Data Element – number of contingency beds?

4. In Appendix D, Page D-24, the table appears to be labeled incorrectly. It should read *Formulas for Calculation of Medical/Dental Infrastructure Military Value Metrics*. Additionally, the Medical/Dental Infrastructure sub-group is the only sub-group that outlines the scoring of each activity based on the answers to the questions. For example, an installation with a FCI between 0-0.050 will be assigned a score of 1.0. It is unclear how the other sub-groups will assign scores. While it can be inferred that the answers to the questions and the actual points for that question will be calculated in a linear manner, it needs to be clear in the report to minimize confusion.

5. The report should be revised to make more clear that the sensitivity analysis performed in each subgroup was based on notional information derived from professional experience, in lieu of a combination of "in-house data sources" and "general knowledge regarding each activity." We understand the process used was a method to validate question/attribute scoring to ensure appropriate weighting and sufficient differentiation, rather than actual data analysis.

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

Anne R Davis

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

TAB 4

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

01 March 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

SUBJECT: DON comments on the Industrial Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report

We have conducted a detailed review of the draft Industrial Joint Cross Service Group Military Value Report, and provide the following recommendations to make the written report a more complete product.

Major Concerns:

1. The rationale for much of the Industrial JCSG approach to military value is unclear in the draft of the written report. A robust record of decision processes is important to be able to thoroughly explain the process used by DoD to arrive at the recommendations it makes. If this necessary record is contained in minutes of the I-JCSG deliberative sessions, a summary in the report would be helpful for completeness.

2. The functional charters of the JCSGs naturally have led them to focus on deriving military value for multiple functions and sub-functions. Installations typically have missions involving multiple functions and sub-functions, which will result in multiple military value scores at individual sites. Uniform guidance to the JCSGs on how to reconcile multiple military values at individual sites in the context of analysis and formulation of recommendations for realignment and closure actions will facilitate the work of the JCSGs. Specifically, the Industrial JCSG approach derives military value in each of nine sub-functions (and for many commodities within two of the sub-functions). This may have several implications:

- Use of many distinct approaches to military value makes consolidated analysis of industrial activities across subgroups difficult. For example, unless shipyards respond to questions from the maintenance sub-group, it will be difficult to develop and analyze scenarios that would examine alignment of maintenance commodities to shipyards.
- Similar military value attributes are treated differently across Industrial JCSG sub-groups. For example, Costs and Manpower Implications are queried and scored differently among the sub-groups. While there may be sound reasons for these differences, it is not clear from the report why different approaches were taken for metrics that relate to similar qualities.

3. The scoring and weighting approaches described in the report should be examined to ensure they are analytically sound and value what the JCSG intends. For instance, investing just a few questions with the preponderance of military value increases the risk that any error or misunderstanding in reported data could invalidate the conclusions derived from them. In some sub-functions, responses to a very few questions will determine as much as 75% of an activity's military value.

Specific Recommendations:

1. The full extent of the ammunition distribution system is not fully addressed. It does not appear that the existing military value analysis addresses all facets of distribution and deployment. Specifically, metrics related to the effectiveness of the system for getting munitions and armaments from storage sites onto ships are absent.

2. Consider whether the DoD responses to public comments on the selection criteria contain characteristics that should be factored into the Industrial military value analysis, and record consideration of these comments. The characteristics in the public comments with greatest applicability to the Industrial function include: "availability of intellectual capital, critical trade skills, and trained workforce"; "synergy with nearby installations, industrial clusters, academic institutions and other organizations"; "strategic location and irreplaceable facilities"; "an installation's ability to transform, streamline business operations, and manage successful programs"; "encroachment"; and "difficulty in obtaining licenses and permits".

3. Consider whether installation size is weighted in the manner that indicates the importance intended by the Industrial JCSG. For example, in the Maintenance sub-function, the combined effect of workload size, unrestricted acreage, size of facilities, and capacity favor larger activities, which seems to assume that large sites correspond to higher mission responsiveness and military value. In general, where particular features do account for very significant fractions of total military value, it becomes especially important that the rationale for these choices is well documented.

4. Evaluate whether measures of mission responsiveness and effectiveness are captured in a manner that reflect important features of industrial activities. Such features include on-time performance, re-work, completion within budgeted cost, and defects reported by customers. While no single measure is perfect, use of several less than perfect metrics might be preferable, if applied consistently.

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

Anne R Davis

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

TAB 5

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

1 March 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

SUBJECT: DON comments on the Supply and Storage Joint Cross-Service Group (JCSG) Military Value Report

We have conducted a detailed review of the draft Supply and Storage Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report, and provide the following recommendations to make the written report a more complete product.

Major Concerns:

1. We need to develop a process for establishing consistency of terminology and Military Value attributes/metrics/weights/scores assignment across like areas of other JCSGs (for example the munitions sub-function of the Industrial JCSG). Of particular concern is the fact that the evaluation of the munitions distribution function by the Industrial JCSG uses very different weighting, scoring, and metrics than the scoring plan developed for the rest of the distribution function by the Supply & Storage JCSG. This will become particularly important during the scenario phase as inter-JCSG negotiations become necessary and during review by higher level and external organizations.

2. A comprehensive definition or list defining the Supply and Storage JCSG universe of activities is required. There is no consistent understanding across services as to what a supply and storage activity is for the purposes of BRAC.

3. Separate military value scoring plans should be developed for supply, storage and distribution functions. When the same scoring plan is used for all three functions, activities that do not perform one or more of the functions will be unintentionally penalized. Additionally, when only similarly aligned activities are compared, the weights for the scoring plans will be skewed, with the particular function under assessment and criterion 4, cost and manpower implications, being weighted in a proportion far in excess of what we believe to be the JCSG's intention. We understand this has been born out by recently conducted sensitivity analysis.

4. The Supply and Storage JCSG should conduct sensitivity analyses using notional data to determine the viability of the weights, scoring and formulas in the Military Value Report. It is unclear whether their scoring plan properly values those attributes they consider important. Sensitivity analyses should point out where skewed and unintended results might occur.

Specific Recommendations

1. End item management is heavily weighted in the complexity factor, with a four to one ratio when compared to consumable management. Recommend this portion of the complexity factor be reviewed to ensure it does what is intended, since most inventory control point management is of repair parts and consumables.

2. In order to determine where their commodities fall in the complexity factor matrix, activities will need detailed guidance to ensure that each activity sorts its commodities in the same way. Additionally, appropriate definitions and clarifications should be sent out with the next data call. Experience with the capacity data call shows that in-depth definition guidance is critically important in obtaining consistent responses from the field. In the report there are references to information that is not routinely accessed by field level activities.

3. The breakdown in criterion 4 by supply, storage and distribution is not matched in the questions or in the weighting plan section.

4. Reassess military value as it applies to capacity, condition and location. Under the proposed scoring plan, efficiency and effectiveness accounts for 30% of the military value of a supply and storage activity. Capacity is addressed, but perhaps not sufficiently to capture distinct differences in kinds of capacity. Location is only considered as it applies to distribution nodes, with no consideration being given to an activity's proximity to its customers, which we believe could be important.

My staff and I stand ready to further clarify these issues and assist in implementation of the recommendations as necessary.

Anne R Davis

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

TAB 6

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

01 March 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

SUBJECT: DON comments on the Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report

We have conducted a detailed review of the draft Headquarters and Support Activities Joint Cross-Service Group Military Value Report, and provide the following recommendations to make the written report a more complete product.

Major Concerns:

1. Many of the most contentious decisions potentially impacting Combatant Commands, Service headquarters, and major support commands fall within the domain of the H&SA JCSG to assess. Clearer guidelines from OSD and the ISG should be provided to the JCSG to address these activities. Clearly defined imperatives from all services, as well as the ISG, to set boundaries of performance and mission criticalities are necessary to focus the efforts of the H&SA subgroups. This is particularly critical when rationalizing a headquarters' presence in the Washington D.C. area, which undoubtedly will be more than just an issue of whether or not they are in leased space and frequency of contact with senior officials.

2. We understand the military value data call will be handled as a targeted data call, with military value questions for a function/sub-function sent only to activities that perform that function. H&SA must have time to analyze the capacity data call responses to determine who is in the Washington D.C. area, who is in a geographic cluster, etc., in order to conduct its military value data call. As discussed at the 20 Feb 04 ISG meeting, all JCSGs need to make tentative decisions on what their universe of activities is, which can be confirmed by capacity data. Those who wait for the data prior to making any decisions will not be able to meet the deadlines.

Specific Recommendations:

1. The H&SA JCSG appears to be focusing more on Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) than reduction of infrastructure. However, review of the models and weighting reveal this is not being done consistently. For example, the Geographic Clusters scoring model fails to give credit to organizations that have already re-aligned to a more efficient consolidated regional support concept, such as the Navy Regions for base operating support. Conversely, the IT support/computing services model accurately rewards established economies of scale, which is the essence of the Navy and Marine Corps Internet (NMCI) re-alignment effort. Consolidated sites and support appears to be the overall intention, with low scores (less per installation) being good, rewarding economies of scale. Proper recognition of significant consolidations and cost saving successes should be incorporated consistently.

2. There are references to data that will be provided from "COBRA" such as BOS costs, BAH rate for an O-4, and cost of living indexes. Recommend additional collaboration with the

COBRA team, as these requirements do not align with the latest understood data collection intentions.

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

Anne R Davis

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

TAB 7

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

TAB 8

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

RP-0082
IAT/JAN
16 March 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INFRASTRUTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 4 MARCH 2004

Encl: (1) IAT Military Value Weighting Brief of 4 Mar 04
(2) IAT Surface/Subsurface Operations Notional Military Value Evaluation Questions
(3) IAT Surface/Subsurface Function Military Value Notional Matrix
(4) IEG Question Scoring Bands

1. The second deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) convened at 1001 on 4 March 2004 in the Infrastructure Analysis Team (IAT) conference room located at Crystal Plaza 6, 9th floor. The following members of the IEG were present: Mr. H. T. Johnson, Chair; Ms. Anne R. Davis, Vice Chair; RADM Christopher E. Weaver, USN, alternate for VADM Charles W. Moore, Jr., USN, Member; Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree, alternate for VADM Albert H. Konetzni, USN, Member; Ms. Carla Liberatore, alternate for LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member; RADM Mark T. Emerson, USN, alternate for LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Member; Mr. Michael F. McGrath, Member; Col Carol K. Joyce, USMC, alternate for Dr. Russ Beland, Member. The following members of the IAT were present: Mr. Dennis Biddick; Mr. David W. LaCroix; CAPT Chris T. Nichols, USN; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Carl Deputy, USN; LtCol Terri Erdag, USMC; LtCol Robert R. Mullins, USMCR; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; LCDR Daniel Frost, USN; LCDR Brian D. Miller, USNR; LCDR Steven J. Cincotta, USN; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC. Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service (NAVAUDSVC), Representative entered the deliberative session at 1101.

2. Ms. Davis reminded the IEG that deliberative sessions will be closed, participation will be limited to those necessary for the discussion; and, substantive discussion by IEG members should be conducted only in the deliberative sessions.

3. CAPT Nichols, IAT Operations Team lead, and CDR Fairbairn, IAT Operations Team briefed enclosure (1). The IEG discussed the military value selection criteria (1) through (4) to ensure

that there was a common understanding within the IEG as to the meaning and scope of each criterion for military value analysis. The IEG agreed to the following labels and abbreviations for the military value selection criteria generally, and assigned the following weights for the surface/subsurface functions:

a) Readiness (R): 50
b) Facilities (F): 20
c) *Flexibility and Sustainment* (*TBD*): 15
d) Cost and Manpower (C): 15.

The IEG concurred that the label used for selection criteria #3 should reflect flexibility and sustainment but did not agree on the label to be used. The IEG will make the label selection at a later session.

4. The IAT proposed the following attributes for surface/ subsurface operations function: Operational Infrastructure, Operational Training, Port Characteristics, Environment and Encroachment, and Personnel Support. Following discussion, the IEG approved the proposed attributes.

5. The IAT proposed a number of components for each of the approved attributes. The IEG conceptually approved the following components, subject to the changes noted:

a) Operational Infrastructure: Ship Berthing, Ship Maintenance, Security/Fire & Rescue, Unique/Specialized Capabilities/Missions, Weapons Handling Capability and Operational Staff Facilities. The IEG noted that accessibility to infrastructure should be thematic and that sustainment should be considered as part of the Ship Berthing component.

b) Operational Training: Training Facilities, OPAREAs/Ranges and Small Arms Training. The IEG noted that there would not be a repetitive analysis of Range capacity that is considered by the JCSGs; rather, the IEG will be concerned with access and availability.

c) Port Characteristics: Operation Location, Strategic Location, Port Restrictions, Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection, Locality Cost, and Supply and Storage. The IEG directed that Intermodal capacity should be included as a component.

d) Environment and Encroachment: Land Constraints, Dredging, Encroachment, Environmental Costs, Waste Disposal, Potable Water, Marine Mammals/Resources/Sanctuaries, and Air

Quality. The IEG directed that Mammals/Resources/Sanctuaries be replaced with Natural Resource Considerations.

e) Personnel Support (QOL): Medical/Dental, Housing, Non-Military Education, Spouse Employment, Fleet & Family Services, MWR, Messing, Follow-on Tour Opportunities, and Metropolitan Area Characteristics. The IEG noted that Messing should be deleted as a component.

The components will be revised in accordance with the IEG's direction and presented to the IEG at the next deliberative session for approval.

6. The IEG next considered the questions developed by the IAT for each component for surface/subsurface functions. The IEG generally concurred with the direction of the questions but suggested a number of changes. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the IAT will revise the questions to reflect the IEG's concerns and present them to the IEG for consideration at the next deliberative session. The next session will address attributes weights, assign questions to attributes, and develop groupings and scores. The deliberative session adjourned at 1233.

JAMES A. NOEL
Captain, U.S. Marine Corps
Recorder, IAT

Department of the Navy

Infrastructure Analysis Team

Military Value Weighting Deliberative Session

Surface / Subsurface Operations Function

4 March 2004

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

Surface/Subsurface Operations Agenda

0930 Weight Selection Criteria

0945 Review, Modify and Approve Attributes and associated Components

1015 Review, Modify and Approve Questions

1100 Weight Attributes within Selection Criteria

1115 Score and assign Questions to Selection Criteria

1200 Break

1215 Review, Modify and Approve Weighting Results (time permitting)

1230 Adjourn

Selection Criteria Weights

Selection Criteria Weights for Surface / Sub-surface Operations Function – BRAC 2005

1. Readiness (R): __
2. Facilities (F): __
3. Mobilization Capability (M): __
4. Cost and Manpower (C): __

Surface/Subsurface Operations MV Attributes

- Operational Infrastructure
- Operational Training
- Port Characteristics
- Environment and Encroachment
- Personnel Support (QOL)

PROPOSED

Surface/Subsurface Operations MV Attributes

- Operational Infrastructure
  - Ship Berthing
  - Ship Maintenance
  - Security / Fire & Rescue
  - Unique / Specialized Capabilities / Missions
  - Weapons Handling Capability
  - Operational Staff Facilities

PROPOSED

Surface/Subsurface Operations MV Attributes

- Operational Training
  - Training Facilities
  - OPAREAs / Ranges
  - Small Arms Training

PROPOSED

Surface/Subsurface Operations MV Attributes

- Port Characteristics
  - Operational Location
  - Strategic Location
  - Port Restrictions
  - Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection
  - Locality Cost
  - Supply and Storage

PROPOSED

Surface/Subsurface Operations MV Attributes

- Environment and Encroachment
  - Land Constraints
  - Dredging
  - Encroachment
  - Environmental Costs
  - Waste Disposal
  - Potable Water
  - Marine Mammals/Resources/Sanctuaries
  - Air Quality

PROPOSED

Surface/Subsurface Operations MV Attributes

- Personnel Support (QOL)
  - Medical / Dental
  - Housing
  - Non-Military Education
  - Spouse Employment
  - Fleet & Family Services
  - MWR
  - Messing
  - Follow-on Tour Opportunities
  - Metropolitan Area Characteristics

PROPOSED

Operational Infrastructure Questions

- **Ship Berthing**
  - What is the maximum combined CG Equivalent capacity for your activity's piers / wharfs?
  - How many CVNs can you berth at your activity in cold iron status?
  - How many SSBNs can you berth at your activity in cold iron status?
  - What is the relative condition of the piers at your activity?
- **Ship Maintenance**
  - What is the relative value of the supporting SIMA in terms of proximity, capability and capacity?
  - What is the relative value of the the available drydocks in the harbor complex?
  - What is the distance (safe navigation route) from your pier / wharf complex to the nearest nuclear capable shipyard?
  - Is there a degaussing range in the natural harbor complex?
  - Is there a deperming facility in the natural harbor complex?
  - What is the maximum lift tonnage for any individual pier-side capable crane at your activity?

PROPOSED

Operational Infrastructure Questions

- **Security / Fire & Rescue**
  - Does the activity have specialized security / emergency services capabilities?
- **Unique / Specialized Capabilities / Missions**
  - Does the activity perform / possess unique capabilities or missions?
  - Does the activity perform / possess any specialized capabilities or missions?
- **Weapons Handling Capability**
  - What is the combined maximum ordnance handling pier capacity for your waterfront piers / wharfs?
  - Does your activity have any on-location ordnance magazines?
- **Operational Staff Facilities**
  - What is the total square footage of ADEQUATE administrative space at your activity?

PROPOSED

Operational Training Questions

- Training Facilities
  - What is the distance to the nearest shipboard firefighting training facility?
  - What is the distance to the nearest ship handling training facility?
  - What is the distance to the nearest damage control training facility?
  - What is the distance to the nearest submarine handling training facility?
  - What is the annual throughput for all "C" and "F" schools located within 50 miles of your activity?
  - Does the activity have any unique operational training facilities?

PROPOSED

Operational Training Questions

- OPAREAs / Ranges
  - What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest anti-air warfare range?
  - What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest naval gunnery qualification range?
  - What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest submarine operating area?
  - What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest mine warfare training area?
  - What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest submarine training range?
- Small Arms Training
  - What is the maximum throughput of your activity's small arms range?

PROPOSED

Port Characteristics Questions

- Operational Location
  - What is the channel distance (safe navigation route) to sea?
  - What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the 50 fathom curve?
  - What percent of the day (averaged for FY03) would your harbor channel allow CV/CVN transits?
  - What is the relative impact of weather on operations at the port location?
  - What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest weapons station?
  - What is the distance to the nearest Explosive Ordnance Detachment support?
- Strategic Location
  - Is the port location of strategic military value?

PROPOSED

Port Characteristics Questions

- **Port Restrictions**
  - What is the relative impact of port / harbor restrictions on operations?
- **Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection**
  - What is the total square footage of buildings which meet structural criteria and/or perimeter standoff criteria?
  - Is there adequate space available for Entry Control Points to have vehicle search, holding areas, and rejection lanes?
  - Is the installation supported by an electric, water or gas utility (government or commercial) that is a single point source (no redundant capability)?
- **Locality Cost**
  - What is the relative value of the locality cost?
- **Supply and Storage**
  - What is the distance from your activity to the nearest Fleet and Industrial Supply Center?

PROPOSED

Environment and Encroachment Questions

- **Dredging**
  - Are there known impediments to conducting dredging operations?
- **Land Constraints**
  - Do land constraints at the installation and its outlying real property restrict current operations?
- **Encroachment**
  - Are operations hindered by external encroachments?
- **Environmental Costs**
  - What are the costs associated with conducting the installation's environmental program?

PROPOSED

Environment and Encroachment Questions

- **Waste Disposal**
  - What is the installation's capacity to dispose of solid or hazardous waste?
- **Potable Water**
  - Are potable water resources constrained?
- **Marine Mammals/Resources/Sanctuaries**
  - Are in-water operations or testing/training activities conducted at the installation or at ranges that the installation manages restricted due to environmental laws/regulations?
- **Air Quality**
  - Does the installation have air quality control issues due to current or proposed regulations?

PROPOSED

Personnel Support (QOL) Questions

- **Medical / Dental**
  - Is your activity within a medical catchment area of an inpatient military medical treatment facility?
- **Housing**
  - Is your activity located in a Critical Housing Area?
  - What was the average wait time (in months) of family housing at your installation as of 30 September 2003?
  - What is the total number of ADEQUATE Bachelor Quarters (combined officer and enlisted) at your installation?
  - What was the daily average Bachelor Quarter occupancy rate for the past five years (99-03) at your installation?
  - What is the average commute time for those living off base?

PROPOSED

Personnel Support (QOL) Questions

- **Non-Military Education**
  - How many undergraduate and graduate colleges/universities are available off-base in your community?
  - Does your state offer in-state tuition for higher education for military members/military family members?
  - What is your community's average SAT/ACT score?
  - What is your community's student/teacher ratio?
  - What percent of classroom teachers in your community are certified in their subject/core area?
  - How many vocational/technical schools are available off base in your community?
- **Spouse Employment**
  - What was the average number of persons unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force, seasonally adjusted from 1995-2003?
  - What was the percentage change in job growth from 1995-2003?

PROPOSED

Personnel Support (QOL) Questions

- **Fleet & Family Services**
  - Does your installation have on base services (NEX, DECA, Package Store, FSC, Chapel, FSC Auditorium)?
  - Does your installation have adequate child care support?
- **MWR**
  - Does your installation have listed MWR Facilities?
- **Follow-on Tour Opportunities**
  - Describe the follow-on tour opportunities for the top five sea intensive ratings at your installation.
- **Metropolitan Area Characteristics**
  - What is the distance in miles to the nearest population center/city that has a population greater than 100,000?
  - What is the distance in miles to the nearest commercial airport that offers regularly scheduled service by a major airline carrier?
  - What is the FBI Crime Index for your activity's location?

PROPOSED

Attribute Weighting

With the Selection Criteria having been Weighted previously, the attributes must now be weighted as they apply to each Selection Criteria.

Selection Criteria (SC) / Weighting / Attribute	Readiness	Facilities	Mobilization	Cost	TOTAL 100
Operational Infrastructure					
Operational Training					
Port Characteristics					
Environment & Encroachment					
Personnel Support (QOL)					
	100	100	100	100	100

IEG Determines Attribute weights for each Selection Criteria

Question Matrix

Step 1: Review, modify and approve the the question band

- **The IAT placed questions in one of three "bands" based on relative importance within the attribute.**

Step 2: Assign a score (1-10) under general guideline

- **Band 1: 6 – 10**
- **Band 2: 3 – 7**
- **Band 3: 1 – 4**

Step 3: Assign the question to Selection Criteria / Attribute Pair

- **Questions should apply to "parent" attribute.**
- **It is possible that a question also applies to another attribute.**

Break

IAT will complete preliminary scoring sheet and display results for IEG review

Backup

OSD Final Selection Criteria #1

- ***"The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the Department of Defense's total force including impacts on joint warfighting, training and readiness."***
- **Referred to as "Readiness" with the abbreviation "R" in BRAC 1995 deliberative documents.**

back

OSD Final Selection Criteria #2

- ***"The availability and condition of land, facilities and associated airspace (including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations."***
- **Referred to as "Facilities" with the abbreviation "F" in BRAC 1995 deliberative documents.**

back

OSD Final Selection Criteria #3

- ***"The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations and training."***
- **Referred to as "Mobilization and Capability" with the abbreviation "M" in BRAC 1995 deliberative documents.**

back

OSD Final Selection Criteria #4

- ***"The cost of operations and the manpower implications."***
- **Referred to as Cost and Manpower with the abbreviation "C" BRAC 1995 deliberative documents.**

back

SURFACE / SUBSURFACE FUNCTION MILITARY VALUE MATRIX (NOTIONAL)

MV Matrix #	Supporting Question(s)	Data Call	DC Quest(s)	IAT Band	Matrix Question	IEG Score	Readiness					Facilities					Mobilizatio			
ATTRIBUTE - Attribute Weight							OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	E
Component							0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OPERATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE				0																
Ship Berthing																				
1	SEA-1			1	What is the maximum combined CG Equivalent (CGE) capacity for your activity's piers / wharfs?															
2	SEA-2			1	How many CVNs can you berth at your activity in cold iron status?															
3	SEA-3			1	How many SSBNs can you berth at your activity in cold iron status?															
4	SEA-4a			2	What is the relative condition of the piers at your activity?															
Ship Maintenance																				
5	SEA-5a-c			2	What is the relative value of the supporting SIMA in terms of proximity, capability and capacity?															
6	SEA-6a-c			2	What is the relative value of the the available drydocks in the harbor complex?															
7	SEA-7			2	What is the distance (safe navigation route) from your pier / wharf complex to the nearest nuclear capable shipyard?															
8	SEA-8			3	Is there a degaussing range in the natural harbor complex? (y/n)															
9	SEA-9			3	Is there a deperming facility in the natural harbor complex? (y/n)															
10	SEA-10			3	What is the maximum lift tonnage for any individual pier-side capable crane at your activity? (Tonnage)															
Security / Emergency Services																				
11	SEA-11			2	Does the activity have specialized security / emergency services capabilities?															
Unique/Specialized Capabilities																				
12	SEA-12a			1	Does the activity perform / possess unique capabilities or missions?															
13	SEA-13a-c			2	Does the activity perform / possess specialized capabilities or missions?															
Weapons Handling																				
14	SEA-14			2	What is the combined maximum ordnance handling pier capacity for your waterfront piers / wharfs? (Count)															
15	SEA-15			3	Does your activity have any on-location Ordnance Magazines?															
Operational Staff Facilities																				
16	SEA-16			3	What is the total square footage of ADEQUATE administrative space at your activity? (SQR FT)															
					Question Total															

SURFACE / SUBSURFACE FUNCTION MILITARY VALUE MATRIX (NOTIONAL)

MV Matrix #	Supporting Question(s)	Data Call	DC Quest(s)	IAT Band	Matrix Question	IEG Score	Readiness					Facilities					Mobilizatio			
ATTRIBUTE - Attribute Weight							OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	E
Component							0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OPERATIONAL TRAINING				0																
Training Facilities																				
17	SEA-17			2	What is the distance to the nearest shipboard firefighting training facility? (Distance: miles)															
18	SEA-18			2	What is the distance to the nearest damage control training facility? (Distance: miles)															
19	SEA-19			2	What is the distance to the nearest submarine handling training facility? (Distance: miles)															
20	SEA-20			2	Does the activity possess any of selected unique training capabilities?															
21	SEA-21			3	What is the distance to the nearest ship handling training facility? (Distance: miles)															
22	SEA-22			3	What is the annual throughput for all "C" and "F" schools located within 50 miles of your activity?															
OPAREAS/Ranges																				
23	SEA-23			2	What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest anti-air warfare range? (Distance: nautical miles)															
24	SEA-24			2	What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest naval gunnery qualification range? (Distance: nautical miles)															
25	SEA-25			2	What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest submarine operating area? (Distance: nautical miles)															
26	SEA-26			2	What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest mine warfare training area? (Distance: nautical miles)															
27	SEA-27			2	What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest submarine training range? (Distance: nautical miles)															
Small Arms Training																				
28	SEA-28			3	What is the maximum throughput of your activity's small arms range? (qualifications/year)															
					Question Total															

SURFACE / SUBSURFACE FUNCTION MILITARY VALUE MATRIX (NOTIONAL)

MV Matrix #	Supporting Question(s)	Data Call	DC Quest(s)	IAT Band	Matrix Question	IEG Score	Readiness					Facilities					Mobilizatio			
ATTRIBUTE - Attribute Weight							OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	E
Component							0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PORT CHARACTERISTICS				0																
Operational Location																				
29	SEA-29			2	What is the channel distance (safe navigation route) to sea? (Distance: nautical miles)															
30	SEA-30			2	What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the 50 fathom curve? (Distance: nautical miles)															
31	SEA-31			2	What percent of the day (averaged for FY03) would your harbor channel allow CV/CVN transits? (%)															
32	SEA-32a-b			2	What is the relative impact of weather on operations at your port's location?															
33	SEA-33			3	What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest weapons station? (Distance: nautical miles)															
34	SEA-34			3	What is the distance to the nearest Explosive Ordnance Detachment support? (Distance: miles)															
Strategic Location																				
35	SEA-35			1	Is the port location of strategic military value? (yes/no)															
Port Restrictions																				
36	SEA-36a-c			1	What is the relative impact of port / harbor restrictions on operations?															
Anti-Terror/Force Prot																				
37	SEA-37a-b			3	What is the total square footage of buildings which meet structural criteria and/or perimeter standoff criteria?															
38	SEA-38			3	Is there adaquate space available for Entry Control Points to have vehicle search, holding areas, and rejection lanes?															
39	SEA-39			3	Is the installation supported by an electric, water or gas utility (government or commercial) that is a single point source (no redundant capability)?															
Locality Cost																				
40	SEA-40a-b			3	What is the relative value of the locality cost?															
Supply and Storage																				
41	SEA-41			3	What is the distance from your activity to the nearest Fleet and Industrial Supply Center? (Distance: miles)															
					Question Total															

SURFACE / SUBSURFACE FUNCTION MILITARY VALUE MATRIX (NOTIONAL)

MV Matrix #	Supporting Question(s)	Data Call	DC Quest(s)	IAT Band	Matrix Question	IEG Score	Readiness					Facilities					Mobilizatio			
ATTRIBUTE - Attribute Weight							OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	E
Component							0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
ENVIRONMENT & ENCROACHMENT				0																
Dredging																				
42	ENV-1a-c			1	Are there known impediments to conducting dredging operations?															
Land Constraints																				
43	ENV-2a-g			2	Do land constraints at the installation and its outlying real property restrict current operations?															
Encroachment																				
44	ENV-3a-d			2	Are operations hindered by external encroachments?															
Environmental Costs																				
45	ENV-4a-b			2	What are the costs associated with conducting the installation's environmental program?															
Waste Disposal																				
46	ENV-5a-c			2	What is the installation's capacity to dispose of solid or hazardous waste?															
Potable Water																				
47	ENV-6a-b			2	Are potable water resources constrained?															
Marine Mammals/Resources/Sanctuaries																				
48	ENV-7a-c			2	Are in-water operations or testing/training activities conducted at the installation or at ranges that the installation manages restricted due to environmental laws/regulations?															
Air Quality																				
49	ENV-8a-h			3	Does the installation have air quality control issues due to current or proposed regulations?															
					Question Total															

SURFACE / SUBSURFACE FUNCTION MILITARY VALUE MATRIX (NOTIONAL)

MV Matrix #	Supporting Question(s)	Data Call	DC Quest(s)	IAT Band	Matrix Question	IEG Score	Readiness					Facilities					Mobilizatio			
ATTRIBUTE - Attribute Weight							OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	E
Component							0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
PERSONNEL SUPPORT/QOL				0																
Medical																				
50	PS-1			1	Is your activity within the medical catchment area of an in-patient military medical treatment facility?															
Housing																				
51	PS-2			1	Is your activity located in a Critical Housing Area? (y/n)															
52	PS-3			2	What was the average wait time (in months) of family housing at your installation as of 30 September 2003?															
53	PS-4			3	What is the total number of ADEQUATE Bachelor Quarters (combined officer and enlisted) at your installation?															
54	PS-5			3	What was the daily average Bachelor Quarter occupancy rate for the past five years (1999-2003) at your installation? (Rooms occupied per day / Total rooms available)															
55	PS-6			3	What was the average commute time for those living off base (source: Census Bureau) (Time: minutes)															
Non-Military Education																				
56	PS-7			2	How many undergraduate and graduate colleges/universities are available off-base in your community?															
57	PS-8			2	Does your state offer in-state tuition for higher education for military members/military family members?															
58	PS-9			3	What is your community's average SAT/ACT score?															
59	PS-10			3	What is your community's student/teacher ratio?															
60	PS-11			3	What percent of classroom teachers in your community are certified in their subject/core area?															
61	PS-12			3	How many vocational/technical schools are available off base in your community?															
Spouse Employment																				
62	PS-13			3	What was the average number of persons unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force, seasonally adjusted from 1995-2003?															
63	PS-14			3	What was the percentage change in job growth from 1995-2003?															
Fleet and Family Services																				
64	PS-15a			1	Does your installation have on base services (NEX, DECA, Package Store, FSC, Chapel, FSC Auditorium)?															
65	PS-16a-c			3	Does your installation have adequate child-care support?															
MWR																				

SURFACE / SUBSURFACE FUNCTION MILITARY VALUE MATRIX (NOTIONAL)

MV Matrix #	Supporting Question(s)	Data Call	DC Quest(s)	IAT Band	Matrix Question	IEG Score	Readiness					Facilities					Mobilizati			
ATTRIBUTE - Attribute Weight							OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	E
Component							0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
66	PS-17a			1	Does your installation have listed MWR Facilities?															
Follow-on-Tour Opportunities																				
67	PS-18			2	Describe the follow-on tour opportunities for the top five sea intensive ratings at your installation.															
Metropolitan Area Characteristics																				
68	PS-19			3	What is the distance in miles to the nearest population center/city that has a population greater than 100,000?															
69	PS-20			3	What is the distance in miles to the nearest commercial airport that offers regularly scheduled service by a major airline carrier?															
70	PS-21			3	What is the FBI Crime Index for your activities location?															
					Question Total															

SURFACE/SUB-SURFACE FUNCTION TOTAL

All Questions Total

0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	EE	PS	OI	OT	PC	E	
Readiness					Facilities					Mobilizati				

Surface / Subsurface Operations
Military Value Evaluation Questions

Attribute: ***Operational Infrastructure***

Component: Ship Berthing

SEA-1. What is the maximum combined CG Equivalent (CGE) capacity for your activity's piers / wharfs? (CGEs)

SEA-2. How many CVNs can you berth at your activity in cold iron status? (Count)

SEA-3. How many SSBNs can you berth at your activity in cold iron status? (Count)

SEA-4. What is the relative condition of the piers at your activity?

SEA-4a. What is the combined total linear feet of berthing for your piers / wharfs in the following categories:

Adequate Linear Feet	Substandard Linear Feet	Inadequate Linear Feet

Attribute: ***Operational Infrastructure***

Component: Ship Maintenance Capability

SEA-5a-c. What is the relative value of the supporting SIMA in terms of proximity, capability and capacity?

SEA-5a. What is the distance from your pier / wharf complex to the nearest Shore Intermediate Maintenance Activity (SIMA)? (Distance: miles)

SEA-5b. Is your nearest SIMA nuclear capable? (y/n)

SEA-5c. For your supporting SIMA, what is your combined Ship Maintenance Commodity Group Capacity Index for FY03? (DLH)

SEA-6a-c. What is the relative value of the available drydocks in the harbor complex?

SEA-6a. How many floating drydocks in your immediate harbor complex (waterfront controlled by your activity)? (Count)

SEA-6b. How many NAVSEA certified commercial drydocks are within your *natural* harbor complex? (Count)

SEA-6c. How many Navy graving drydocks are in your natural harbor complex? (Count)

SEA-7. What is the distance (safe navigation route) from your pier / wharf complex to the nearest nuclear capable shipyard? (Distance: nautical miles)

SEA-8. Is there a degaussing range in the natural harbor complex? (y/n)

SEA-9. Is there a deperming facility in the natural harbor complex? (y/n)

SEA-10. What is the maximum lift tonnage for any individual pier-side capable crane at your activity? (Tonnage)

Attribute: ***Operational Infrastructure***

Component: Security / Emergency Services

SEA-11. Does the activity have specialized security / emergency service capabilities: (y/n)

Nuclear Weapons Handling (y/n)	Radiological Accident Response (y/n)

Attribute: ***Operational Infrastructure***

Component: Unique or Specialized Capabilities / Missions

SEA-12. Does the activity perform/possess unique capabilities or missions?

SEA-12a. List and describe any unique capabilities or missions performed by your activity. Unique is defined as a capability or mission performed at no other location.

Capability/Mission	Description

SEA-13a-c. Does the activity perform/possess specialized capabilities or missions:

SEA-13a. Does your activity perform any of the following missions: (y/n)

Strategic Deterrence Missions (y/n)	SEAL/Explosive Ordnance Disposal (y/n)	Surveillance / Drug Interdiction (y/n)	Direct METOC Support (y/n)

SEA-13b. Does your base have a specialized Mine Warfare capability? (y/n)

SEA-13c. Does your base have a specialized Landing Craft (displacement or non-displacement) capability? (y/n)

Attribute: ***Operational Infrastructure***

Component: Weapons Handling Capability

SEA-14. What is the combined maximum ordnance handling pier capacity for your waterfront piers / wharfs? (Count)

SEA-15. Does your activity have any on-location ordnance magazines? (y/n)

Attribute: ***Operational Infrastructure***

Component: Operational Staff Facilities

SEA-16. What is the total square footage of ADEQUATE administrative space at your activity? (SQR FT)

Attribute: ***Operational Training***

Component: Training Facilities

SEA-17. What is the distance to the nearest shipboard firefighting training facility? (Distance: miles)

SEA-18. What is the distance to the nearest damage control training facility? (Distance: miles)

SEA-19. What is the distance to the nearest submarine handling training facility? (Distance: miles)

SEA-20. List any unique operational training facilities at your activity (defined as facility which exists at no other location).

Facility Title (text)	Specific Location (text)	Training Objective (text)

SEA-21. What is the distance to the nearest ship handling training facility? (Distance: miles)

SEA-22. What is the annual throughput for all "C" and "F" schools located within 50 miles of your activity?

Attribute: ***Operational Training***

Component: OPAREAs / Ranges

SEA-23. What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest anti-air warfare range? (Distance: nautical miles)

SEA-24. What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest naval gunnery qualification range? (Distance: nautical miles)

SEA-25. What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest submarine operating area? (Distance: nautical miles)

SEA-26. What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest mine warfare training area? (Distance: nautical miles)

SEA-27. What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest submarine training range? (Distance: nautical miles)

Attribute: ***Operational Training***

Component: Small Arms Training

SEA-28. What is the maximum throughput of your activity's small arms range? (qualifications/year)

SEA-29. What is the channel distance (safe navigation route) to sea? (Distance: nautical miles)

SEA-30. What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the 50 fathom curve? (Distance: nautical miles)

SEA-31. What percent of the day (averaged for FY03) would your harbor channel allow CV/CVN transits? (%)

SEA-32a-b. What is the relative impact of weather on operations at your port's location?

SEA-32a. In the table below provide the percent of ship underways and arrivals delayed more than three hours due to weather.

	% Delay CY00	% Delay CY01	% Delay CY02	% Delay CY03
JAN				

FEB				
MAR				
APR				
MAY				
JUN				
JUL				
AUG				
SEP				
OCT				
NOV				
DEC				

SEA-32b. In the table below, provide the number of days inport lost due to weather related emergency sorties.

	CY00	CY01	CY02	CY03
# of Days Lost				

SEA-33. What is the transit distance (safe navigation route) to the nearest weapons station? (Distance: nautical miles)

Attribute: ***Port Characteristics***

Component: Operational Location

SEA-34. What is the distance to the nearest Explosive Ordnance Detachment support? (Distance: miles)

Attribute: ***Port Characteristics***

Component: Strategic Location

SEA-35. Is the port location of strategic military value? (yes/no; To be determined by IEG)

Attribute: ***Port Characteristics***

Component: Port Restrictions

SEA-36a-c. What is the relative impact of port/harbor restrictions on operations?

SEA-36a. What percent of the week (averaged over FY03) was your harbor's operations limited due to dredging restrictions? (%)

SEA-36b. What is your harbor's minimum MLLW along the channel from your pier / wharf complex to sea? (Depth: fathoms)

SEA-36c. In the table below, list additional harbor restriction factors and the average % operation time lost per week for FY03. (Text / Percentage)

Attribute: ***Port Characteristics***

Component: Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection

SEA-37a-b. What is the total square footage of buildings which meet structural criteria and/or perimeter standoff criteria?

SEA-37a. What total square footage of your buildings comply with structural criteria (frame, walls, glazing, etc.) contained in DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings (UFC 4-010-01)?

SEA-37b. What total square footage of your buildings meet the minimum perimeter standoff distance distances as specified in DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings (UFC 4-010-01)?

SEA-38. Is adequate space available for all Entry Control Points (ECPs) to have vehicle search, holding areas, and rejection lanes as specified in UFC 4-010-01?

SEA-39. Is the installation supported by an electric, water or gas utility (government or commercial) that is a single point source (no redundant capability)?

Attribute: ***Port Characteristics***

Component: Locality Cost

SEA-40a-b. What is the relative value of locality cost?

SEA-40a: What is the GS Locality Pay percentage for your activity's geographical area? (%)

SEA-40b. What is your host installation's Area Cost Factor (ACF) as described in the DoD Facilities Pricing Guide? (Number)

Attribute: ***Port Characteristics***

Component: Supply and Storage

SEA-41. What is the distance from your activity to the nearest Fleet and Industrial Supply Center? (Distance: miles)

Attribute: ***Environment and Encroachment***

Component: Dredging

ENV-1a-c. Are there known impediments to conducting dredging operations?

ENV-1a. Are there known impediments to deepening existing channels (possible structural concerns, etc.)?

ENV-1b. Is a dredge spoil site identified? If so what is the remaining capacity?

ENV-1c. Is dredging activity impacted because of the known or suspected presence of ordnance in the water?

Attribute: ***Environment and Encroachment***

Component: Land Constraints

ENV-2a-g. Do land constraints at the installation and its outlying real property restrict current operations?

ENV-2a. Do any sites with high archeological potential, including sacred, Traditional Cultural Properties, or burial sites used by Native People, constrain current or future construction?

ENV-2b. Do electromagnetic radiation and/or emissions constrain operations?

ENV-2c. Are explosive safety waivers or exemptions in effect?

ENV-2d. Can existing Explosive Safety Quantity Distance (ESQD) arcs be expanded by 100 feet or more without encroaching on non-compatible areas and without requiring a special waiver?
ENV-2e. Has the accommodation of the installation's missions been limited by existing or proposed activities of other military departments or other federal tribal state or local agencies being located on the installation, range or auxiliary field?

ENV-2f. Do wetlands result in restrictions on operations? If so, identify the percent of restricted acres compared to the total acres.

ENV-2g. Are there operational testing/training restrictions as a result of the presence of Threatened and Endangered Species (TES), candidate species, biological opinions or sensitive resource areas? If yes, what percent of land is restricted compared to total acres?

Attribute: ***Environment and Encroachment***

Component: Encroachment

ENV-3a-d. Are operations hindered by external encroachments?

ENV-3a. Have non-DoD parties (through developers, community organizations, etc.) formally requested transfer of DoD real property or proposed restrictions to operational procedures?

ENV-3b. Are there hazardous waste contamination sites located off the installation that restrict or could restrict operations? If so, what is amount of constrained acreage with respect to total acres?

ENV-3c. Have noise abatement procedures been published for the installation, range or auxiliary field?

ENV-3d. Have mission operations been substantially impacted by environmental constraints?

Attribute: ***Environment and Encroachment***

Component: Environmental Costs

ENV-4a-b. What are the costs associated with conducting the installation's environmental program?

ENV-4a. Identify Defense Environmental Restoration Account (DERA) money spent through FY 03, and estimated Cost to Complete (FY04 to completion))

ENV-4b. Excluding DERA funds, provide the average annual total cost of environmental fees, studies, permits, licenses, projects, etc. over the last 3 fiscal years (FY01-03). Provide the annual installation budget over this same period. Divide the environmental costs by the installation budget.

Attribute: ***Environment and Encroachment***

Component: Waste Disposal

ENV-5a-c. What is the installation's capacity to dispose of solid or hazardous waste?

ENV-5a. Does the installation have a permitted hazardous waste Resource Conservation and Recovery (RCRA) Treatment, Storage or Disposal (TSD) facility? If so, does the hazardous waste TSD facility permit allow acceptance of off-site waste?

ENV-5b. If the installation has a permitted solid waste disposal facility, what is the remaining capacity?

ENV-5c. Does the installation have an interim or final RCRA Subpart X permit for operation of an open burning/open detonation facility? If so, does the RCRA Subpart X permit allow acceptance of off-site waste (e.g. from other DoD facilities)?

Attribute: ***Environment and Encroachment***

Component: Potable Water

ENV-6a-b. Are potable water resources constrained?

ENV-6a. Can the existing water system/treatment facility provide 50% more water than current demand?

ENV-6b. How many days during FY 1999-2003 were restrictions implemented that limited production or distribution?

Attribute: ***Environment and Encroachment***

Component: Marine Mammals/Resources/Sanctuaries

ENV-7a-c. Are in-water operations or testing/training activities conducted at the installation or at ranges that the installation manages restricted due to environmental laws/ regulations?

ENV-7a. Do current Endangered Species/Marine Mammal Protection Act restrictions affect shore or in–water operations or testing/training activities conducted at the installation or at a range that the installation manages? If so, how many sq miles are restricted compared to the total.

ENV-7b. Has the presence of coral reefs, marine mammals, Essential Fish Habitat, Marine Protected Areas or other sensitive marine zones resulted in restrictions on operations, testing or training activities? If so, how many sq miles are restricted compared to the total.

ENV-7c. Does the existence of marine sanctuaries restrict operations, testing or training activities conducted on the installation or on ranges the installation manages? If so identify how many sq miles are restricted compared to total area.

Attribute: ***Environment and Encroachment***

Component: Air Quality

ENV-8a-h. Does the installation have air quality control issues due to current or proposed regulations?

ENV-8a. Is the installation, range, or auxiliary field located in an area currently designated non-attainment or maintenance for any criteria pollutant?

ENV-8b. What is the most restrictive classification or designation: attainment, marginal, moderate, maintenance, serious, severe or extreme?

ENV-8c. Is the installation, range, or auxiliary field located in an area proposed to be designated non-attainment for the new 8-Hour ozone or the PM2.5 standard?

ENV-8d. Are emission credits owned by the installation or available for purchase in the area?

ENV-8e. Have operations, testing or training been restricted as a result of air quality requirements?

ENV-8f. Has the installation been required to implement emission reduction procedures through special actions?

ENV-8g. Are there critical air quality regions within 100 statute miles of the installation that restrict operations?

ENV-8h. Do the Clean Air Act (CAA) operating permits have any unused capacity?

Attribute: *Personnel Support*

Component: Medical / Dental

PS-1. Is your activity within the medical catchment area of an in-patient military medical treatment facility? (yes/no)

Attribute: *Personnel Support*

Component: Housing

PS-2. Is your activity located in a Critical Housing Area? (yes/no)

PS-3. What was the average wait time (in months) for family housing at your installation as of 30 September 2003?

$$\text{Avg Wait Time} = \frac{(\text{List}_1 \text{ Wait Time x List}_1 \text{ Units}) + (\text{List}_2 \text{ Wait Time x List}_2 \text{ Units}) + \ldots}{\text{Total Housing Units}}$$

PS-4. What is the total number of ADEQUATE Bachelor Quarters (combined officer and enlisted) at your installation? (Count: rooms)

PS-5. What was the daily average Bachelor Quarter occupancy rate for the past five years (1999-2003) at your installation? (Rooms occupied per day / Total rooms available)

PS-6. What is the average commute time for those living off base (source: Census Bureau)? (Time: minutes)

Attribute: *Personnel Support*

Component: Non-Military Education

PS-7. How many undergraduate or graduate colleges/universities are available off-base in your community? (count)

PS-8. Does your state offer in-state tuition for higher education for military members/military family members? (yes/no)

PS-9. What was the average SAT/ACT score for high school students in your community last testing year? (numeric)

PS-10. What is your community's student/teacher ratio? (%)

PS-11. What percent of classroom teachers in your community are certified in their subject/core area? (%)

PS-12. How many vocational/technical schools are available off base in your community? (count)

Attribute: *Personnel Support*

Component: Spouse Employment

PS-13. What was the average number of persons unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force, seasonally adjusted from 1995-2003? (%)

PS-14. What was the percentage change in job growth from 1995-2003? (%)

Attribute: *Personnel Support*

Component: Military Family Services

PS-15. Does your installation have on base services (NEX, DECA, Package Store, FSC, Chapel, FSC Auditorium)?

PS-15a. Which Support Services facilities are located at your installation? (y/n)

FACILITY	Available (yes/no)
Exchange	
Commissary	
Package Store	
Family Service Center	
Chapel	
FSC Classroom/Auditorium	

PS-16a-c. Does your activity have adequate child care support?

PS-16a. How many licensed and/or accredited child care centers do you have?

PS-16b. What is the average cost in a licensed/accredited child care center for a child birth-three years old?

PS-16c. What is the average wait to enroll (in days) for on-base child care? (Count: days)

Attribute: ***Personnel Support***

Component: MWR

PS-17. Are MWR facilities located at your activity?

PS-17a. Which MWR facilities are located at your installation? (y/n)

FACILITY	Available (yes/no)
Auto Hobby	
Arts/Crafts	
Wood Hobby	
Bowling	
Enlisted Club	
Officer Club	
Library	
Theater	
ITT	
Museum/Memorial	
Pool (indoor)	
Pool (outdoor)	
Beach	
Swimming Ponds	

Tennis CT	
Volleyball CT (outdoor)	
Basketball CT (outdoor)	
Racquetball CT	
Golf Course	
Driving Range	
Gymnasium	
Fitness Center	
Marina	
Stables	
Softball Fld	
Football Fld	
Soccer Fld	
Youth Center	

Attribute: ***Personnel Support***

Component: Follow-on Tour Opportunites

PS-18. For the top five sea intensive ratings in the principle warfare community your base supports, provide the following: (Text: Counts)

Rating	# of Sea Billets in Local Area	#of Shore Billets in Local Area

Attribute: ***Personnel Support***

Component: Metropolitan Area Characteristics

PS-19. What is the distance in miles to the nearest population center/city that has a population greater than 100,000?

PS-20. What is the distance in miles to the nearest commercial airport that offers regularly scheduled service by a major airline carrier?

PS-21. What is the FBI Crime Index for your activity's location? (source: FBI Crime Index 2002; http://www.fbi.gov/ucr/ucr.htm) (Numeric)

IEG Question Scoring Bands

Band 1: 6 to 10 points
Band 2: 3 to 7 points
Band 3: 1 to 4 points