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

DCN:5494

MN-0102
IAT/JAN
01 April 2004

MEMORANDUM

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 25 MARCH 2004

Encl: (1) 25 March 2004 IEG Meeting Agenda
(2) Notional Targeted Activities for Surface/Subsurface
(3) OSD Final Selection Criteria Handout
(4) Recording Secretary's Report of IEG Deliberations on 25 March 2004 with enclosures

1. The twentieth meeting of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) was convened at 0900 on 25 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; VADM Charles W. Moore, Jr., USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4), Member; CAPT Mark Anthony, USN, Deputy Director Fleet Training (N7A), 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; LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (I&L), Member; 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; 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. RADM Mark T. Emerson, USN, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Aviation (AVN), serving as an alternate for LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Aviation (AVN), Member, entered the meeting at 0908. Dr. Michael F. McGrath, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research Development Test & Evaluation (DASN(RDT&E)), Member, entered the meeting at 0919.

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 25 MARCH 2004

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; LtCol Paul J. Warhola, USMC; LCDR Daniel Frost, USN; LCDR Brian D. Miller, USNR; LCDR Steven J. Cincotta, USN; and LCDR Timothy Cowan, CEC, USN. All attendees were provided enclosures (1) through (3). Ms. Davis presented the minutes from the 19 March 2004 IEG meeting for review and they were approved.

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

(a) ISG/JCSGs. The Intelligence data call has been promulgated as a discrete data call of 17 questions to a finite set of DoN activities. The Intel data call will utilize the Joint Worldwide Intelligence Communications Systems (JWICS) due to the possibility that the data call responses, individually or collectively, may be classified. The IAT is continuing quality assurance checks on the capacity data call. The data from the capacity data call will be certified by the IAT and provided to the JCSGs by 5 April. DoN has completed initial comments on the military value data call. OSD has synthesized and forwarded the comments from the Services to the JCSGs; the final reports will be issued by the JCSGs this week. The first report was due Monday, 22 March. As of 25 March, no reports had been received. The Services are allotted seven days to provide additional comment with a scheduled due date of Tuesday, 30 March.

(b) Policy Imperatives. SECNAV signed a tasker on 16 March for CNO and CMC to formulate DoN policy imperatives. A similar tasker from OSD is expected requesting overarching policy concerns (equivalent to what DoN would view as constraints) from the Services. The IAT will coordinate the Navy and Marine Corps response to the OSD taskers.

4. The IEG moved into deliberative session at 0910. See enclosure (4). The next meeting of the IEG is scheduled for Thursday, 01 April 2004. The meeting adjourned at 1255.

H T Johnson

H. T. JOHNSON
Chairman, IEG

Infrastructure Evaluation Group

25 Mar 2004
0900-1300
Crystal Plaza 6

Meeting called by:	Chairman	Recorder:	Capt Noel

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

Review and approve minutes of IEG Meeting of 19 Mar 04	Ms. Davis

Status Updates:
• ISG/JCSGs
  o 14 day comments complete
  o 30 day JCSG Final MV report to OSD
  o 30 Mar ISG Coordination
  o 2 Apr Integration meeting (except Intel)
  o Formal coordination of MV Reports
	Ms Davis

• Policy imperatives tasker signed	Ms Davis

• Deliberative Session
  o Complete Surface/Subsurface Operations
  o Develop structure and weighting for Ground Operations
	All

Administrative

- Next meeting Thursday 1 Apr 04, 0930-1230
- Meeting location Crystal Plaza 6, 9th Floor

Other Information

Draft minutes of 19 mar IEG meeting provided.
Read ahead for deliberative discussions.

Notional Targeted Activities for Surface/Subsurface Function

Naval Base Coronado*
Naval Base Pt Loma
Naval Base Ventura County*
Naval Station Agana, Guam
Naval Amphib Base Little Creek*
Naval Shipyard Norfolk
Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor
Naval Shipyard Portsmouth
Naval Shipyard Puget Sound
Naval Weapon Station Charleston
Naval Weapon Station Concord
Naval Weapon Station Earl
Naval Weapon Station Seal Beach
Naval Weapon Station Yorktown
Naval Station Bremerton
Naval Station Everett
Naval Station Ingleside
Naval Station Mayport*
Naval Station Newport
Naval Station Norfolk*
Naval Station Pascagoula
Naval Station Pearl Harbor
Naval Station San Diego
Subase Bangor
Subase Kings Bay
Subase New London
Subase San Diego

*Indicates multiple Operations functions at an installation

OSD Final Selection Criteria

Final Selection Criterion #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.

Final Selection Criterion #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.

Final Selection Criterion #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.

Final Selection Criterion #4:

The cost of operations and the manpower implications.

Referred to as Cost and Manpower with the abbreviation "C" BRAC 1995 deliberative documents.

RP-0103
IAT/JAN
30 March 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INFRASTRUTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 25 MARCH 2004

Encl: (1) IAT Military Value Weighting Brief for Surface/Subsurface Operations Functions of 25 March 2004
(2) Surface/Subsurface Operations Military Value Evaluation Questions
(3) Surface/Subsurface Function Military Value Matrices
(4) IAT Military Value Weighting Brief for Naval Ground Force Operations of 25 March 2004
(5) Naval Ground Operations Military Value Evaluation Questions
(6) Naval Ground Operations Military Value Matrices

1. The fourth deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) convened at 0910 on 25 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; VADM Charles W. Moore, Jr., USN, Member; CAPT Mark Anthony, USN, alternate for VADM Albert H. Konetzni, USN, Member; LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member; RADM Mark T. Emerson, USN, alternate for LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Member; Dr. Russ Beland, Member; Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service (NAVAUDSVC), Representative; and Mr. Thomas N. Ledvina, Navy Office of General Counsel (OGC) Representative. Dr. Michael F. McGrath, Member, entered the session at 0919. The following IAT members were present: Mr. Dennis Biddick; Mr. David W. LaCroix; CAPT Chris T. Nichols, USN; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; CDR Carl Deputy, USN; LtCol Terri Erdag, USMC; LtCol Robert R. Mullins, USMCR; LCDR Daniel Frost, USN; LCDR Brian D. Miller, USNR; LCDR Steven J. Cincotta, USN; LCDR Timothy Cowan, CEC, USN; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC.

2. Ms. Davis reviewed the issues raised and decisions made by the IEG during the 19 March 2004 deliberative session using enclosure (1). She noted that the objective of this deliberative session was to complete the Military Value Scoring Plan for the Surface/Subsurface Operations Function and to develop a complete Military Value Scoring Plan for the Naval

Ground Forces Operations Function. As directed by the IEG at the last deliberative session, the IAT reconstructed roll-up questions SEA-15 and SEA-38 and presented them to the IEG for consideration. The IEG approved reconstructed roll-up questions SEA-15 and SEA-38. See enclosure (2).

3. CAPT Nichols and the IAT Operations Team members provided proposed Surface/Subsurface Operations Military Value Evaluation Questions for the Personnel Support (PS) attribute and its components. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the proposed scoring statements and roll-up questions in this area had been revised by the IAT to address issues previously raised by the IEG. See enclosure (1). The IEG concurred with the IAT's recommended resolution to these issues. Except as noted below, the IEG approved the scoring statements and roll-up questions, including apportionment where necessary, for the PS attribute. See enclosure (2).

a) Housing. The IEG recognized the importance of housing issues to DON leadership and noted that bachelor-housing issues are as important as family housing issues. The IEG directed that scoring statements 53 (PS-2) (family housing) and 54 (PS-3) (bachelor housing) be treated equally with identical roll-up questions. The IAT will reconstruct the roll-up questions for approval by the IEG at the next deliberative session.

b) Non-Military Education. The IEG raised a concern that the measurements used in the roll-up question, e.g., average SAT/ACT scores, were appropriate and consistent with Department of Education (DOE) standards. Ms. Davis asked Ms. Nanci Bowers, IAT member working on the criteria 7 Joint Process Action Team (JPAT), to elaborate on the rationale for scoring statements 55 (PS-4) and 56 (PS-5). The JPAT consists of representatives from the Services. Ms. Bowers entered the session at 1000 and indicated that the roll-up questions were developed targeting a measurement (i.e., SAT/ACT scores) for local high schools after discussion with experts from the DOE's National Center for Education Statistics. The IAT will reconstruct the roll-up questions for consideration by the IEG at a future deliberative session.

c) Employment. The IEG expressed concern about an activity's ability to obtain data necessary to answer the roll-up questions and that they did not adequately measure the quality of available employment. Ms. Bowers provided background for scoring statement 57 (PS-6), indicating that the intent of the JPAT is to provide a credible source, the Bureau of Labor

website, for an activity to obtain the required data. In light of the IEG's concern that roll-up question 57b (PS-6b) did not capture the quality of available employment, the IAT will address the issue with the JPAT, and provide updated information concerning the background and rationale for the question to the office of the DASN(MA&A). The IAT will reconstruct the roll-up questions for consideration by the IEG at a future deliberative session. Ms. Bowers departed from the session at 1022.

d) Fleet and Family Services. The IEG modified roll-up question 58 (PS-7) directing the following relative values for support services: Exchange - 0.2, Commissary - 0.4, Convenience store - 0.1, Family Service Center (includes FSC classroom/ auditorium) - 0.2, and Chapel - 0.1.

e) MWR. The IEG directed the IAT to reassign the relative values for the listed MWR facilities in roll-up question 60 (PS-9). The IAT will present a reconstructed list of MWR facilities at the next deliberative session.

4. After the IEG approved the scoring statements for PS attribute and its components, it placed the scoring statements in one of three bands (Band 1, 2, or 3 in descending order of importance). Except as noted below, the IEG approved the IAT recommended band placements for the PS attribute. See enclosure (3).

a) Medical. The IEG concluded that location of an in-patient medical treatment facility within the medical catchment was less of an operational concern and changed the IAT suggested scoring band from 1 to 2 for scoring statement 52 (PS-1).

b) Housing. For the same rationale stated in paragraph 3a, the IEG changed the IAT suggested scoring band from 2 to 1 for scoring statement 54 (PS-3).

c) Fleet and Family Services. The IEG changed the IAT suggested scoring band from 1 to 2 for scoring statement 58 (PS-7). Noting childcare's importance, the IEG changed the IAT suggested scoring band from 3 to 2 for scoring statement 59 (PS-8)

d) MWR. The IEG changed the IAT suggested scoring band from 1 to 2 for scoring statement 60 (PS-9).

e) Follow-on Tour Opportunities. The IEG observed that enhancement of geographic stability is specifically addressed in

the draft Navy policy imperatives; nonetheless, the IEG changed the IAT suggested scoring band from 2 to 3 for scoring statement 61 (PS-10).

5. After the IEG approved the band placement for the PS attribute and its components, it determined a numerical score for each scoring statement. The numerical score for each scoring statement depended upon its band placement (i.e., Band 1: 6-10; Band 2: 3-7; and Band 3: 1-4). See enclosure (3).

6. The IEG tasked the IAT with preparing suggested assignment of the Surface/Subsurface Operations Function scoring statements with respect to the selection criteria for the IEG's consideration at the next deliberative session.

7. The IEG determined attribute weights as applied to each military value selection criteria for the Surface/Subsurface Operations Function. The IEG determined each attribute's applicability to the selection criteria as indicated on the chart below. See enclosure (1), slide 10.

Selection Criteria (SC)		Readiness		Facilities		Surge Capability		Cost		TOTAL
	Weighting	50		20		15		15		100
Attribute										
Operational Infrastructure		40		35		35		30		
Operational Training		30		35		20		20		
Port Characteristics		20		10		20		10		
Environment & Encroachment		5		0		15		20		
Personnel Support		5		20		10		20		
		100		100		100		100		

Mr. H. T. Johnson, Chair left the session at 1035 and returned at 1045. LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member left the session at 1040.

8. The IEG recessed at 1055 and reconvened at 1105. All IEG members present when the IEG recessed were again present. Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Mr. Thomas N. Ledvina and all IAT members, identified in paragraph 1, with the exception of LtCol Warhola, were present when the IEG reconvened the deliberative session. Additionally, Col Walter B. Hamm, USMC, a member of the IAT, entered the deliberative session at this time.

9. LtCol Erdag, IAT Operations Team, briefed enclosure (4). The IEG agreed to apply the same weights for the Naval Ground

Forces Operations Function as were applied for the Surface/ Subsurface Operations Function:

a) Readiness (R): 50
b) Facilities (F): 20
c) Surge Capabilities (SC): 15
d) Cost and Manpower (C): 15.

10. The IAT proposed identical attributes for the Naval Ground Force Operations Function as had been previously approved by the IEG for the Surface/Subsurface Operations Function, except that Base Characteristics is substituted for Port Characteristics. The IEG approved the following attributes: Operational Infrastructure, Operational Training, Base Characteristics, Environment and Encroachment, and Personal Support (QOL).

11. The IAT proposed components for Naval Ground Operations Functions similar to those previously approved by the IEG for Surface/Subsurface Operations Functions. The IEG approved the components proposed by the IAT. See enclosure (4).

12. LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member returned to the session at 1120.

13. Generally, the IEG applied the same rationale to the Naval Ground Operations Function as it applied for Surface/Subsurface Operations, consequently reaching the same general results. The IAT proposed scoring statements and roll-up questions for the Naval Ground Operations Function. Except as noted below, the IEG approved the proposed scoring statements and roll-up questions, including apportionment where necessary. See enclosure (5).

a) Personnel Support. For this attribute, the IEG approved scoring statements and roll-up questions for Naval Ground Operations Function in an identical manner as approved for Surface/Subsurface Operations Function. Likewise, the IEG directed changes for Surface/Subsurface Operations Function in the Personnel Support attribute, as reflected in paragraph 3 above, will be applied to the Naval Ground Operations Function. See enclosure (5). The IEG directed that Messing should be deleted as a component since all of the Messing function for the Marine Corps is contracted out and therefore not a discriminator between activities.

14. After the IEG approved the scoring statements and roll-up questions for the Naval Ground Force Operations Function

attributes and components, it placed the scoring statements in one of three bands (Band 1, 2, or 3 in descending order of importance). See enclosure (6). Except as noted below, the IEG approved the IAT recommended band placements for the Naval Ground Force Operations Function scoring statements.

a) Training Facilities. The IEG changed the IAT suggested scoring band from 2 to 1 for scoring statement 10 (GRD-10). The IEG changed the IAT suggested scoring band from 1 to 2 for scoring statement 11 (GRD-11).

b) Maneuver/Ranges. Noting the importance of this component, the IEG directed that all scoring statements for this component be placed in scoring band 1.

c) Environment and Encroachment. Following a discussion that environmental and encroachment issues may be more profound for ground operations, the IEG directed scoring statements for ground operations be banded in the same manner as banded for the Surface/Subsurface Operations Function. The IEG directed scoring statements 37 (ENV-2), 38 (ENV-3), and 42 (ENV-7) be changed from band 2 to 1.

d) Personnel Support. For this attribute, the IEG approved bands for the Naval Ground Operations Function in an identical manner as approved for Surface/Subsurface Operations Function. Likewise, the IEG directed changes for Surface/Subsurface Operations Function in the Personnel Support attribute, as reflected in paragraph 4 above, will be applied to the Naval Ground Operations Function. See enclosure (6).

15. After the IEG approved the band placements for the Naval Ground Force Operations Function scoring statements, it gave a numerical score to each scoring statement. The numerical score for each scoring statement depended upon its band placement (i.e., Band 1: 6-10, Band 2: 3-7; and Band 3: 1-4). See enclosure (6).

16. The IEG commented that for roll-up questions addressing unique capabilities/mission, unique training capabilities, and specialized capabilities and missions the IEG would review answers and (1) determine whether the capability or mission is unique or specialized, (2) evaluate its importance, and (3) assign appropriate credit. Additionally, for roll-up questions addressing strategic military value the IEG will apply military judgment to the answers provided to determine strategic military value. The IEG directed the IAT to assign proposed attribute

weighting to the selection criteria for Naval Ground Force Operations for consideration by the IEG at the next deliberative session. The next deliberative session will address final revisions for Surface/Subsurface operations Military Value, completion of the Naval Ground Force Operations Military Value scoring plan, and commencement of the Military Value scoring plan for Aviation Operations Function. The deliberative session adjourned at 1255.

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