



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

DCN:5492

MN-0110  
IAT/REV  
8 April 2004

MEMORANDUM

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)  
MEETING OF 1 APRIL 2004

- Encl: (1) 1 April 2004 IEG Meeting Agenda  
(2) ASN (I&E) memo of 31 March 2004 ICO DON Comments on Final JCSG Military Value Reports  
(3) ASN (I&E) memo of 31 March 2004 ICO DON Comments on Final JCSG Integration Issues  
(4) Recording Secretary's Report of IEG Deliberations on 1 April 2004 with enclosures

1. The twenty-first meeting of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) was convened at 0935 on 1 April 2004 in the Infrastructure Analysis Team (IAT) conference room located at Crystal Plaza 6, 9<sup>th</sup> 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; Ms. Ariane Whittemore, Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4), serving as alternate for VADM Charles W. Moore, Jr., USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4), Member; Mr. 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; LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (I&L), Member; BGen Samuel T. Helland, USMC, Assistant Deputy Commandants for Aviation (AVN), serving as alternate for LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Aviation (AVN), 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; Dr. Michael F. McGrath, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research Development Test & Evaluation (DASN(RDT&E)), Member; Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service (NAVAUDSVC), Representative;

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)  
MEETING OF 01 APRIL 2004

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.

2. Additionally, the following members of the IAT were present: Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff, CAPT Christopher T. Nichols, USN, Operations Team Lead; CAPT Jason A. Leaver, USN; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; LtCol Terri E. Erdag, USMC; LtCol Robert R. Mullins, USMCR; LtCol Paul J. Warhola, USMC; LCDR Daniel L. Frost, USN; LCDR Brian D. Miller, USNR; LCDR Timothy P. Cowan, CEC, USN; and, LCDR Kevin D. Laye, USN. All attendees were provided enclosures (1) through (3). Ms. Davis presented the minutes from the 25 March 2004 IEG meeting for review and they were approved.

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

a. JCSG Military Value Reports. On 31 March 2004, ASN (I&E) provided DON comments on the final JCSG Military Value Reports and Integration issues to OSD. Enclosures (2) and (3) pertain. The Army and Air Force also provided comments to OSD. The ISG will address the Services' comments on these two issues at its 2 April 2004 meeting. It is anticipated that the ISG will establish a formal coordination process in order to resolve outstanding military value issues and finalize the Military Value Data Call by early May.

b. Future ISG Meetings. The Intelligence JCSG will present its proposed military value approach at the 9 April 2004 ISG meeting. On 23 April 2004, the ISG will discuss the development of principles and policy imperatives. Although OSD has not issued a formal tasking to date, the Services anticipate having to develop a list of principles and constraints. In response to SECNAV's directive, CNO and CMC have drafted policy imperatives. The IAT will coordinate efforts to respond to the OSD tasker when issued.

c. Capacity Data Call. The IAT will receive certified data from 779 naval activities, 704 Navy and 75 Marine Corps. The IAT has received the certified data from all Marine Corps activities and expects to receive all of the certified data from Navy activities by close of business today. The IAT is

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)  
MEETING OF 01 APRIL 2004

conducting a quality assurance review of the Capacity Data Call. This review will enable DASN (IS&A) to certify the data and forward it to the JCSGs by 5 April. The IAT will initiate an administrative process to identify and request necessary additional data, ensure data is complete, and resolve data inconsistencies.

d. Naval Audit Service Review. Mr. Ron Booth informed the IEG that the auditors are visiting 60 activities and the auditors have completed approximately 25% of the audit process at each naval activity. The auditors have not identified any systemic issues with the capacity data call response process.

4. The IEG moved into deliberative session at 0945. See enclosure (4). The next meeting of the IEG is scheduled for Thursday, 8 April 2004. The meeting adjourned at 1236.



H. T. JOHNSON  
Chairman, IEG





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

MAR 31 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR ACTING UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY AND LOGISTICS)

SUBJECT: Department of the Navy Comments on Final Joint Cross-Service Military Value Reports

We have conducted a review of the final Joint Cross-Service Group (JCSG) Military Value Reports provided by the Office of the Secretary of Defense on March 25-26, 2004. Many of the concerns noted in our initial review have been addressed by the JCSGs in their reports, and the content and clarity of the reports are improved. However, there are several issues that we feel still warrant resolution, either because they were not addressed by a JCSG or because they have arisen in the report revision. These issues are specifically noted below for the applicable JCSG.

**Technical**

In addressing actions taken in response to the comments on the first report draft, the report notes two actions that must be completed. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Technical and Education and Training JCSGs concerning range evaluation needs to be finalized to define the coordination process between those JCSGs. We also recommended in our initial comments that the JCSG reconsider the assigned weights for Selection Criteria #4 as there are technical areas in which the cost of operations and the manpower implications could be significant factors. The final report notes the JCSG intends to suggest an approach on this issue at the April 2, 2004 Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG). We recommend this approach be provided in advance of the meeting so the ISG principals can assess whether it is responsive to the concerns stated.

The report still does not articulate the rationale for all questions, scoring and weighting (i.e. Future Warfighting Capability, Jointness, Multiple Functions/Capability Areas, and Dual Use Capacity). In particular, differences in scoring and weighting between apparently like sub-functions and similarity in scoring between apparently different sub-functions should be explained. The areas of Air Land Sea & Space (ALSS) and Weapons & Armaments (W&A) are similar and as such the weights and scoring are expected to be comparable, however under S&T in Physical Structure & Equipment a 22 percent variation exists relative to Uniqueness, also for D&A in Synergy a 15 variation exists relative to Jointness with no explanation. If this rationale is contained in deliberative documents, the report could just note that fact.

We continue to have a concern that the question requesting funding plans for "high value warfighting capabilities/technology" may not be available at the same level of detail for all Military Departments. We recommend the JCSG provide a clear definition of the information sought to ensure consistency across the Military Departments.

The JCSG proposes to use contractor personnel data as equivalent to government personnel data (e.g., education, patents, etc.) for purposes of determining military value. We strongly believe this is not appropriate for BRAC purposes because it is not auditable and does not reflect the nature of the government workforce or infrastructure requirements. We request that the contractor data be eliminated from the scoring plan in its entirety. Similarly, the use of externally executed funding as a metric skews the value of activities being analyzed. BRAC is specifically related to infrastructure and support costs and externally executed funding has little relationship to that. We recommend externally executed funding be eliminated, or at least marginalized as a measure of military value.

The current Military Value scoring plan uses percentages vice absolute numbers as a measure of value in certain people-related areas. Test runs of the scoring plan have shown that this method produces irrational results in the analysis. We recommend that the method of measurement be changed to use absolute numbers.

Defense Acquisition Workforce Improvement Act (DAWIA) certification is used as a metric of people's military value for all personnel in the Technical professional community. This provides an inconsistent metric for all the services in the sub-function of Science and Technology, since DON does not require DAWIA certification except for limited numbers of management positions. In this area, DAWIA certification provides little to Military Value and should be eliminated from the scoring plan.

The current Military Value approach has individual military value scores developed for each of the 39 sub-functions. The JCSG needs to understand in advance of their capacity and military value analyses what the model will be solving for. This may necessitate having the ability to score activities both at the sub-functional level and in the aggregate at the activity level, as well developing a methodology of how to score many different combinations of the 39 sub-functions.

### **Medical**

It is not clear from the report alone whether the JCSG has considered the DoD commitments that were made in the Federal Register in response to public comments to the draft selection criteria. The ISG comments to the first draft of the JCSG Military Value reports directed the JCSGs to "review [the Federal Register notice containing commitments on how DoD will interpret and apply the final selection criteria] to determine if such commitments should be built into your military value approach." In order to establish for the record that this step has been accomplished, it would be valuable to have the Medical JCSG include a statement to this effect in either its report or the minutes of its deliberations

### **Supply and Storage**

The JCSG does not appear to have responded to our comment about reassessing military value weights as they apply to capacity, condition and location. Our concern is that the scoring plan may unintentionally favor efficient/effective supply functions without regard to size or

location. Capacity is addressed, but not sufficiently to capture distinct differences in kinds of capacity, while location is only considered as it applies to distribution nodes.

The explanation of the Complexity Factor and how it will be used in analysis is more complete than in the original draft. It will be critical, however, for the directions and definitions included with the data call to be very clear on how activities are to fill in the table that will be used for the Complexity Factor in order to ensure answers are consistent across activities.

Similar to Technical, the JCSG needs to understand in advance of their capacity and military value analyses what the model will be solving for. This may necessitate having the ability to score activities both at the sub-functional level and in the aggregate at the activity level. The current Military Value approach has each Supply & Storage activity receiving one score, which is an aggregate score of the three subfunctions - supply, storage, and distribution. A methodology and statement should be included in the report that separate military value scores may be used for the individual functions of supply, storage and distribution.

### **Industrial**

As previously mentioned in the Medical comments, it is not clear from the report alone whether the JCSG has considered the DoD commitments that were made in the Federal Register in response to public comments to the draft selection criteria. In order to establish for the record that this step has been accomplished, it would be valuable to have the Industrial JCSG include a statement to this effect in either its report or the minutes of its deliberations.

In reviewing the Supply and Storage JCSG military value report, we find it contains an approach that should be considered for application to the munitions distribution network in the Industrial JCSG. The Supply and Storage JCSG uses similar data to that of the Industrial JCSG, but combines them in a manner we believe better represents the value of activities' roles in munitions distribution. In particular, we urge the Industrial JCSG to consider implementing the approach that weights the value of each transportation mode (air, land, sea) according to the volume or tonnage of material that moves through that mode, as well as delivery cycle.

There appears to be uncertainty within the Industrial JCSG concerning how military value scores are to be treated in development and consideration of scenarios. The issue is whether the military value of an activity in performing a function is a one-time static number or is recomputed for each scenario, taking into account the changes in data that would result from implementing that scenario. We recommend the ISG provide guidance to clarify that military value is a one-time calculated value.

Similar to Technical and Supply & Storage, the JCSG needs to understand in advance of their capacity and military value analyses what the model will be solving for. This may necessitate having the ability to score activities both at the sub-functional level and in the aggregate at the activity level. The current Military Value methodology has separate military value scores being calculated for many sub-functions, as well commodities.

## **Headquarters & Support**

The JCSG has expanded question #446 (common administrative functions) to include not only the major headquarters, but also middle management organizations such as the Navy's Regional Commands. We are concerned that the weighting within the scoring models fails to credit previous consolidations under the Navy's installation management program. While the Navy is certainly open to further opportunity for improvement in shore infrastructure management, it has already invested significantly to consolidate its shore management organization and is concerned about merely restructuring in a different way.

## **Education and Training**

The DON remains concerned about the inclusion of graduate flight training in the JCSG analysis and recommends assigning graduate level flight training to the Services for analysis. We believe that the graduate flight training function is more properly evaluated as an adjunct to basing of operational aviation forces and thus is largely Service-specific. Integration or consolidation potential may arise as the result of considerations of joint basing scenarios, and can be addressed between the Military Departments at that time.

Cost can be a significant factor in choosing ranges for training. It is not clear how this will be accounted for in the Ranges subgroup's analysis plan. Recommend that the subgroup identify a method that recognizes cost implications to training.

Our review of the revised report identified one new area of concern. The ISG identified GLOBAL HAWK as the only UAV platform to be included in the JCSG analysis. Although it is assumed that future UAVs will be jointly operated, there are no UAVs in the present inventory that are considered truly "joint." The ISG should more clearly define the requirements the E&T JCSG should meet assess future training for joint UAVs.

We look forward to discussing these issues at the 2 April ISG meeting.

  
H. T. Johnson



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

MAR 31 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR ACTING UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (ACQUISITION,  
TECHNOLOGY AND LOGISTICS)

SUBJECT: Department of the Navy Comments on Final Joint Cross-Service Military Value  
Integration Issues

Based upon our review of the final military value reports, we have developed the following list of issues that should be addressed in order to ensure consistency of approach between and among the JCSGs as they proceed in their analysis of military value and subsequent scenario development. The list contains the general subject matter of the issue and matters that should be addressed. We have included recommendations on possible approaches to resolve these issues.

Issue 1: Common Approaches for Common Characteristics

Are common measures treated similarly across JCSGs (e.g., calculating cost of operations and efficiency, measuring human and intellectual capital, and facility factors – condition codes and space calculation standards)? Are contractor personnel to be counted with the same value as Government personnel? Are requirements to support contractor personnel included in developing capacity? Is information on contractor personnel auditable? Is there consistency of weighting/scoring and consistency of use of questions for Criteria 7 & 8 within Military Value?

Recommendation: These factors are internal to each analysis but also cross over multiple JCSG, which begs the issue of standardization. A working group made up of representatives from each JCSG and Military Department should define the common elements and develop recommendations for resolution to the ISG through the DASs/JCSG Chairs.

Issue 2: Imperatives/Principles

What are the differences between an “imperative” and a “principle?” How are principles and imperatives to be used? What is the process/timeline for development and approval and their interplay with the military value analyses?

Recommendation: Principles should be the overarching forcing functions that guide the BRAC analytical process generally. We need to press on with their development for discussion at the 23 April ISG meeting. These guiding statements are especially critical to the HSA JCSG for their analysis of the Combatant Commands, Service Headquarters and major support commands. Imperatives should be defined as constraints on the end results derived from the principles. As such, imperatives do not need to be finalized until military value analysis is complete and prior to scenario development. The process should include approval of both principles and imperatives at the ISG level, if not the IEC.

### Issue 3: Activity/Installation List

Who develops the list of activities/facilities/installations to receive Military Value data calls and what is the timeline/process? Do you need to develop a Military Value score for every activity/facility/installation that receives a targeted data call? Can you move/realign a function to an activity/facility/installation not included in the “scored” group?

Recommendation: Each JCSG should define which activities/facilities/installations they want to get their data calls with the assistance of the Military Departments. Each activity/facility/installation receiving a data call should be evaluated as part of that “like” function. The current process does not provide a mechanism to evaluate realigning a function to a place that currently does not perform that function. Recommend the DASs review this issue and recommend a process to the ISG.

### Issue 4: Treatment of Installations/Facility/Activity/Functions

Are installations (the fence lines/real estate) being evaluated by JCSGs? Did we gather data in the initial capacity data call to the required level/granularity to perform capacity analysis commensurate with the military value functions/subfunctions to be measured?

Recommendation: Since JCSGs are only evaluating functions, a process needs to be developed to determine how the real estate value is assessed after functional alignment is complete. In other words, how do we evaluate what partial installations/bases are closed or filled to capacity with functions not previously supported by that installation? Military Departments need to have some consistency on how the real estate worth results in what closes and what remains. The current military value approach subdivides functions in some cases into many levels, which need to be supported by corresponding capacity analysis. Once the information from Data Call 1 is received, the JCSGs and Military Departments should assess whether the appropriate level of data has been obtained to match capacity and military value analyses.

### Issue 5: Twenty-Year Force Structure Evaluation

When do we use the force structure plan in the analysis? Who defines requirements for all functions? How do we align timeframe of operations between now and 20-year force structure if BRAC execution occurs in year 6?

Recommendation: We recommend the force structure plan be used to determine the end state requirement or capability, measured against existing capacity/capability to determine excess, rather than measuring excess by looking only at current utilization versus current need. The ISG should define the process and expected outputs of the capacity analysis. The requirements to support 20-year force structure needs to be determined by each JSCG using SME to help extrapolate force structure into all areas of functional requirements.

### Issue 6: Leader/Follower

Do we need to define a rule that identifies who comes first - operational functions (Military Departments) versus support functions (JCSGs) and how potential overlaps should be handled? What will be the process of integrating scenario development among the JCSGs and Military Departments? Do we need a consistent approach to define the value of common attributes of different functions at the same location? Who controls availability of "buildable" acres? Are some functions clear followers?

Recommendations: Although we don't want to suboptimize the possibilities, there should be an understanding of what could be the driver in retaining functions at an installation/base. The ultimate integration of the various possible scenarios should not wait until after scenario development. A rule set should be established in advance to establish parameters to deconflict possible outcomes. Perhaps development of overarching principles could provide the starting point for integration rules. Many of the JCSGs and the Military Departments are evaluating the available buildable acres at an installation or base and could be competing for the same piece of real estate. When defining attributes that are common to different functions at the same location, some consideration needs to be given to the consistency of the evaluation. Some functions are clear followers and need to be viewed as such in identifying the order of hierarchy. Recommend the DASs should develop a recommended methodology to the ISG to resolve and establish the rule set.

#### Issue 7: Firewalls/Conflict of Interest

Should we be concerned about the potential for wide distribution of BRAC information? Are decision-makers in the BRAC process also in the operational chain providing the data to be used in analysis? Is this a potential conflict of interest?

Recommendation: Although it is desirable to have SME involved in the BRAC process, putting individuals in position to certify the data that are also responsible for creating the process to evaluate that data can be a conflict of interest. The public perception could be that the same people responsible for defending their current function are also evaluating that function. Additionally, resource constraints at the beginning of the process have opened up who is inside the process to such an extent that it may be difficult to control the integrity of the data. We recommend the OSD BRAC office evaluate the current structure to see if tighter controls need to be exercised.

#### Issue 8: Use of Optimization Model

Is use of the Department of the Navy-developed Optimization Model mandatory for the JCSGs? Are the inputs and outputs of the model commonly understood?

Recommendation: Although not specifically stated previously, use of Optimization Model developed by the Department of the Navy should be mandatory for all JCSGs. This will allow for more standardization of product and better use of resources. The input to the model requires corresponding capacity and military value numbers for each like function to be evaluated and can be individually defined for each JCSG. Guidance should be provided to clarify that military value is a one-time calculated value, rather than a value that will be

recalculated for each possible scenario. The JCSGs need to understand in advance of their capacity and military value analyses what the model will be solving for. This may necessitate having the ability to score activities both at the sub-functional level and in the aggregate at the activity level, particularly in the Technical, Supply & Storage, and Industrial JCSGs. The DON analysis team is available to work with each JCSG to provide development assistance.

We look forward to discussing these issues at the 2 April ISG meeting.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "HT Johnson". The signature is written in a cursive, somewhat stylized font.

H. T. Johnson

RP-0111  
IAT/REV  
7 April 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INFRASTRUTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 1 APRIL 2004

- Encl: (1) IAT Military Value Weighting Brief for Operations Functions - Surface/Subsurface, Ground, and Air of 1 April 2004
- (2) IAT Surface/Subsurface Operations Function Revised Military Value Evaluation Questions
- (3) IAT Surface/Subsurface Operations Function Military Value Notional Matrices
- (4) IAT Ground Operations Function Military Value Notional Matrices
- (5) IAT Military Value Analysis for Naval Air Introductory Brief of 1 April 2004
- (6) IAT Aviation Operations Function Military Value Evaluation Questions

1. The fifth deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) convened at 0945 on 1 April 2004 in the Infrastructure Analysis Team (IAT) conference room located at Crystal Plaza 6, 9<sup>th</sup> floor. The following members of the IEG were present: Mr. H. T. Johnson, Chair; Ms. Anne R. Davis, Vice Chair; Ms. Ariane Whittemore, alternate for VADM Charles W. Moore, Jr., USN, Member; Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree, alternate for VADM Albert H. Konetzni, USN, Member; LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member; BGen Samuel T. Helland, USMC, alternate for LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Member; Col Carol K. Joyce, USMC, alternate for Dr. Russ Beland, Member; Dr. Michael F. McGrath, Member; Mr. Ronnie J. Booth, Navy Audit Service, Representative; and, Mr. Thomas N. Ledvina, Navy Office of General Counsel, Representative. The following members of the IAT were present: Mr. Dennis Biddick; Mr. David W. LaCroix; CAPT Chris T. Nichols, USN; CAPT Jason A. Leaver, USN; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; LtCol Terri E. Erdag, USMC; LtCol Robert R. Mullins, USMCR; LtCol Paul J. Warhola, USMC; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; LCDR Daniel L. Frost, USN; LCDR Brian D. Miller, USNR; LCDR Timothy P. Cowan, CEC, USN; LCDR Kevin D. Laye, USN; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC.

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 1 APRIL 2004

2. Ms. Davis outlined the agenda for the deliberative session using enclosure (1). Initially, the IEG reviewed the segment of the operations functions military value scoring plan pertaining to questions and answers concerning "unique" and "specialized" missions and capabilities and "unique" training capabilities. The IEG decided that activities would be directed to identify and describe any unique or specialized missions or capabilities. In reviewing the answers to these questions, the IEG will apply its collective military judgment to determine whether the capability or mission is actually unique or specialized. The IEG adopted the following analyses in order to make these determinations:

a. Unique. Unique is defined as "one of a kind." If the IEG concludes that a mission or capability is unique, for DON or DOD, then the IEG will evaluate its importance by assessing the usefulness of the mission or capability. Thus, a mission or capability could be unique, but no longer useful or important. The IEG will then array all identified unique capabilities and missions and determine appropriate valuation.

b. Specialized. The IEG recognized it may not fully understand the support provided by Navy and Marine Corps activities to "specialized missions" until the data was arrayed. It acknowledged the need to positively value mission support that was not unique but not commonly provided by operational units. Accordingly, the IEG concluded it would determine appropriate valuation after data was arrayed and it could assess the relative value of support to specialized missions.

3. As directed by the IEG at the last deliberative session, the IAT Operations Team reconstructed four scoring statements and roll-up questions for the Personnel Support Attribute and presented them to the IEG for consideration. Ms. Davis noted the IEG had previously directed the IAT to reconstruct the scoring statements for family and bachelor housing (PS-2 and PS-3). Upon review, the IAT modified its earlier recommendation and suggested that the preferable approach was to evaluate the relative value of government and community housing vice family and bachelor housing. The IEG concurred with the IAT's modified recommendation. In order to accurately depict the types of government housing available, the IEG added the words, "and PPV", to scoring statement PS-2. With this change, the IEG approved the scoring statements, roll-up questions and apportionment for PS-2, PS-3, PS-7, and PS-9. See enclosure (2). These revisions will be applicable for the Personnel

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 1 APRIL 2004

Support Attribute for all Operations Functions -  
Surface/Subsurface, Ground, and Aviation.

4. As directed by the IEG at the last deliberative session, the IAT prepared suggested assignment of the Surface/Subsurface Operations Function scoring statements, by attribute, to the four military value selection criteria. See enclosure (3). Insertion of a "1" indicated the scoring statement related to a particular military value selection criteria. Except as noted below, the IEG approved the IAT's recommendations:

a. Operational Infrastructure. The IEG reviewed the Surge Capabilities selection criteria and assigned scoring statement SEA-7a-c to it. Additionally, the IEG determined that pier-side crane list availability affects operational infrastructure readiness and assigned scoring statement SEA-12 to the Readiness selection criteria.

b. Operational Training. The IEG determined that the Force Reduction Plan concept and throughput issues necessitated assigning scoring statement SEA-24 to both the Readiness and Surge Capabilities selection criteria.

c. Port Characteristics. The IEG determined that proximity to a weapons station and Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection facilities affect costs. Accordingly, the IEG assigned scoring statements SEA-35, SEA 39a-b, SEA-40, and SEA-41 to the Cost/Manpower Implications selection criteria.

d. Environment & Encroachment. The IEG determined that an activity could enhance its ability to dispose solid and hazardous waste and reduce potable water constraints by purchasing these services in the local community, if necessary. Accordingly, the IEG determined scoring statements ENV-5a-c and ENV-6a-b should not be assigned to the Surge Capabilities selection criteria, but assigned to the Cost/Manpower Implications selection criteria. Additionally, the IEG assigned scoring statement ENV-7a-c to the Surge Capabilities selection criteria.

e. Personnel Support/QOL. The IEG determined that government and community housing availability affect surge capabilities. Accordingly, scoring statement PS-3a-b was assigned to the Surge Capabilities selection criteria.

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 1 APRIL 2004

5. Ms. Davis noted that the IEG determined Surface/Subsurface Operations Function Military Value Attribute Selection Criteria Weights at the 25 March 2004 deliberative session. After the application of the scoring statements to the selection criteria, it became apparent that the attribute weighting did not adequately reflect the assignment of scoring statements to the selection criteria. Accordingly, the IAT prepared new attribute weights for the IEG's consideration. The IEG directed the changes noted below and approved the revised attribute weights as listed:

<b>Selection Criteria (SC)</b>		<b>Readiness</b>	<b>Facilities</b>	<b>Surge Capability</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
<b>Weighting</b>		<b>50</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Attribute</b>						
<b>Operational Infrastructure</b>		<b>45</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>25</b>	
<b>Operational Training</b>		<b>25</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>Port Characteristics</b>		<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>Environment &amp; Encroachment</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>Personnel Support</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>20</b>	
		<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	

The IEG determined that the Operational Infrastructure weight for the Cost selection criteria should be higher than Operational Training. Accordingly, the attribute weight for Operational Infrastructure was changed from 20 to 25 and Operational Training was changed from 25 to 20.

6. The IEG recessed at 1042 and reconvened at 1052. All IEG members present when the IEG recessed were again present. Ms. Carla Liberatore, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, and Col Walter B. Hamm, USMC, entered the deliberative session at 1052.

7. As directed by the IEG at the last deliberative session, the IAT prepared suggested assignment of the Ground Operations Function scoring statements, by attribute, to the four military value selection criteria. See enclosure (4). Insertion of a "1" indicated the scoring statement related to a particular military value selection criteria. Except as noted below, the IEG approved the IAT's recommendations:

a. Operational Infrastructure. The IEG determined that scoring statement GRD-7a-b should not be assigned to the Surge Capabilities selection criteria.

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 1 APRIL 2004

b. Environment and Encroachment and Personnel Support/QOL.  
 The IEG made the same changes for these two attributes as delineated in paragraph 4d. and 4e. of this report.

8. As directed by the IEG at the last deliberative session, the IAT prepared proposed attribute weighting to the selection criteria for Ground Operations Function. The IEG directed the changes noted below and approved the recommended attribute weights as listed:

<u>Selection Criteria (SC)</u>	<u>Readiness</u>	<u>Facilities</u>	<u>Surge Capability</u>	<u>Cost</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
<i>Weighting</i>	50	20	15	15	100
<u>Attribute</u>					
Operational Infrastructure	20	25	25	25	
Operational Training	40	30	30	20	
Base Characteristics	15	25	20	15	
Environment & Encroachment	10	10	20	20	
Personnel Support	15	10	5	20	
	100	100	100	100	

The IEG determined that personnel support has a significant impact on the readiness of Ground Operations. Accordingly, the attribute weight for Personnel Support for the Readiness selection criteria was changed from 5 to 15 and Operational Infrastructure was changed from 30 to 20. Additionally, the IEG determined that the attribute weight for Base Characteristics and Environment & Encroachment in the Cost selection criteria should be the same for Ground Operations and Surface /Subsurface Functions. Accordingly, the attribute weight for Base Characteristics was changed from 20 to 15 and the attribute weight for Environment & Encroachment was changed from 15 to 20.

9. LtGen Kelly, USMC, Member, left the session at 1143. Ms. Liberatore served as his alternate.

10. CAPT Nichols and CDR Deputy provided the IEG the military value analysis overview for the Naval Aviation Operations Function. See enclosure (5). The IAT presented an Aviation Universe to the IEG. This universe contained DOD owned aviation facilities capable of home basing operational naval air squadrons/wings. The IAT will review its proposed list to ensure it captures all potential facilities and will

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 1 APRIL 2004

report on its review to the IEG at the next deliberative session.

11. The IEG agreed to apply the same weights as were applied for the Surface/Subsurface and Ground Operations Functions:

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

12. The IAT proposed identical attributes for the Naval Aviation Operations Function as had been previously approved by the IEG for Surface/Subsurface Operations and Ground Functions, except Airfield Characteristics is substituted for Port Characteristics and Base Characteristics, respectively. The IEG approved the following attributes: Operational Infrastructure, Operational Training, Airfield Characteristics, Environment and Encroachment, and Personnel Support/QOL.

13. The IAT proposed components for Naval Aviation Operations Function similar to those previously approved by the IEG for Surface/Subsurface Operations Function. The IEG conceptually approved the following components:

a. Operational Infrastructure: Runways/Arresting Gear, Hangars/Ramps, Navaids/Lighting, Munitions Storage, Intermediate Maintenance, and Unique or Specialized Capabilities/Missions.

b. Operational Training: Outlying and Auxiliary Fields (OLFs), Special Use Airspace, Ranges, MTRs, Aircrew Training Facilities, and Simulator Facilities.

c. Airfield Characteristics: Operational Location, Airfield Restrictions, Weather, Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection, and Locality Cost.

d. Environment and Encroachment: Encroachment, Air Quality, Accident Potential Zone I and II, Clear Zones, Noise, Zoning, Waste Disposal, and Potable Water.

e. Personnel Support (QOL): Medical, Housing, Education, Employment, Fleet & Family Services, MWR, Follow-on Tour Opportunities, and Metropolitan Area Characteristics.

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 1 APRIL 2004

14. The IEG approved the proposed scoring statements and roll-up questions for the Naval Aviation Operational Infrastructure attribute and its components. See enclosure (6). The IEG then placed the Operational Infrastructure attribute scoring statements in one of three bands (Band 1, 2, or 3 in descending order of importance). The IEG approved the bands recommended by the IAT, except that the bands for scoring statements AIR-7 and AIR-9 were changed from "3" to "2" since the IEG determined the number of runways serviced by Optical Landing System (OLS) and Precision Approach Radar (PAR) was as important as the number of hot refueling hydrants. The IEG changed the band for scoring statement AIR-10 was changed from "2" to "3" after it noted that munitions are not stored at air facilities.

15. After the IEG approved the band placement for the Operational Infrastructure attribute and its components, it determined a numerical score. 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 enclosures (6).

16. The deliberative session adjourned at 1236.



ROBERT E. VINCENT II  
CDR, JAGC, U.S. Navy  
Recorder, IAT