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

DCN:5490

MN-0120
IAT/REV
22 April 2004

MEMORANDUM

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 15 APRIL 2004

Encl: (1) 15 April 2004 IEG Meeting Agenda
(2) Recording Secretary's Report of IEG Deliberations on 15 April 2004 with enclosures

1. The twenty-third meeting of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) was convened at 0950 on 15 April 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; 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; CAPT Mark H. 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; Ms. Carla Liberatore, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (I&L), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, 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; 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; Mr. Thomas N. Ledvina, Navy Office of General Counsel (OGC) Representative; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN, Recorder; and Capt James A. Noel, USMC, Recorder. Dr. Russ Beland, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower Analysis and Assessment (DASN(MA&A)), Member, was absent.

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 15 APRIL 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; CAPT Gene A. Summerlin, USN, Education and Training Team Lead; CAPT Jason A. Leaver, USN; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; LtCol Paul J. Warhola, USMC; LtCol Terri E. Erdag, USMC; CDR Phillip A. Black, USN; LCDR Steven J. Cincotta, USN; LCDR Daniel L. Frost, USN; LCDR Brian D. Miller, USNR; LCDR Timothy P. Cowan, CEC, USN; and, LCDR William J. Billingsley, USN. All attendees were provided enclosure (1). Ms. Davis presented the minutes from the 8 April 2004 IEG meeting for review and they were approved.

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

a. 9 April 2004 ISG Meeting. The ISG addressed the Intelligence JCSG Military Value approach and determined that realignment potential should be the primary focus. The ISG is assessing the appropriate universe of activities for the military value data call. DASN (IS&A) is coordinating DON comments on the draft Intelligence JCSG Military Value Report and will submit consolidated comments by the end of the week.

b. Deputy Assistant Secretaries (DAS) Military Value Integration Meetings). As directed by the ISG, the DAS are conducting regular meetings in order to address the integration and military value issues the Services raised in reviewing the JCSGs' Military Value Reports. Mr. Biddick noted many integration and military value issues have been resolved, but three primary issues remain under discussion: (1) HS&A geographic cluster scope of consideration; (2) Graduate Flight Training for joint platforms; and, (3) crediting contractor work force in government facilities. He informed the IEG that OSD would review the DAS recommendations and promulgate resolutions by early next week. The JCSGs will then finalize the military value reports for submission to the ISG and IEC.

c. 23 April 2004 ISG Meeting. The primary focus of this meeting will be to develop definitions of "principles" and "policy imperatives." The IEG recognizes that this will be an iterative process. When an official tasker is promulgated, the IAT will coordinate efforts to assess the policy imperatives CNO and CMC provided to SECNAV and combine them into DON principles

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 15 APRIL 2004

for the ISG. Ms. Davis noted that some principles would probably be submitted as Navy or Marine Corps unique. Ms. Whittemore informed the IEG that the VCNO discussed the development of principles and imperatives during his 14 April 2004 meeting with the JCSG DON Principals. The VCNO will draft a definition of principles and further discuss this issue at his 21 April 2004 meeting.

d. Schedule of IEG Meetings. The IEG agreed to continue to meet each Thursday from 0930 to 1230 through the end of May.

4. The IEG moved into deliberative session at 1016. See enclosure (2). The next meeting of the IEG is scheduled for Thursday, 22 April 2004. The meeting adjourned at 1234.

H T Johnson

H. T. JOHNSON
Chairman, IEG

# Infrastructure Evaluation Group

**15 Apr 2004**
**0930-1230**
**Crystal Plaza 6**

| **Meeting called by:** | Chairman | Recorder: | CDR Vincent |
|---|---|---|---|

## ----- Agenda Topics -----

| | |
|---|---|
| Review and approve minutes of IEG Meeting of 8 Apr 04 | Ms. Davis |
| Status Updates:<br>• ISG/JCSGs<br>  o 9 Apr ISG<br>  o DAS Military Value Integration Meetings | Ms Davis |
| • Deliberative Session<br>  o Complete Air Operations<br>  o Review operational functions scoring plans<br>  o Begin Navy specific Education & Training topics | All |
| Administrative<br>• Next meeting Thursday 22 Apr 04, 0930-1230<br>• Meeting location Crystal Plaza 6, 9th Floor | Ms. Davis |

## Other Information

Draft minutes of 8 Apr 04 IEG meeting provided.
Read ahead for deliberative discussions.

RP-0121
IAT/REV
21 April 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INFRASTRUTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 15 APRIL 2004

Encl: (1) IAT Naval Aviation Revised Military Value Evaluation Scoring Statement and Question for Air-31
(2) IAT Naval Aviation Military Value Extract of Aviation Safety Questions
(3) IAT Naval Aviation Military Value Attribute - Selection Criteria Weighting
(4) IAT Naval Aviation Military Value Matrices
(5) IAT Naval Aviation Military Value Question - Selection Criteria Mapping
(6) IAT Naval Aviation Military Value Summaries
(7) IAT Naval Aviation Military Value Ranking of Attribute Components By Weight
(8) IAT Naval Aviation Revised Military Value Evaluation Scoring Statement and Question for Parallel runway operations
(9) IAT Naval Aviation Revised Military Value Summaries
(10) IAT Naval Aviation Revised Military Value Ranking of Attribute Components By Weight
(11) IAT Surface/Subsurface Military Value Attribute Selection Criteria Weights
(12) IAT Surface/Subsurface Military Value Matrices
(13) IAT Surface/Subsurface Military Value Ranking of Attribute Components By Weight
(14) IAT Ground Operations Military Value Attribute - Selection Criteria Weighting
(15) IAT Ground Operations Military Value Matrices
(16) IAT Ground Operations Military Value Ranking of Attribute Components By Weight
(17) IAT Military Value Analysis of DON Specific Education & Training Functions.

1. The seventh deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) convened at 1016 on 15 April 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; Ms. Ariane Whittemore, alternate for VADM Charles W. Moore, Jr., USN, Member; CAPT Mark

H. Anthony, USN, 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; 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 when the deliberative session commenced: Mr. Dennis Biddick; CAPT Chris T. Nichols, USN; CAPT Gene A. Summerlin, USN; CAPT Jason A. Leaver, USN; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; LtCol Terri E. Erdag, USMC; LtCol Paul J. Warhola, USMC; CDR Phillip A. Black, USN; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; LCDR Steven Cincotta, USN; LCDR Daniel L. Frost, USN; LCDR Brian D. Miller, USNR; LCDR Timothy P. Cowan, CEC, USN; LCDR William J. Billingsley, USN; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC.

2. As directed by the IEG at the last deliberative session, the IAT Operations Team reconstructed the roll-up question for scoring statement Air-31 of the Aviation Operations Function Simulator Facilities component and presented it to the IEG for consideration. Enclosure (1) pertains. Upon review, the IEG determined that Operational Flight Trainer (OFT) was a more appropriate discriminator than full motion simulator. Accordingly, the IEG directed the IAT to reconstruct both the scoring statement and roll-up question to incorporate this change for the next deliberative session.

3. As directed by the IEG at the last deliberative session, the IAT Operations Team identified and arrayed the Aviation Operations Function scoring statements and roll-up questions relating to aviation safety. The IEG reviewed enclosure (2) and determined that there is a consistent approach in assessing aviation safety concerns.

4. The IAT presented enclosures (3) through (6) to the IEG. These enclosures were a review of the IEG's banding, scoring, mapping, and weighting decisions for the Naval Aviation Operations Function. Ms. Davis noted the selection criteria mapping approach reflected in enclosure (5) was consistent with the mapping for Surface/Subsurface and Ground Operations Functions. The IEG did not direct any changes to these enclosures.

5. The IAT provided enclosure (7) to the IEG. Ms. Davis highlighted that the Environment and Encroachment attribute had the highest weight and that the Housing component had a higher weight than the Ranges component. She informed the IEG that the

IAT recommended two changes, which would ensure more accurate component weighting. The first recommendation was to move the "Parallel runway operations" scoring statement and roll-up question to a more appropriate attribute and component. Specifically, the IAT recommended moving "Parallel runway operations" from the Weather component of the Airfield Characteristics attribute to the Runways and Arresting Gear component of the Operational Infrastructure attribute. Scoring statement Air 4a-b of enclosure (8) pertains.

6. The second recommendation was to eliminate the "Ranges" and "Military Training Routes" components under the Operational Training attribute. The IAT recommended that the scoring statements and roll-up questions under these two components be reassigned to the "Special Use Airspace" component under the Operational Infrastructure attribute. Enclosure (9) pertains. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the Education and Training JCSG adopted a similar approach for its aviation military value analysis. The IEG approved the two recommendations contained in enclosures (8) and (9), respectively.

7. The IAT provided enclosure (10) to the IEG, which contained revised component weights incorporating the two recommended changes. The IEG reviewed enclosure (10), discussed the importance of accurate component labels, and determined that "Proximity to Training Airspace" was a more accurate component label than "Special Use Airspace." Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the IAT would review the component labels for all three Operational Functions to ensure accurate labeling.

8. The IEG recessed at 1052 and reconvened at 1102. All IEG members present when the IEG recessed were again present.

9. The IAT presented enclosures (11) through (13) to the IEG. These enclosures were a review of the IEG's banding, scoring, mapping, and weighting decisions for the Surface/Subsurface Operations Function. The IEG did not direct any changes to enclosures (11) and (12). The IEG reviewed enclosure (13) and determined that "Munitions Storage and Handling" was a more accurate component label than "Weapons Handling."

10. The IAT presented enclosures (14) through (16) to the IEG. These enclosures were a review of the IEG's banding, scoring, mapping, and weighting decisions for the Ground Operations Function. Recognizing the critical importance of location of bases conducting ground operations, the IEG determined the weight for the Operational Location component was lower than

expected. The IEG directed the IAT to review the scoring statements to ensure they were placed within the appropriate components. Additionally, the IEG reviewed the attribute weighting to the selection criteria and opined that inaccurate attribute weighting for the Readiness selection criteria was a contributing factor to the weight for the Operational Location and Throughput components. Accordingly, the IEG changed the attribute weight for Personnel Support for the Readiness selection criteria from 15 to 10 and the attribute weight for Base Characteristics was changed from 15 to 20. The IAT will provide revised documentation reflecting the IEG's changes at the next deliberative session.

11. The IEG recessed at 1137 and reconvened at 1141. All IEG members present when the IEG recessed were again present. When the IEG reconvened, Mr. Booth, Mr. Ledvina, and the following members of the IAT were present: Mr. Dennis Biddick; CAPT Chris T. Nichols, USN; CAPT Gene A. Summerlin, USN; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CAPT Jason A. Leaver, USN; CDR Phillip A. Black, USN; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; Ms. Laura D. Knight; LCDR Kevin D. Laye, USN; LCDR Chris T. Sosa, USN; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC.

12. CAPT Summerlin, and members of his team briefed enclosure (17). Ms. Davis advised the IEG that the purpose of this portion of the deliberative session was to consider the military value analysis methodology for DON specific E&T functions. At the outset, she noted that this methodology differed from operational functions because the IEG will only conduct military value analysis of DON E&T functions not under review by the Education and Training JCSG. She recommended the IEG begin its assessment by reviewing the E&T JCSG military value methodology and universe. The E&T JCSG identified four functional areas: Flight Training, Ranges, Specialized Skills Training, and Professional Development Education. The E&T JCSG Universe of functions is quite expansive, including all undergraduate flight training, joint graduate flight training, all ranges, all specialized skills training and professional development education.

13. After reviewing the E&T JCSG methodology, the IAT provided a proposed military value analysis methodology to the IEG. See enclosure (17). The IAT recommended the IEG evaluate the E&T JCSG Military Value Scoring Plan as a starting point. Ms. Davis also noted that if the IEG initiated its review by evaluating the E&T JCSG's methodology, it would be easier to

articulate any apparent differences in approach that may arise between the E&T JCSG's and IEG's recommendations.

14. The IAT recommended the IEG conduct military value analysis on four functional areas: DON Specific Professional Military Education (PME), DON Recruit Training, DON Officer Accession Training, and DON Specific Graduate Level Flight Training. Ms. Davis noted that the IAT Aviation Operations Function military value analysis would cover the DON Specific Graduate Flight Training functional area.

15. The IAT presented the proposed universe of activities to the IEG. The IEG reviewed the list of DON-specific PME activities and directed the IAT to confirm the accuracy of the list. The IEG wanted specificity concerning what type of civilian courses and Marine Corps schools the E&T JCSG would review. Ms. Davis apprised the IEG that the IAT proposed evaluating DON Recruit Training and DON Officer Accession Training as separate functional areas since they are different training processes.

16. The IEG discussed the importance of ensuring the universe of DON-specific functions was accurate and complete. The initial step is to immediately identify all functions the E&T JCSG will not review. The IEG emphasized the importance that the entire BRAC process, JCSG and DON review, captures all realignment and closure possibilities. The IEG decided to revisit this issue at a subsequent deliberative session.

17. The deliberative session adjourned at 1234.

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