



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

DCN:5488

MN-0126
IAT/REV
6 May 2004

MEMORANDUM

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)
MEETING OF 29 APRIL 2004

Encl: (1) 29 April 2004 IEG Meeting Agenda
(2) Recording Secretary's Report of IEG Deliberations on
29 April 2004 with enclosures

1. The twenty-fifth meeting of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) was convened at 0938 on 29 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; 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; 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 29 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 Matthew R. Beebe, CEC, USN, Headquarters and Support Activity Team Lead; CAPT David D. Foy, USN; Ms. Laura Knight; Mr. John A. Crossen, CNA; Mr. Michael D. Bowes, CNA; Ms. Amy L. Palko; CDR Philip A. Black, USN; CDR Joseph E. Arleth, USN; CDR Jennifer R. Flather, USN; CDR Lee Jaenichen, USN; MAJ Gregory J. Moore, USMCR; MAJ Stanley Sober, USMC; LCDR Robert A. Dews, USN; and, LCDR Majella D. Stevenson, CEC, USN. All attendees were provided enclosure (1). Ms. Davis presented the minutes from the 22 April 2004 IEG meeting for review and they were approved.

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

a. Intelligence JCSG Military Value Report. The Services provided comments on the draft Military Value Report to OSD. OSD has prepared a draft memorandum outlining the Services' comments and forwarded it to the Intelligence JCSG. The final Intelligence JCSG Military Value report is due on 14 May 2004.

b. Final Review of JCSG Military Value Reports. The Deputy Assistant Secretaries (DAS) have prepared a series of draft memoranda for each JCSG Chair containing proposed resolutions to the integration and military value issues the Services raised in reviewing the draft JCSGs' Military Value Reports. Each JCSG was directed to amend its final Military Value Report by incorporating the comments contained in the draft memoranda. OSD forwarded the draft memoranda and the final Military Value Reports to the ISG members for coordination. ASN (I&E) will coordinate DON review with VCNO and ACMC and provide a response by 5 May 2004.

c. Principles and Policy Imperatives Tasker. The ISG will discuss principles and policy imperatives at its 14 May 2004 meeting. OSD has requested that the Services provide draft principles and policy imperatives by 7 May 2004 in order to prepare for the meeting. The ISG will review the drafts submitted by each Service and determine the best approach for developing final principles and policy imperatives.

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)
MEETING OF 29 APRIL 2004

d. Intelligence Capacity Analysis Data Call. DASN (IS&A) should receive the data call responses today. The responses will be submitted to OPNAV by 1 May 2004 and DASN (IS&A) must certify the data and forward it to the Intelligence JCSG by 14 May 2004.

4. The IEG moved into deliberative session at 0950. See enclosure (2). The next meeting of the IEG is scheduled for Thursday, 6 May 2004. The meeting adjourned at 1212.



H. T. JOHNSON
Chairman, IEG

TAB 1

TAB 2

RP-0127
IAT/REV
5 May 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INFRASTRUTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 29 APRIL 2004

- Encl:
- (1) IAT E&T DON Recruit Training Military Value Attribute - Selection Criteria Weighting
 - (2) IAT E&T DON Recruit Training Military Value Ranking of Attribute Components by Weight
 - (3) IAT E&T DON Officer Accession Training Military Value Attribute - Selection Criteria Weighting
 - (4) IAT E&T DON Officer Accession Training Military Value Ranking of Attribute Components by Weight
 - (5) IAT E&T DON Specific PME Military Value Attribute - Selection Criteria Weighting
 - (6) IAT E&T DON Specific PME Military Value Ranking of Attribute Components by Weight
 - (7) IAT E&T DON Recruit Training Revised Military Value Attribute - Selection Criteria Weighting
 - (8) IAT E&T DON Recruit Training Revised Military Value Ranking of Attribute Components by Weight
 - (9) IAT E&T DON Recruit Training Revised Military Value Scoring Statement - Selection Criteria Mapping
 - (10) IAT E&T DON Officer Accession Training Revised Military Value Attribute - Selection Criteria Weighting
 - (11) IAT E&T DON Officer Accession Training Revised Military Value Ranking of Attribute Components by Weight
 - (12) IAT E&T DON Officer Accession Training Revised Military Value Scoring Statement - Selection Criteria Mapping
 - (13) IAT E&T DON Specific PME Revised Military Value Attribute - Selection Criteria Weighting
 - (14) IAT E&T DON Specific PME Revised Military Value Ranking of Attribute Components by Weight
 - (15) IAT E&T DON Specific PME Revised Military Value Scoring Statement - Selection Criteria Mapping
 - (16) IAT E&T Military Value Evaluation Proposed Scoring Statements and Questions for Environmental and Encroachment Attribute

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 29 APRIL 2004

- (17) IAT Ground Operations Function Military Value Matrix
- (18) IAT Military Value Analysis of DON Specific Headquarters and Support Activities Functions of 29 April 2004

1. The ninth deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) convened at 0950 on 29 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; Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree, alternate for VADM Albert H. Konetzni, USN, Member; LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member; 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 Matthew R. Beebe, CEC, USN, Headquarters and Support Activity Team Lead; CAPT David D. Foy, USN; Ms. Laura Knight; Mr. John A. Crossen, CNA; Mr. Michael D. Bowes, CNA; Ms. Amy L. Palko; CDR Philip A. Black, USN; CDR Joseph E. Arleth, USN; CDR Jennifer R. Flather, USN; CDR Lee Jaenichen, USN; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; MAJ Gregory J. Moore, USMCR; MAJ Stanley Sober, USMC; LCDR Robert A. Dews, USN; and, LCDR Majella D. Stevenson, CEC, USN; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC.

2. The IAT provided enclosures (1) through (6) to the IEG. Ms. Davis highlighted that the Student Load component of the Training Output attribute had the highest component weight for all three E&T DON Functions. She explained this was due to the fact that Student Load was the only remaining component within the Training Output attribute since the IEG decided to eliminate the Educational Staff component at the last deliberative session. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the IAT reevaluated the purpose and intent of the Student Load component to determine if it was the most important discriminator for the three E&T DON functions. Upon review of the underlying scoring statements and questions, the IAT noted that the Student Load component is closely related to infrastructure since it will measure student throughput. Accordingly, the IAT recommended numerous changes, which would ensure more accurate component measurements and weighting, for all three E&T DON Functions. Enclosures (7) through (15) pertain.

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 29 APRIL 2004

3. The first recommendation was to change the change the component label from "Student Load" to "Student Throughput". The new label would more accurately depict the intended military value purpose of the component. Second, since throughput is directly related to infrastructure, the Training Infrastructure attribute was the most appropriate attribute for the "Student Throughput" component. Accordingly, the IAT recommended moving the "Student Throughput" component from the Training Output attribute to the Training Infrastructure attribute. Ms. Davis noted that student throughput would be analyzed as one of a myriad of important infrastructure discriminators within the Training Infrastructure attribute. Third, the Training Output attribute should be eliminated since it would no longer contain any components. Enclosures (7), (10), and (13) pertain.

4. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the IAT also reviewed the assignment of scoring statements, by attribute, to the four military value selection criteria. She noted that the IAT recommended three changes. First, scoring statement E&T-1 should not be assigned to the Surge Capabilities selection criteria. This scoring statement does not affect surge capabilities since it was designed to measure current student throughput. Second, scoring statement E&T-2 should not be assigned to the Cost selection criteria. This scoring statement will consider current facility infrastructure only and, therefore, there would not be any additional cost considerations. Finally, scoring statement E&T-3 should not be assigned to the Surge Capabilities selection criteria because the centralization of training measurement does not affect surge capabilities. Enclosures (9), (12), and (15) pertain. The IEG approved the IAT recommendations set forth in paragraph 3 and 4 of this report and determined the recommendations were applicable for all three E&T DON functions.

5. Upon approval of these recommendations by the IEG, Ms. Davis noted that environmental and encroachment factors affected the three E&T DON Functions since these functions encompass classroom and field facilities. Therefore, the IAT recommended that an Environmental and Encroachment attribute be added to the military value analysis of E&T DON Functions. The IEG reviewed enclosure (16), which contained a proposed Environmental and Encroachment attribute with the following components: Land Constraints, Encroachment, Environmental Costs, Waste Disposal, Potable Water, Natural Resource Considerations, and Air Quality. The IEG approved adding the Environmental and Encroachment attribute and the proposed components.

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 29 APRIL 2004

6. Upon approval of the Environmental and Encroachment attribute and underlying components, the IEG reviewed the proposed scoring statements and roll-up questions contained in enclosure (16). Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the IAT reviewed the environmental and encroachment scoring statements approved for Naval Operations Functions. The IAT recommended using the Ground Operations Function scoring statements for E&T DON Functions since these scoring statements and questions address environmental and encroachment factors which also could affect E&T DON classroom and field facilities. Ms. Davis apprised the IEG that it could approve all of the scoring statements and roll-up questions that were approved for the Ground Operations Function in order to ensure that identical environmental and encroachment factors were evaluated or it could identify and use scoring statement and roll-up questions which were true discriminators for E&T DON Functions. The IEG decided to use the same scoring statements and roll-up questions for Ground Operations Function and E&T DON Functions since these functions are affected by similar environmental and encroachment factors.

7. During its review of enclosure (16), the IEG also reviewed the previously approved Ground Operations Function Military Value Matrix for the Environmental and Encroachment attribute. See enclosure (17). The IEG determined that ground water and the Clean Water Act were significant environmental factors affecting both naval operations and educational functions. The IEG instructed the IAT to develop applicable ground water and Clean Water Act components, scoring statements, and questions for the three Naval Operations Functions and the three E&T DON Functions.

8. Additionally, the IEG determined that ground water and air quality environmental and encroachment issues affect naval operations and educational functions as significantly as endangered species issues. The IEG determined that scoring statement ENV-8a-h (Air Quality) and the ground water scoring statement should receive the same banding and numerical score as scoring statement ENV-7a-c (Natural Resource Considerations). Accordingly, scoring statement ENV-8-a-h and the new ground water scoring statement will be placed in scoring band "1" and receive a numerical score of "7" for both the Ground Operations Function and the three E&T DON Functions. The IEG directed the IAT to review the environmental and encroachment scoring statements for Naval Surface/Subsurface Operations and Aviation Functions and recommend similar modifications.

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 29 APRIL 2004

9. The IEG agreed that the three E&T DON Functions should contain the same bands and numerical scores for the remaining Ground Operations Function environmental and encroachment scoring statements contained in enclosure (17). The IEG then reviewed the assignment of the Ground Operations Function environmental and encroachment scoring statements to the selection criteria. The IEG agreed to use the same scoring statement assignments for the three E&T DON Functions. However, the IEG determined that scoring statement ENV-7-a-c should be assigned to the Readiness, Surge Capabilities, and Cost selection criteria, but not the Facilities selection criteria, for the Naval Operations Functions, where applicable, and the E&T DON Functions.

10. The IEG recessed at 1043 and reconvened at 1055. All IEG members present when the IEG recessed were again present. In addition, Mr. Booth, Mr. Ledvina, and the following members of the IAT were present: Mr. Dennis Biddick; CAPT Matthew R. Beebe, CEC, USN; CAPT David D. Foy, USN; Mr. John A. Crossen, CNA; Mr. Michael D. Bowes, CNA; Ms. Amy L. Palko; CDR Lee Jaenichen, USN; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; MAJ Stanley Sober, USMC; LCDR Robert A. Dews, USN; LCDR Majella D. Stevenson, CEC, USN; Capt Francine Iazzetta, USMCR; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC. CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN entered the deliberative session at 1106.

11. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that she had consulted with the Department of the Army and Department of the Air Force since the last deliberative session and confirmed that both Services are conducting military value analysis of their respective service academies with other officer and institutional training activities. The IEG agreed to evaluate the United States Naval Academy within the E&T DON Officer Accession Training Function. The IEG determined that the functions performed at the Naval Academy are similar to functions performed by activities within the E&T DON Officer Accession Training Function.

12. CAPT Beebe and members of his team briefed enclosure (18). 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 Headquarters and Support Activities (HSA) Functions. She noted that this methodology differed from operational functions because the IEG will only conduct military value analysis of DON HSA functions not under review by the HSA JCSG. She recommended the IEG begin its assessment by reviewing the HSA JCSG military value methodology, universe, and scoring plans. The HSA JCSG

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 29 APRIL 2004

identified eight functional areas: Major Administrative and Headquarters Activities, Mobilization Centers, Civilian Personnel Offices, Military Personnel Offices, Correctional Facilities, Defense Finance and Accounting Services, Computing Services, and Geographical (GEO) Clusters (Installation Management, Installation Military Personnel, Finance and Accounting, and Headquarters Support Activities). The GEO clusters assessment is designed to streamline functions by identifying two or more Services providing similar functions within the same proximate geographical location. CAPT Beebe and his staff informed the IEG that the HSA JCSG military value analysis would explore both joint and "goodness for the Service" opportunities.

13. The IEG agreed to evaluate the HSA JCSG Military Value scoring plan as a starting point and tailor it for DON specific activities. The IEG agreed to conduct military value analysis on two functional areas, Recruiting Districts/Stations and Reserve Centers, but noted that the IAT was continuing to evaluate activities that provide regional support and/or administrative support to ascertain whether there are additional functional areas. Ms. Davis explained that Recruiting Districts/Stations included approximately 85 activities and Reserve Centers included approximately 266 activities. The Recruiting Districts/Stations Universe would include 31 Navy Recruiting Districts, 48 Marine Corps Recruiting Stations, and 6 Navy Reserve Recruiting Areas. The IAT determined that the optimal way to evaluate the military value of naval recruiting operations was to conduct military value analysis of the recruiting activities that provide management and oversight over the "storefront" recruiting operations. Ms. Davis further informed the IEG that the HSA JCSG was not conducting military value analysis on Navy and Marine Corps Reserve Centers. The IEG conditionally approved the Universe lists for Recruiting Districts/Stations and Reserve Centers denoted in enclosure (18).

14. The IAT reviewed the HSA JCSG scoring plans for the eight functional areas and determined that the Headquarters and Support Activities, Military Personnel Offices, and Civilian Personnel Officers functional areas were most similar to the HSA DON Recruiting Districts/Stations and Reserve Centers functions. The IAT reviewed the attributes associated with these three HSA JCSG functional areas and developed proposed attributes for the HSA DON functions. The IEG approved the following proposed attributes for both Recruiting Districts/Stations and Reserve Centers: Effectiveness of Operation, Efficiency of Operation,

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 29 APRIL 2004

Quality of Facilities, and Personnel Support. Additionally, the IEG directed the IAT to add an Environmental and Encroachment attribute for the Reserve Centers function. The IEG determined that this attribute was not applicable for the Recruiting Districts/Stations function since environmental and encroachment factors do not affect the military value of naval recruiting stations.

15. The IEG approved the following components for the Recruiting Districts/Stations Function attributes:

- a. Effectiveness of Operation: Recruiting Mission/Goal, Recruiting Demographics, and Scope of Responsibility.
- b. Efficiency of Operation: Proximity & Control and Cost.
- c. Quality of Facilities: Facility Condition and Security.
- d. Personnel Support: Medical, Housing, Non-Military Education, Employment, MWR/MCCS/Fleet, and Family Services, Follow-on Tour Opportunities, and Metropolitan Area Characteristics.

16. The IEG directed the IAT to develop applicable components for the Environmental & Encroachment attribute and approved the following components for the other four Reserve Centers Function attributes:

- a. Effectiveness of Operation: Population Served, Training/Special Responsibilities, and Potential for Expanding Mission.
- b. Efficiency of Operation: Cost of Operation and Efficient Use of Facilities.
- c. Quality of Facilities: Condition of Facility and Security.
- d. Personnel Support: Medical, Housing, Non-Military Education, Employment, MWR/MCCS/Fleet, and Family Services, Follow-on Tour Opportunities, and Metropolitan Area Characteristics.

17. The IEG reviewed the selection criteria weights used by DON for Reserves Centers, Administrative Activities, and Naval Reserve Readiness Commands in BRAC 1995 and BRAC 2005 selection criteria weights the IEG used for Naval Operations Functions and

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 29 APRIL 2004

E&T DON Specific Functions. See enclosure (18). The IEG noted that readiness and surge requirements are almost equally important for naval recruiting operations and agreed to assign the following weights for the Recruiting Districts/Stations Function:

- a. Readiness: 40
- b. Facilities: 15
- c. Surge Capabilities: 30
- d. Cost and Manpower: 15

18. The IEG noted that reserve centers must maintain an optimal level of readiness and assigned the following weights for the Reserve Centers Function:

- a. Readiness: 55
- b. Facilities: 25
- c. Surge Capabilities: 15
- d. Cost and Manpower: 5

19. The deliberative session adjourned at 1212.



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