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

DCN:5481

MN-0141
IAT/REV
3 June 2004

MEMORANDUM

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 27 MAY 2004

Encl: (1) 27 May 2004 IEG Meeting Agenda
(2) ASN (I&E) Memo of 25 May 2004
(3) Recording Secretary's Report of IEG Deliberations on 27 May 2004

1. The twenty-ninth meeting of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) was convened at 0930 on 27 May 2004 in the CNI conference room located at Crystal Plaza 5, 4th floor. The following members of the IEG were present: Ms. Anne R. Davis, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis (DASN(IS&A)), Acting 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; 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; Dr. Michael F. McGrath, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research Development Test & Evaluation (DASN(RDT&E)), Member; Mr. Robert T. Cali, Assistant General Counsel, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower & Reserve Affairs (M&RA), 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. Mr. H. T. Johnson, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Installations and Environment (ASN(I&E)), Chair, and LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Deputy Commandant for Aviation (AVN), Member, were absent.

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 27 MAY 2004

2. The following members of the IAT were also present: Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff; CAPT Christopher T. Nichols, USN; CAPT Matthew R. Beebe, CEC, USN; CDR Edward L. Jaenichen, USN; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; LtCol Robert R. Mullins, USMCR; CDR Jennifer R. Flather, USN; and, Mr. Michael D. Bowes, CNA. CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN entered the meeting at 1013. All attendees were provided enclosures (1) and (2). Ms. Davis presented the minutes from the 20 May 2004 IEG meeting for review and they were approved.

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

a. Data Call #1 Issue Resolution. As of 24 May 2004, the IAT has identified 613 issues concerning Data Call #1 and is coordinating resolution of these issues with the cognizant naval activities. The IAT has determined that most issues are administrative in nature or involve inconsistent answers when comparing like activities. Ms. Davis noted that the IAT is augmenting its quality assurance review by incorporating the results of the Naval Audit Service's field audit and resolving additional data call issues identified by the JCSGs.

b. Naval Audit Service (NAVAUDSVC). NAVAUDSVC conducted a field audit of 61 naval activities. She noted that NAVAUDSVC provided her an interim report indicating that it had reviewed over 3100 questions and identified 769 discrepancies. The collection and retention of source documentation are the primary issues identified by the field auditors. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that DASN (IS&A) would promulgate a policy memorandum to naval activities reminding them of the importance of retaining source documentation. Of the remaining discrepancies, NAVAUDSVC indicated that fifteen percent were attributable to human error, e.g., transposition error. Another frequent discrepancy was real time system error, which NAVAUDSVC described as reliance upon data accurate on the date it is obtained, but subject to change. Naval activities did not always ensure that they recorded and retained the supporting documentation on the date the data was obtained in order to verify its accuracy at a later date. Finally, the other major categories of discrepancies were duplicate answers (host and tenant activities providing answers), and "judgment call" discrepancies (NAVAUDSVC disagreed with a particular activity's decision to answer or not answer a question). As noted above, the noted discrepancies will be resolved as part of the IAT quality assurance process. Ms. Davis and Mr. Ron Booth indicated that the NAVAUDSVC final report would assess the integrity of the BRAC process and the reliability of the certified data.

c. Military Value Data Call. OSD has provided the IAT with the Supply and Storage (S&S) and Education and Training (E&T) JSCG military value questions. These questions are being uploaded into DONBITS and the IAT is ensuring that the questions in the DONBITS system are identical to those provided by OSD. Additionally, the IAT is prepared to issue the DON-specific military value data call questions that the IEG previously approved for Operations, E&T, and Headquarters and Support Activities (HSA). Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the IAT plans to issue the military value data call for the S&S and E&T JCSG questions and DON Operations, E&T, and HSA questions next week. She further explained that Commander, Navy Installations would host a meeting on Thursday, 3 June 2004 with major Navy and Marine Corps claimants so that Ms. Davis can provide specific guidance concerning the military value data call.

d. IEG Meeting of 3 June 2004. The IEG will discuss the Services' draft principles and policy imperatives in order to formulate an appropriate DOD statement of principles that maintain the integrity of DON principles in preparation for the 4 June 2004 ISG meeting. Moreover, as indicated in enclosure (2), the JCSG DON Principals will provide a status briefing to the IEG.

4. The IEG moved into deliberative session at 1013. See enclosure (3). The next meeting of the IEG is scheduled for Thursday, 3 June 2004. The meeting adjourned at 1210.

H T Johnson

H. T. JOHNSON
Chairman, IEG

Infrastructure Evaluation Group

27 May 2004
0930-1230
Crystal Plaza 5

Meeting called by:	Chairman	Recorder:	CDR Vincent

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

Review and approve minutes of IEG Meeting of 20 May 04	Ms. Davis

Status Updates:
• ISG/JCSGs
  o Data Call #1 Issue Resolution Status
  o Data Call Release
  o Audit Status
	Ms. Davis

• Deliberative Session
  o Complete Navy specific HSA functions
  • Regional Support
  o Aviation Capacity Analysis
  o COBRA
	All

Administrative
• Next meeting:
  o Discussion of DON Principles & Imperatives
  o Status briefs by JCSG Principals
  o Location: Pentagon, 4D447
• Meeting location for future meetings (10 Jun, 17 Jun & 24 Jun) will be at CNI, Crystal Plaza 5, Room 416
	Ms. Davis

Other Information

Draft minutes of 20 May 04 IEG meeting provided.
Read ahead for deliberative discussions.

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

MAY 25 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR FUNCTIONAL ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS

Subj: FAB INTEGRATION

Ref: (a) SECNAV Memorandum of 29 May 2003

Encl: (1) IEG Briefing Schedule

The Functional Advisory Board (FAB) was established by reference (a). The FAB reports directly to and coordinates with the Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) in order to clearly articulate the Department of the Navy (DON) position on common business oriented functions. Further, the FAB is tasked with ensuring that DON leadership is thoroughly briefed and prepared on Joint Cross Service Group (JCSG) matters that will ultimately be addressed to the Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC). In short, the FAB is intended to provide a mechanism to ensure that the Navy and Marine Corps vision of the future is clearly articulated, understood, and supported throughout the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 process.

As our analysis begins to develop closure and realignment alternatives, the IEG and the FAB must have a complete understanding of process and data issues related to Navy and Marine Corps installations. As a first step, I am requesting that the DON principal for each JCSG (or his or her alternate if the principal is not available) brief the status of their respective JCSG at the June 3, 2004 IEG meeting.

I request the Navy and Marine Corps principals for each JCSG coordinate their presentations into a single briefing, and suggest the briefings follow the format being used for the Navy JCSG principal's upcoming brief to the Chief of Naval Operations. A briefing schedule is provided at enclosure (1). Questions concerning the IEG briefings should be directed to LCDR Beth Hartmann at (703) 602-6755.

H T Johnson

H. T. Johnson
Chair,
Infrastructure Evaluation Group

enclosure

BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR JCSG PRINCIPALS
AT THE 3 JUNE 2004 IEG MEETING
1100-1230

Education and Training

Supply and Storage

Industrial

Technical

Headquarters and Support

Medical

Intelligence

Department of the Navy
IAT

INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS TEAM
ODASN (IS&A), 2221 South Clark Street, Suite 900, Arlington, VA 22202

(703)-602-6500

RP-0142
IAT/REV
3 June 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INFRASTRUTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 27 MAY 2004

Encl: (1) Military Value Analysis of DON Specific Headquarters and Support Activities Functions Brief of 27 May 2004
(2) IAT HSA DON Specific Regional Management Proposed Military Value Attributes, Components, and Scoring Statements
(3) Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA) Overview Brief for IEG of 27 May 2004

1. The thirteenth deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) convened at 1013 on 27 May 2004 in the CNI conference room located at Crystal Plaza 5, 4th floor. The following members of the IEG were present: Ms. Anne R. Davis, Acting Chair; Ms. Ariane Whittemore, alternate for VADM Charles W. Moore, Jr., USN, Member; Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree, alternate for VADM Albert H. Konetzni Jr., USN, Member; Ms. Carla Liberatore, alternate for LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member; Dr. Michael F. McGrath, Member; Mr. Robert T. Cali, 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, Chief of Staff; Mr. David W. LaCroix; CAPT Christopher T. Nichols, USN; CAPT Matthew R. Beebe, CEC, USN; CDR Edward L. Jaenichen, USN; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; LtCol Robert R. Mullins, USMCR; CDR Jennifer R. Flather, USN; Mr. Michael D. Bowes, CNA; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC.

2. Ms. Davis reminded the IEG that the IAT presented a preliminary analysis of 217 "other" DON activities that are not functionally aligned with a JCSG or a DON function at the last deliberative session. At that deliberative session, the IEG conceptually approved five proposed categories for these activities, including Regional Support Activities. Regional Support Activities include numerous geographic shore support

activities that are not tied to a specific location or set of operational forces. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the IAT HSA team would present the military value scoring methodology for Regional Support Activities at today's deliberative session. Enclosure (1) pertains.

3. The IAT informed the IEG that the HSA JCSG would conduct military value analysis on the operational functions performed by some of these Regional Support Activities. The IAT's intent is to conduct military value analysis of the management/overhead functions performed vice their operational functions. Specifically, the IAT will focus upon the management of subordinate activities and internal support functions performed by these activities. These management and internal support functions include the following: Administration and Contracting; Administration and Business Management; Environmental Services and Safety; Facilities Management; Financial Management and Comptroller Services; Inspection and Evaluation; Security; and, Supply and Support Services. In order to differentiate operational versus management and internal support functions and refine the list of applicable Regional Support Activities, the IAT recommended inclusion of a series of questions concerning an activity's managerial functions. The IAT proposed that these questions could be included in the "other" activity "mini" data call discussed at last week's deliberative session. The "mini" data call questions will enhance the IAT's understanding of an activity's mission. The IEG approved the IAT's recommendation to prepare a list of appropriate questions.

4. The IAT informed the IEG that the Regional Support Activities universe included 75 naval activities that currently operate on a regional basis. See slide (3) of enclosure (1). The IEG reviewed the proposed universe list and questioned whether Fleet and Industrial Supply Centers (FISC) should be included in the Regional Support Activities universe or in any of the other four categories for the 217 "other" DON activities. The IEG opined that FISC's critical function is to provide operational support to the fleet and noted that the Supply and Storage JCSG would be conducting capacity and military value analysis of the FISC's operational functions. The IEG concluded that performance of peripheral missions did not warrant separate military value analysis for FISCs.

5. Ms. Davis noted that the IAT had identified three primary considerations for the military value analysis of Regional Support Activities - alignment, integration, and location.

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 27 MAY 2004

Optimal alignment requires an evaluation of an activity's linkages and relationships in order to ascertain which relationships need to be strengthened through realignment. Integration evaluates the balance between efficiency of integration and mission effectiveness. Optimal location requires an evaluation of an activity's area of responsibility and actual location. See slides (5) and (6) of enclosure (1).

6. The IAT provided a list of four proposed attributes and accompanying components and scoring statements designed to assess the geographical responsibilities, span of control, and alignment of Regional Support Activities. See slide (7) of enclosure (1) and enclosure (2). Ms. Davis asked the IEG to review the proposed attributes, components, and scoring statements. She stated that if the IEG determined the attributes, components, and scoring statements were appropriate, then the IAT would prepare applicable military value analysis questions. The IEG reviewed the attributes, components, and scoring statements and directed the IAT to refine the scoring statements and develop questions.

7. Mr. Jack Leather, IAT staff member, entered the deliberative session at 1030. Ms. Whittemore departed the deliberative session at 1116. CAPT Nichols; CAPT Beebe; CDR Jaenichen; CDR Deputy; LtCol Mullins; CDR Flather; and, Mr. Michael D. Bowes departed the deliberative session at 1137.

8. Mr. Jack Leather used enclosure (3) to brief the IEG on the COBRA model. He informed the IEG that OSD assigned the Department of the Army as the lead Service for the implementation and use of the COBRA model and further directed all Services and the JCSGs to use the COBRA model to calculate costs, savings, and return on investment of all proposed realignment and closure actions. He also stated that the ISG has approved the COBRA model methodology for BRAC 2005.

9. The deliberative session adjourned at 1210.

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