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

DCN:5471

MN-0148
IAT/REV
17 June 2004

MEMORANDUM

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 10 JUNE 2004

Encl: (1) 10 June 2004 IEG Meeting Agenda
(2) Recording Secretary's Report of IEG Deliberations on 10 June 2004

1. The thirty-first meeting of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) was convened at 0928 on 10 June 2004 in the CNI conference room located at Crystal Plaza 5, 4th 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; RDML 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; Mr. Michael F. Jaggard, Chief of Staff/Policy for Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Research Development Test & Evaluation (DASN(RDT&E)), serving as alternate for Dr. Michael F. McGrath, 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. Mark H. Anthony, Deputy Director Fleet Training (N7A), U.S. Fleet Forces Command, was in attendance.

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 10 JUNE 2004

2. The following members of the IAT were also present: Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff; Dr. Ron H. Nickel, CNA; CAPT Matthew R. Beebe, CEC, USN; Col Joseph R. Kennedy, USMCR; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Edward L. Jaenichen, USN; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; LtCol Terri E. Erdag, USMC; and, Ms. Christina E. Richardson. All attendees were provided enclosure (1). Ms. Davis presented the minutes from the 3 June 2004 IEG meeting for review and they were approved.

3. The IEG moved into deliberative session at 0930. See enclosure (2). The next meeting of the IEG is scheduled for Thursday, 17 June 2004. The meeting adjourned at 1125.

Anne R Davis
for H. T. JOHNSON
Chairman, IEG

Infrastructure Evaluation Group

10 June 2004
0930-1230
Crystal Plaza 5

Meeting called by:	Chairman	Recorder:	CDR Vincent

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

Review and approve minutes of IEG Meeting of 3 June 04	Ms. Davis

Status Updates:
• ISG/JCSGs
  o Principles/Imperatives
  o Data Call #1 Issue Resolution Status
  o Data Call #2 Release
	Ms Davis

• Deliberative Session
  o Operational *Initial* Capacity Analysis
  • Air Operations
  • Surface/Subsurface Operations
  o Ground Capacity Analysis Issues
  o Navy specific HSA functions
  • Regional Support draft Military Value scoring plan
	All

Administrative • Meeting location for next meeting, Crystal Plaza 5, 4 Floor, Room 416	Ms. Davis

Other Information

Draft minutes of 3 June 04 IEG meeting provided.
Read ahead for deliberative discussions.

Department of the Navy

INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS TEAM

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

(703)-602-6500

RP-0149
IAT/REV
16 June 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 10 JUNE 2004

Encl: (1) OSD Proposed BRAC Principles List undated
(2) OSD Proposed BRAC Principles undated
(3) Ground Operations Capacity Analysis Issue Brief of 10 June 2004
(4) Military Value Analysis of DON-Specific Headquarters and Support Activities Regional Support Function Brief of 10 June 2004
(5) IAT HSA DON-Specific Regional Support Activities Proposed Military Value Attributes, Components, Scoring Statements, and Questions
(6) Initial Capacity Analysis for Air Operations and Surface/Subsurface Operations Brief of 10 June 2004

1. The fifteenth deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) convened at 0930 on 10 June 2004 in the CNI conference room located at Crystal Plaza 5, 4th 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 Jr., USN, Member; LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member; RDML Mark T. Emerson, USN, alternate for LtGen Michael A. Hough, USMC, Member; Mr. Michael F. Jaggard, alternate for 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; Dr. Ron H. Nickel, CNA; CAPT Matthew R. Beebe, CEC, USN; Col Joseph R. Kennedy, USMCR; CDR Edward J. Fairbairn, USN; CDR Edward L. Jaenichen, USN; CDR Carl W. Deputy, USN; LtCol Terri E. Erdag, USMC; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; Capt James A. Noel, USMC; and, Ms. Christina E. Richardson. Mr. Mark H. Anthony was also in attendance.

2. Ms. Davis provided enclosures (1) and (2) to the IEG. She noted that enclosure (1) contained draft BRAC principles developed at the 4 June 2004 ISG meeting. Enclosure (2) contained the Service-specific and joint staff draft BRAC principles that the ISG considered in developing the draft BRAC principles. Additionally, she stated that the draft BRAC principles are based upon the Department of Defense and Services' functions and responsibilities delineated in Title 10, United States Code, Secretary of Defense guidance, and the selection criteria. The ISG is scheduled to consider and approve the final BRAC principles at its 25 June 2004 meeting.

3. Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the ISG has directed the Services to formulate Service-specific imperatives. The imperatives should be specific, detailed statements that flow from the BRAC principles. The Services must provide draft imperatives to the OSD BRAC office by Wednesday, 16 June 2004 and the ISG will consider the imperatives at its 25 June 2004 meeting. The IEG recognized the critical importance of imperatives and directed the IAT to coordinate the development of Navy and Marine Corps imperatives with CNO and CMC staff. Mr. Johnson will review and forward the draft imperatives to the OSD BRAC office on 16 June 2004.

4. Ms. Davis and LtCol Erdag used enclosure (3) to provide an initial capacity analysis briefing for Ground Operations. They noted that developing a discrete metric for Ground Operations was difficult and that they were seeking guidance from the IEG in that regard. They informed the IEG that the Ground Operations capacity analysis data call was designed to capture administrative, covered storage, and maintenance spaces by naval installation. The IEG approved the IAT's recommendation to use the Ground Operations military value universe for capacity analysis as well. See slide (2) of enclosure (3).

5. The IAT reviewed the naval installations within the Ground Operations universe and identified 22 unique types of Marine Corps battalions and three unique types of Navy Ground units (NMCB, ACB, and NSWU). The IAT noted that these battalions and units each have discrete "footprints" based upon the three distinct metrics listed above. However, battalion and unit requirements are not delineated in doctrinal or historical references. Accordingly, LtGen Kelley and Ms. Whittemore agreed to work with the IAT Ground Operations Team to determine appropriate measures for each type of battalion and unit. See slides (3) through (5) of enclosure (3). Furthermore, Mr. Johnson directed the IAT to ensure that "training areas" are

considered for each type of battalion and ground unit. LtCol Erdag departed the deliberative session at 0954.

6. Ms. Davis used enclosure (4) to recap the IEG's prior decision to conduct military value analysis of the management/overhead functions performed by Regional Support Activities (RSA). The IEG approved the IAT's recommendation to add six Naval Reserve Recruiting Areas and Commander, Naval Reserve Forces Command to the Regional Support Activities universe. Additionally, the IEG reconsidered its 27 May 2004 decision and determined that the five Fleet and Industrial Supply Centers (FISCs) should be included within the RSA universe. Accordingly, the RSA universe will include 82 naval activities that currently operate on a regional basis. See slide (3) of enclosure (4).

7. The IEG approved the IAT's recommendation to place the RSA activities into four categories. Category A contains the 12 Navy Installation Management Regions. Category B contains large service providers with a large civilian staff that provide direct support to customers. The FISCs would fall within this category. Category C contains middle management activities. These activities have a small staff mostly comprised of military personnel. Category D contains administrative service providers. These activities have limited direct contact with their customers. Ms. Davis noted that location is not a major concern for the activities in category D.

8. The IAT provided the IEG with four military value scoring plan methodologies. See Slide (4) of enclosure (4). The IEG determined that the second option was the most appropriate method. Accordingly, the IAT was directed to develop a broadly based scoring plan, which will enable the IEG to score the military value questions separately for each of the four RSA categories.

9. The IAT provided the IEG a list of four proposed attributes and accompanying components, scoring statements, and roll-up questions for RSAs. See slide (5) of enclosure (4) and enclosure (5). The IEG decided to review the proposed attributes, components, scoring statements, and roll-up questions and provide guidance to the IAT at a future deliberative session.

10. Ms. Davis and CDR Deputy used enclosure (6) to provide an initial capacity analysis briefing for Aviation Operations. The Aviation Operations capacity analysis is based upon a hangar

module concept. The hangar module concept has two types of modules. Type I supports carrier-based and rotary wing aircraft and Type II supports larger aircraft. The Aviation Operations capacity analysis evaluates the maximum number of aviation units requiring infrastructure support. Accordingly, there are numerous assumptions that must be taken into consideration in order to ensure all applicable aviation units are accounted for in the capacity analysis. These assumptions include the necessity to home base all squadrons within CONUS and Hawaii, the possibility that all units are home at the same time, and the determination that surge is not a platform issue, since increases in operational tempo would not involve increases in number of platforms. Therefore, surge does not increase the infrastructure requirement.

11. CDR Deputy informed the IEG that the IAT reviewed the capacity data call responses from every naval installation possessing an operable runway and counted the number of Type I and Type II hangar modules at each naval installation. This process provided the maximum capacity for both Type I and Type II hangar modules. The IAT determined current and future excess capacity by subtracting current and future force requirements from the maximum capacity derived from the capacity data call. Current force requirements were derived from the DOD 2004 Report to Congress and future force structure was derived from the 20-year Force Structure Plan. The IAT noted that future excess capacity would be very similar to current excess capacity.

12. The IAT identified three future issues that could affect capacity analysis. The first issue concerns the P3-C's transition to Multi-Mission Maritime Aircraft between 2013 and 2019. The second issue concerns the transition to Joint Strike Fighter, which will commence in 2010 for the Marine Corps and 2012 for the Navy. The final issue concerns the fact that hangars are being used for missions other than aircraft maintenance. The IAT will continue to refine the data used for the capacity analysis and will review the P-80 criteria for aircraft hangar requirements to see if they accurately reflect current reality.

13. RADM Christopher E. Weaver, USN, Commander, Navy Installations, entered the deliberative session at 1034. Ms. Whittemore, Mr. Crabtree, and Mr. Biddick departed the deliberative session at 1039. RADM Weaver and Mr. Mark Anthony began participation in the deliberative session for Ms. Whittemore and Mr. Crabtree, respectively.

14. Ms. Davis and CDR Fairbairn used enclosure (6) to provide an initial capacity analysis briefing for Surface/Subsurface (S/SS) Operations. The S/SS Operations capacity analysis is based upon a cruiser-equivalent concept, which is used to normalize berthing requirements and pier space to a single metric. Under this concept, piers must have cold-iron, homeport capability and meet channel depth and height restrictions in order to berth any type of active naval or auxiliary vessel. The capacity analysis considers all naval activities that reported cruiser-equivalent berthing capability. The IEG approved the IAT's recommendation to delete Naval District Washington, Naval Support Activity, New Orleans, and Nuclear Power Training Unit Charleston from the S/SS Operations universe since these activities have limited capability and viability to homeport naval vessels.

15. Similar to Aviation Operations, S/SS has numerous assumptions that must be taken into consideration in order to ensure that the capacity analysis accurately depicts the capacity and requirements. Current active homeports were distinguished from naval activities not currently used as berthing facilities. These activities include shipyards, weapons stations, and previously closed naval activities. See slide (12) of enclosure (6). Additionally, the current basing of Military Sealift Command Naval Fleet Auxiliary Force is included in the analysis, but the United States Coast Guard is not included in the analysis. Additionally, since surge is not a platform issue, it does not require increases in infrastructure. The IAT identified other assumptions, including the application of an inport paradigm and the removal of forward deployed ships and ships in overhaul from the capacity requirement. The IAT provided capacity analysis results, both with and without application of the inport paradigm, for the IEG's review. The IEG recognized that Commander, Fleet Forces Command (CFFC) is continuing to evaluate the impact of the Fleet Response Plan on these assumptions and directed the IAT to coordinate efforts with CFFC staff in order to finalize these assumptions and complete capacity analysis.

16. CDR Fairbairn provided the maximum capacity for both active homeports and all available ports. The IAT determined current and future excess capacity by subtracting current and future force requirements from the maximum capacity (for both active and all homeports) derived from the capacity data call. Current and future force requirements were derived from the 2004 BRAC Force Structure Report.

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 10 JUNE 2004

17. The deliberative session adjourned at 1125.

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