DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
1000 NAVY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20350-1000

DCN:5459

MN-0429
IAT/VJM
13 January 2005

MEMORANDUM

Subj: MINUTES OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG) MEETING OF 6 JANUARY 2005

Encl: (1) 6 January 2005 IEG Meeting Agenda
(2) Recording Secretary's Report of IEG Deliberations on 6 January 2005

1. The fifty-first meeting of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) was convened at 1001 on 6 January 2005 in room 4D447 at the Pentagon. The following members of the IEG were present: Ms. Anne R. Davis, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Navy for all matters associated with BRAC 2005 (Special Assistant for BRAC), Co-Chair; ADM John B. Nathman, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations (VCNO), Co-Chair; VADM Justin D. McCarthy, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics (N4), Member; VADM Kevin J. Cosgriff, 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 Martin Post, USMC, 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. 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, JACG, USN, Recorder; LCDR Vincent J. Moore, JAGC, USNR, Recorder; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC, Recorder. Gen William L. Nyland, USMC, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps (ACMC), Co-Chair, was absent.

2. The following members of the DON Analysis Group (DAG) were present: Mr. Michael G. Akin, alternate for RADM Christopher E. Weaver, USN, Commander, Navy Installations Command/Director, Ashore Readiness Division (OPNAV N46); Ms. Ariane Whittemore, Assistant Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness

and Logistics (N4B); Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree, Director Fleet Training (N7A), U.S. Fleet Forces Command; Ms. Carla Liberatore, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (I&L), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; Mr. Paul Hubbell, Deputy Assistant Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics (Facilities) Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; Mr. Michael F. Jaggard, Chief of Staff, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition (ASN(RD&A)); Ms. Debra Edmond, Director, Office of Civilian Human Resources, Assistant Secretary of the Navy, Manpower & Reserve Affairs (M&RA); and, CAPT Thomas Mangold, USN, alternate for RDML(sel) Charles Martoglio, USN, Director, Strategy and Policy Division, N51.

3. The following members or representatives of the Functional Advisory Board (FAB) were present: VADM Gerald L. Hoewing, USN, Chief of Naval Personnel and Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Manpower and Personnel; RADM Jay Cohen, USN, Chief of Naval Research; RADM William R. Klemm, USN, Deputy Commander, Logistics, Maintenance, and Industrial Operations, SEA-04, NAVSEASYSCOM; RADM(sel) Alan S. Thompson, SC, USN, Director, Supply, Ordnance and Logistics Operations Division, N41, OPNAV; Ms. Claudia Clark, Deputy Director of Naval Intelligence (DDNI); Mr. Michael Rhodes, Assistant Deputy Commandant for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (M&RA), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; BGen Thomas L. Conant, USMC, Commanding General, Training Command and Deputy Commanding General, Training and Education Command; Mr. George Ryan, OPNAV 091; Col Michael J. Massoth, USMC; CAPT David W. Mathias, CEC, USN; CAPT Albert J. Shimkus, NC, USN; CAPT Nancy Hight, MSC, USN; and, Mr. Thomas B. Grewe.

4. The following members of the IAT were also present: Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff; Mr. John E. Leather; CAPT Jason A. Leaver, USN; Mr. Andrew S. Demott; CAPT Gene A. Summerlin, USN; CAPT Jan G. Rivenburg, USN; CDR Margaret M. Carlson, JAGC, USN; LtCol Mark S. Murphy, USMC; CDR Robert S. Clarke, CEC, USN; CDR Phillip A. Black, USN; CDR Beth L. Hartmann, CEC, USN; and, LCDR Kristina M. Nielsen, CEC, USN. All attendees were provided enclosure (1). Ms. Davis presented the minutes from the 23 December 2004 IEG meeting for review and they were approved.

5. Ms. Davis stated that OSD has issued policy memoranda concerning environmental impacts for leased space, surge, final selection criteria, and procedures for review of Candidate Recommendations. Ms. Davis noted that the final version of the Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS) had been signed on 3 January 2005. She stated that the final version was in most respects identical to the draft version that had been

guiding BRAC deliberations to date, particularly with respect to the move of a CVN into the Pacific Command area of responsibility. One change of note, however, states that CVN maintenance capability "should" be located near the CVN, as compared to the draft version that used the word "must". Ms. Davis then briefly described the likely procedure for submitting Candidate Recommendations to the IEC and stated that due to the Inauguration Day holiday; OSD was now expecting Service Candidate Recommendations, signed by the Secretary concerned, on 21 January 2005 vice 20 January 2005. The IEG moved into deliberative session at 1008. See enclosure (2). The meeting adjourned at 1124.

Anne R Davis

Anne Rathmell Davis
Co-Chair, IEG

TAB 1

Infrastructure Evaluation Group

6 January 2005
1000-1200
Pentagon, Room 4D447

Meeting called by:	Chairs	Recorder:	LCDR Moore

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

Review and approve minutes of IEG Meeting of 23 Dec 04	Ms. Davis
Deliberative Session :	Ms. Davis

- Scenario Data Call Status
- Scenario Development
  - Delete DON-0035
- Scenario Analysis (Full)
  - COBRA Recap, Criteria 6-8 and Risk Assessments
    - 30 Reserve Centers
    - NRDs
    - OTCs
- Scenario Analysis (COBRA Comparison)
  - Fenceline Closures
    - Whiting Field
    - Monterey
- IEG/FAB Open Discussion

Administrative

- Next meeting 13 Jan 05, 1000-1200, 4D447

Other Information

Draft minutes of 23 Dec 04 IEG meeting provided [To IEG members only]
Report of 23 Dec 04 IEG deliberative session provided [To IEG members only]
Other Read Aheads [To all attendees]

TAB 2

Department of the Navy
IAT

INFRASTRUCTURE ANALYSIS TEAM
ODASN (IS&A), 2221 South Clark Street, Suite 900, Arlington, VA 22202
(703)-602-6500

RP-0430
IAT/VJM
11 January 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR THE INFRASTRUCTURE EVALUATION GROUP (IEG)

Subj: REPORT OF IEG DELIBERATIONS OF 6 JANUARY 2005

Encl: (1) DON Analysis Group Brief to IEG of 6 January 2005
(2) Criteria 6-8 Analysis for DON-0057

1. The thirty-fifth deliberative session of the Department of the Navy (DON) Infrastructure Evaluation Group (IEG) convened at 1008 on 6 January 2005 in room 4D447 at the Pentagon. The following members of the IEG were present: Ms. Anne R. Davis, Co-Chair; ADM John B. Nathman, USN, Co-Chair; VADM Justin D. McCarthy, USN, Member; VADM Kevin J. Cosgriff, USN, Member; LtGen Richard L. Kelly, USMC, Member; BGen Martin Post, USMC, alternate for LtGen Michael A. Hough, 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 (OGC), Representative. The following members of the DON Analysis Group (DAG) were present: Mr. Michael G. Akin, alternate for RADM Christopher E. Weaver, USN; Ms. Ariane Whittemore; Mr. Thomas R. Crabtree; Ms. Carla Liberatore; Mr. Paul Hubbell; Mr. Michael F. Jaggard; Ms. Debra Edmond; and, CAPT Thomas Mangold, USN, alternate for RDML(sel) Charles Martoglio, USN. The following members or representatives of the Functional Advisory Board (FAB) were present: VADM Gerald L. Hoewing, USN; RADM Jay Cohen, USN; RADM(sel) Alan S. Thompson, SC, USN; Ms. Claudia Clark; Mr. Michael Rhodes; BGen Thomas L. Conant, USMC; Mr. George Ryan; Col Michael J. Massoth, USMC; CAPT David W. Mathias, CEC, USN; CAPT Albert J. Shimkus, NC, USN; CAPT Nancy Hight, MSC, USN; and, Mr. Thomas B. Grewe. The following members of the IAT were also present: Mr. Dennis Biddick, Chief of Staff; Mr. David W. LaCroix, Senior Counsel; Mr. John E. Leather; Mr. Andrew S. Demott; CAPT Gene A. Summerlin, USN; CAPT Jan G. Rivenburg, USN; CDR Robert E. Vincent II, JAGC, USN; CDR Margaret M. Carlson, JAGC, USN; LtCol Mark S. Murphy, USMC; CDR Robert S. Clarke, CEC, USN; CDR Phillip A. Black, USN; CDR Beth Hartmann, CEC, USN; LCDR Kristina M. Nielsen, CEC, USN; LCDR Vincent J. Moore, JAGC, USNR; and, Capt James A. Noel, USMC. All attendees were provided enclosure (1).

2. Ms. Davis used slide 3 of enclosure (1) to update the DAG on the status of the scenario data call (SDC) process as of 4 January 2005, noting that 160 DON and 481 JCSG scenarios are now posted in the OSD scenario tracking tool. She observed that the volume of new JCSG scenarios has slowed considerably over the last two weeks.

3. Ms. Davis next discussed scenario DON-0035, which closes NAVSTA Everett, WA, and moves its CVN to NAS North Island, CA (NASNI). Ms. Davis advised the IEG that when this scenario was first briefed to the DAG, the DAG realized that Commander, Pacific Fleet (COMPACFLT), assumed that three carriers were to be berthed at NASNI for this scenario, when the intention of this scenario was to add a fourth carrier based on the apparent capacity at NASNI. A discrepancy data call (DDC) was issued and COMPACFLT responded that only three approved CVN berths exist at NASNI. An additional berth cannot be made available for a variety of reasons (e.g., cost, facility limitations, and environmental issues). The DAG concluded at its 30 December 2004 deliberative session that this scenario is infeasible and that it should recommend to the IEG that the scenario be eliminated from further consideration. The IEG approved removing DON-0035 from further consideration.

4. Ms. Davis next briefed the IEG on Criteria 6, 7, and 8, and Risk Assessment for reserve center scenarios. She reminded the IEG that at its 16 December 2004 deliberative session, it had directed the DAG to proceed with scenario analysis for 25 close Navy Reserve Center (NRC) scenarios with no receiver site identified because all showed an immediate Payback with low One-Time costs and significant Net Present Value (NPV). See slide 6 of enclosure (1).

5. Ms. Davis also reminded the IEG that at its 23 December 2004 deliberative session, it had directed the DAG to continue with scenario analysis for four of five reserve center scenarios with identified receiver sites. These four sites also have an Immediate payback. The scenarios with identified receiver sites have higher One-Time costs than the scenarios with no receiver site because in most cases they require some MILCON at the receiving site to accommodate relocating units, however, they also have a high NPV. See slide 7 of enclosure (1). Ms. Davis advised the IEG that the DAG had decided to also consider for final candidate recommendation those reserve center scenarios for which operational considerations provide a strong basis for closure, despite lower cost benefit. The DAG, therefore, at its 30 December 2004 session, decided to recommend for final

candidate status one scenario which fit this definition: DON-0057 (I&I West Trenton, NJ, to Ft. Dix, NJ). This scenario shows a Payback of two years, but the Marine Corps has a strong desire to move the relocating units to their training assets, which are located at Ft. Dix. Enclosure (2) shows Criteria 6, 7, and 8 analysis for DON-0057.

6. Ms. Davis stated that the results of Criterion 6, 7, and 8 analyses for these 30 scenarios show they have no substantial economic or community impact on losing or gaining communities. The scenarios also have negligible Criterion 8 impacts, with only one scenario requiring minimal wetland mitigation. Ms. Davis then presented a Candidate Recommendation Risk Assessment slide. See slide 9 of enclosure (1). Ms. Davis stated this format had been developed by the IAT and DAG to illustrate the executability risk, warfighting/readiness risk, COCOM concerns and other issues of note presented by fully developed scenarios and that the DAG would continue to refine this format. The slide shows that the 30 reserve center scenarios have minimal executability and warfighting/readiness risk, no COCOM concerns and no other issues of concern. Ms. Davis noted that these scenarios are all consistent with Commander, Naval Reserve Forces and Commander, Marine Forces Reserve future planning and demographic considerations. The IEG directed that candidate recommendation packages be prepared for all 30 reserve center scenarios.

7. Ms. Davis next discussed Criteria 6, 7, and 8, and Risk Assessment for Naval Recruiting District (NRD) scenarios. She reminded the IEG that three scenarios had been developed, all involving closures of activities with no receiving sites. DON-0061, which is based on the optimization model, closes NRD Indianapolis, IN; Omaha, NE; Buffalo, NY; Montgomery, AL; and San Antonio, TX. DON-0062, which is based on the Commander, Navy Recruiting Command (CNRC) Transformation Plan, closes all of the same NRDs except that it closes NRD Kansas City, MO, instead of NRD San Antonio. DON-0063, which is based on the optimization model and eliminates all excess capacity, closes the five NRDs closed under DON-0061 as well as NRD Portland, OR; NRD Jacksonville, FL; and NRD St. Louis, MO. The scenarios all show an immediate Payback, with modest One-Time costs and significant NPV. See slide 12 of enclosure (1). The IEG had directed the DAG to continue with scenario analysis for these NRD scenarios at its 23 December 2004 deliberative session.

8. The results of criterion 6, 7, and 8 analysis for these scenarios show no substantial economic or community impact on

losing or gaining communities, and no substantial environmental impact. Risk Assessment indicates that DON-0062 had minimal executability and warfighting/readiness risk, DON-0061 has slightly higher warfighting/readiness risk, and DON-0063 has high warfighting/readiness risk. See slides 14-16 of enclosure (1). Ms. Davis stated that this assessment of risk is based on the high military value attributed to NRD San Antonio (and NRDs Jacksonville and St. Louis, which have military value in the upper half of the range for these activities, in DON-0063) and CNRC concerns over the effects of DON-0061 and DON-0063. The DAG therefore recommended DON-0062 for further development. Ms. Davis stated that CNRC is already undergoing a Transformation Plan that is aggressively reducing management overhead, including the number of NRDs. She stated CNRC does not favor DON-0061 (which also has the lowest financial value of the three scenarios) because closure of NRD San Antonio increases the range of NRD size by 15% and significantly increases the size of neighboring districts, adversely affecting span of control. Ms. Davis stated that CNRC does not favor DON-0063, although this scenario has the highest financial value, because it significantly increases NRD size and span of control for remaining NRDs and places great stress on a program already undergoing significant change. DON-0063 also has the least capability to handle surge requirements. The IEG noted CNRC's concerns and also expressed concern over the effect of closure of NRD San Antonio on Navy recruiting demographics. The IEG accordingly directed preparation of a Candidate Recommendation package for DON-0062.

9. Ms. Davis next discussed Criteria 6, 7, and 8, and Risk Assessment for Officer Training Command (OTC) scenarios. She reviewed the two scenarios that had been fully developed after the IEG had determined on 23 December 2004 not to further develop DON-0087 (consolidate OTC functions at NAS Pensacola, FL). DON-0085 realigns OTC Pensacola to OTC Newport, RI, a scenario with a two-year Payback, modest One-Time costs and modest NPV. DON-0086, which consolidates OTC Pensacola and OTC Newport at NAVSTA Great Lakes, IL, shows a 21-year Payback and significant One-Time costs. See slide 19 of enclosure (1). Ms. Davis stated that MILCON costs for barracks were the primary cost drivers, with costs for DON-0086 being higher because Newport has significant excess capacity and because two existing facilities were being moved to a third location in DON-0086. Ms. Davis noted that DON-0085 potentially conflicts with DON-0039, which closes NAVSTA Newport (although the DAG does not at the present time believe that pending DON and JCSG scenarios would move enough personnel and activities out of NAVSTA Newport

to make a fenceline closure feasible). Ms. Davis also noted that the Naval Education and Training Command (NETC) favored DON-0086 because NETC sees synergies eventually arising from use by OTC of Recruit Training Command assets already present at NAVSTA Great Lakes, but also noted that consolidation of OTC functions is NETC's highest priority.

10. Criteria 6 and 7 analysis for the OTC scenarios shows minor job changes for the affected communities and no community impacts. There are no substantial environmental impacts identified under Criterion 8. Risk Assessment shows minimal executability and warfighting/readiness risk for DON-0085. DON-0086 shows medium executability risk, primarily because of its low financial value. See slides 21-22 of enclosure (1). The IEG noted the higher financial value to the Navy of consolidation at OTC Newport. The IEG then discussed the possible effect of OTC consolidation on surge and noted that NAVSTA Newport appears to have significant excess capacity. The IEG also discussed the possible effect of numerous JCSG scenarios concerning NAVSTA Newport and determined that it may be too early to examine the possibility of conflicts with DON-0085. The IEG acknowledged the strengths of the scenario consolidating OTC at NAVSTA Newport but decided to table further action on OTC scenarios pending greater visibility of JCSG actions affecting NAVSTA Newport.

11. Ms. Davis next discussed interim COBRA comparison of proposed fenceline closures. Ms. Davis stated that she was presenting this topic to illustrate to the IEG and to JCSG members in attendance the value that can be added by JCSG actions if they enable fenceline closures, and to illustrate that this value may not be apparent from the data analyzed by the JCSG. Ms. Davis displayed preliminary COBRA results for E&T-0044, which relocates all flight training from NAS Whiting Field, MS, and DON-0152, which closes NAS Whiting Field. E&T-0044 on its own has One-Time costs in excess of $100 million and a Payback of 41 years. DON-0152 has modest One-Time costs, an immediate Payback and a NPV savings of almost $820 million. Combined, these scenarios generate an immediate payback and a 20-year NPV savings of approximately $750 million. See slide 25 of enclosure (1). Ms. Davis stated that these two scenarios highlighted a possible process issue. These two scenarios, if approved as final candidate recommendations, would not be presented together to the ISG because they originate from different sources. No other mechanism exists at this time to show the aggregate effect of numerous scenarios affecting a given installation. Ms. Davis stated it is, therefore,

important for the various DON bodies dealing with BRAC scenarios and JCSG members to keep in mind during their deliberations the positive effects of fenceline closures enabled by JCSG scenarios, note these effects in their supporting documentation, and work to enable close coordination of scenario development between services and JCSGs. Ms. Davis also stated that the ISG was aware of this issue, although no discussion of a process to integrate the effects of JCSG scenarios and fenceline closure scenarios had yet taken place.

12. As further illustration of fenceline closure issues, Ms. Davis briefed scenarios that enable the closure of the Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) fenceline in Monterey, CA. E&T-0003 privatizes graduate education and E&T-0012 and TECH-0020 relocate two of the larger NPS tenants (the Defense Resource Management Institute (DRMI) and Naval Research Laboratory (NRL), respectively), and DON-0070 closes the installation. E&T-0003 has fairly high One-Time costs as a result of moving students to private institutions but has considerable financial value because of billet eliminations and shows a Payback in one year. E&T-0012 shows a three-year Payback. TECH-0020 has high One-Time costs and low savings, and never shows a Payback. DON-0070 has high One-Time costs but high savings from the elimination of billets and base operating expenses, and thus shows a Payback in two years. The costs for DON-0070 are driven in large part by the purchase of a supercomputer for the Fleet Numeric Meteorology and Oceanography Center (FNMOC), a NPS tenant that would be relocated to Stennis Space Center, MS. Combined, these scenarios show an immediate Payback and 20-year NPV savings of over $1 billion. See slide 26 of enclosure (1). Ms. Davis noted that this analysis was provisional in that it did not account for the transfer of Navy-unique graduate education functions to a receiving site, and because DON does not have access to the Navy portion of JCSG COBRA data. The IEG discussed the issue of the supercomputer for FNMOC (which is also used by the NRL Detachment). Ms. Davis informed the IEG that the cost was justified by the reporting activity under the rationale that the computer must be in continuous operation for FNMOC to perform its critical mission of delivering weather forecasting products to the fleet. She advised the IEG that the DAG was continuing to research whether this cost was justified.

13. Ms. Davis then discussed DON-0071, a fenceline closure of NPS enabled by E&T-0023 (relocation of the graduate education function to the U.S. Naval Academy (USNA) in Annapolis, MD). E&T-0012 and TECH-0020 are also enabling scenarios for this scenario and have the same cost effects. IT and computer costs

for the NRL Detachment and FNMOC are also the same as in DON-0070. DON-0071 combined with its enabling scenarios shows high One-Time costs and a much lower NPV as compared to DON-0070, and a Payback of 12 years. The major element driving costs are MILCON for constructing a new postgraduate campus at the USNA. The data presented does not represent any synergies from combining NPS and USNA assets and further research is required to determine if any such synergies are possible. Ms. Davis stated that the fenceline scenarios in general illustrated the difficulties in evaluating actions concerning installations affected by multiple JCSG scenarios without a process specified for considering the totality of all of the actions.

14. The IEG received the following JCSG status updates:

a. Industrial. RADM Klemm advised the IEG that nine final candidate recommendation packages would be presented to the JCSG today and an additional eight were being prepared, to include scenarios involving Naval Shipyards and their detachments. The cost metric for aviation depots is still being defined and a meeting with the Assistant Secretary of Defense (AT&L) would occur shortly where it is hoped that progress towards finally defining this metric will be made. The Munitions subgroup is close to concluding its work with no issues of note affecting DON.

b. Medical. CAPT Shimkus advised the IEG that a scenario closing the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences had been prepared, and that data for the National Capital Region appears to favor retaining The National Naval Medical Center at Bethesda, MD, and building a new hospital facility in the Fort Belvoir, VA, area. The JCSG expects to conclude all of its major actions within two weeks.

c. Education and Training. VADM Hoewing advised the IEG that the Flight Training subgroup expected to conclude its deliberations by mid-January 2005. Analysis of Joint Strike Fighter scenarios has been delayed because one of the services has not yet provided its data. The Specialized Skills subgroup is making steady progress with no significant issues of note, although DoN is still tracking scenarios affecting intelligence. No scenarios for the war colleges are expected until the end of January. The Ranges subgroup is working on a conflict between E&T JCSG and Technical JCSG concerning Testing and Evaluation capacity data.

d. Technical. RADM Cohen advised the IEG that the Technical JCSG had developed a list of six scenarios contributing to DON fenceline closures and could contribute additional scenarios possibly leading to fenceline closures that could be assessed by the DAG.

e. Intelligence. Ms. Dolan informed the IEG that the intelligence JCSG expected to conclude its discussions on candidate recommendation packages during the week of 10 January. There is work being done with the E&T JCSG on intelligence training scenarios affecting DON, but with those exceptions none of the JCSG's candidate recommendations affect DON in a significant manner. The scenario consolidating intelligence training at Goodfellow AFB does not appear to be feasible.

f. Headquarters and Support Activities. Mr. Rhodes stated that the HSA JCSG was making steady progress and had developed 16 candidate recommendations to date. He noted that the JCSG was experiencing difficulties in evaluating scenarios because of constantly changing data sets and was considering asking OSD for a lock date for data.

g. Supply and Storage. RADM(Sel.) Thompson advised the IEG that the S&S JCSG was preparing 19 candidate recommendation packages for submission between 21 January and 4 February. These scenarios are intended to restructure the Defense Distribution system, including service Inventory Control Points. The biggest challenge faced by the S&S JCSG is inconsistent COBRA data for Inventory Control Points. RADM(Sel.) Thompson stated that the S&S JCSG Chair had signed out a memo on 5 January 2004 to the Services seeking a procedure to set consistent standards.

15. The IEG adjourned at 1124.

VINCENT J. MOORE
LCDR, JAGC, USNR
Recorder, IAT