BRAC 2005
EDUCATION AND TRAINING JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP

MEETING MINUTES OF 18 MARCH 2004

The Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (P&R), Mr. Abell, chaired the 13th meeting of the E&T JCSG 18 March 2004. Attendee List is at Attachment 2.

Mr. Abell welcomed the E&T JCSG principals and briefly outlined the goal of the meeting was to review subgroups' responses to the ISG comments (Infrastructure Steering Group Comments on the E&T JCSG Draft Military Analysis Value Report, 11 March 2004) and approve proposed changes to the E&T JCSG Military Value Analysis Report. Mr. Dominguez suggested an independent review to assure that the final E&T JCSG MVA Report is a complete, stand-alone document and would address BRAC Commission concerns. The OSD BRAC office representative assured the group that such a review was the responsibility of OSD BRAC.

The E&T JCSG principals considered all general and specific comments as well as discussion remarks offered during the 24 February 2004 ISG meeting. Mr. Howlett, E&T JCSG Coordination Team, briefed a summary of the ISG comments and proposed changes. (Attachment 1). Based upon rationale provided by each subgroup, the E&T JCSG gained consensus on the proposed changes to the E&T JCSG Military Value Analysis Report. Recommendations from the ISG were generally accepted with the following specific comments/clarification:

- Ranges subgroup needs to develop an integrated methodology for Training and Test & Evaluation Ranges. The presentation of military value scoring plans for the two functions should allow for a more easily understood, side-by-side comparison. For example, the Training Ranges military value scoring plan has 14 attributes, while the Test & Evaluation military value scoring plan identified only 5 attributes. Additionally, the cost of services can be a significant factor in choosing a range for training, and it is not clear whether that cost should be addressed differently in the military value scoring plan. *(page 3, para. 2)*
    - Separate scoring plans were developed for the Training and T&E functions within the Ranges subgroup to reflect their respective mission requirements. A table was included in the Military Value Analysis Report that cross-walks the attributes from Training and T&E.
    - While cost is a significant factor in choosing a range to conduct training and funding for those range operations - a range's military value is predominantly its ability and capability to support the mission. Both the Training and T&E sub-functions did not want to reduce that focus and weighted Criterion 4 at 10% of the total. Cost should not be the primary discriminator for military value considerations among Training and T&E functions on ranges. Overall, Scoring percentages for Criterion 4 are in line with other subgroups.

- ...final report should clearly explain why each subgroup places so much weight on Criteria 1 & 2 and very little weight on Criteria 3 & 4, particularly the minimum weight assigned to Criterion 4 by the Ranges subgroup. Please reconsider the current distribution of weights in light of the ISG discussion. *(page 3, para. 3)*
    - Subgroups considered and determined weights were appropriate for each of the criteria. After reviewing the Federal Register Notice Vol. 69, No 29, subgroups determined current weights are appropriate with the following explanation: the ability to accommodate mobilization, contingency & future force requirements is an integral part of Selection Criteria 1 & 2, as well as 3.
    - Explanations of weights are fully addressed in the Military Value Analysis Report.

- Subgroups may be using too many attributes and metrics with too little weight.... Therefore, consider reducing the number of attributes and metrics that carry limited percentages of weight. *(Page 4, item 3)*
    - Information was validated during the subgroups' sensitivity analysis and minor modifications were made to their scoring plans. In particular, the Quality of Life questions were standardized between three of the subgroups resulting in fewer questions and higher weights per question. The number of metrics now allows better discrimination between activities that answer the questions.

- Professional Development Education: Please reconsider the weight of the location attribute and revise your report accordingly. *(Page 5, item 6a)*
    - For Military Graduate Education and Other Full-time Education, "location" was assigned the lowest weight (10%) in the score plan. For PME/JPME it is only 20% which is 4th of the 5 attributes. Location has 5 metrics valuable to resident programs: (1) airport (indicating accessibility), proximity to (2) Service, (3) Joint, and (4) NCR centers of excellence, and (5) other PDE (which indicates synergy and efficiency).

- Professional Development Education: Additionally, the metric "distance to DC" appears to conflict with metrics the HSA JCSG will use in its analysis of the NCR. Please reconsider the use of this metric. *(Page 5, item 6b)*
    - No conflict noted. PDE is not considering the purchase or leasing of real estate in the NCR like the HSA. Metric is an indicator of physical accessibility to resources in NCR including senior military, political, & agency leaders as well as symposiums, think tanks, lecture series, seminars, speakers, etc. -- DC is the center of excellence for national security matters.

- Consider revision to this imperative "...to retain unique/one-of-a-kind assets or capabilities..." to show that its intent is to preserve capabilities or access to capabilities as opposed to the preservation of facilities. *(Page 5, item 7)*
    - This imperative will be deleted from the MVA Report. Imperatives will be vetted through the ISG and provided to the JCSGs.

- Flight Training Sub-functions: The definitions of Flight Training Sub-functions appear to show irregularities (e.g., ABM). Please review the training functions in the Flight Training subgroup for consistency. *(Page 5 item 8)*
    - The E&T JCSG approved moving ABM training from FT to SST. Changes will be reflected in the MVA Report.
    - Based upon ISG guidance during the 24 February 2004 meeting, the E&T JCSG focused the Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) sub-function of Flight Training to those UAV platforms presumed to be joint, specifically Global Hawk (page 3, para 1.b.v).
        - E&T JCSG principals agreed that the cover memo to transmit the MVA Report to the ISG should request flexibility on the scope of responsibility to explore the commonality of jointness on a broader scale. While platforms differ, elements of operator and maintainer training on these future systems may be similar. Also, the E&T JCSG believes it would be premature to rule out E&T JCSG analysis on the assumption that a future UAV platform will be single-Service. Results of this review may not provide concrete recommendations but might be useful in providing a way ahead for joint UAV training.

- Flight Training, Undergraduate Fixed Wing, Question 2, Environment. Consider whether this question should be scored so that a facility that receives credit on Question 1 also receives credit on Question 2. *(Page 6, item 11)*
    - Questions 1 & 2 under the Environment attribute should be separate questions to maintain the existing weighting scheme. Installations that receive full credit for Question 1 will receive no credit for Question 2.

The meeting concluded with the Chair thanking the Subgroups and their respective members for their hard work. He then addressed the principals on the need to establish routine meeting of the E&T JCSG through the summer months. This should help the principals in managing their calendars; it also keeps principals updated on a more routine basis while providing subgroups with the guidance they need during these next critical months. Recommendations for meeting days should be forwarded to the Chair; principals will be notified. Mr. Abell also pointed out the need from this point through scenario development to maintain continuity of group and subgroups members, as much as possible. We have a winning team and need to keep the team together in order to ensure quality results.

Approved: Charles S. Abell
Principal Deputy Under Secretary of
Defense (Personnel & Readiness)
Chairman, Education & Training Joint
Cross-Service Group

Attachments:

1. Briefing Slides
2. List of Attendees, 18 March 2004

Copies Furnished:

1. OSD BRAC Office
2. E&T JCSG Coordination Team
3. DoD IG

BRAC 2005
EDUCATION AND TRAINING JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP
18 March 2004

Attendees

Members:

- Hon Charles S. Abell, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (P&R) Chair
- Mr. Michael Dominguez, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs
- MG Buford Blount, USA, Deputy G-3
- BGen George Flynn, Director, Training and Education Command, USMC
- COL (P) Thomas Maffey, JCS VDJ-7
- CAPT Bill Wilcox, N1D

Others:

- Mr. Bob Howlett, E&T JCSG Coordination Team
- Col Nancy Weaver, USAF, E&T JCSG Coordination Team
- Maj Gen Peter Sutton, AF/DPL
- Maj Gen William Fraser III, USAF, AETC/DO
- Mr. Tom Macia, Ranges BRAC
- Ms. Pat Walker, DASD (RA) M&F
- CAPT Gene Summerlin, USN, Navy BRAC
- Col James Briggs, USAF, AETC/DOO
- Col Jimmie Simmons, USAF, AETC/DOR
- Mr. Bob Harrison, DAMO-TR
- Mr. Steve Jameson, OASD(RA)/M&F
- CAPT Bruce Russell, Division Chief, Joint Doctrine, J-7
- CDR Brad Roberson, OUSD(P&R)
- Lt Col Anne Fitch, AF BRAC
- Mr. Brian Buzzell, OSD BRAC Contract Support
- CPT Marc Mueller, USA, J7/JDETD/JETB
- Ms. Beth Schaefer, DOD/IG
- SSG Kevin Lipscomb, USA, E&T JCSG Coordination Team

Education &Training Joint Cross Service Group

E&T JCSG Principals Meeting
18 March 2004

Military Value Report

Military Value Key Dates

- 24 Feb 04 – E&T JCSG Military Value Report briefed to ISG
- 2 Mar 04 -- Informal comments forwarded to OSD BRAC Office
- 11 Mar 04 – Comments provided to E&T JCSG Chair
- 18 Mar 04 – E&T JCSG to review/approve responses to ISG feedback
- 25 Mar 04 – Final report due for coordination
  - Questions due 7 days later
- 2 Apr 04 – Integration meeting on all reports except Intel.
  - JCSG Chairs invited to attend
- 16 April – Formal coordination complete

ISG Comments

General Comments… (page 1, para. 1)

- ***…your final report should be complete, stand-alone document that contains the reasons for selecting attributes and metrics and assigning weights and scores, supported by official records of deliberation. Similarly, if your analysis relies on questions from the initial data call, the text of those questions should be identified as such in each section of the report.***

- Report reviewed and is a complete, stand-alone document that contains the reasons for selecting attributes and metrics and assigning weights and scores, supported by official records of deliberation.

- Report updated to reflect new Military Value questions, questions from the initial data call, and new capacity questions.

ISG Comments

General Comments... (page 1, para. 2)

- ***...report should clarify how an attribute applies the criteria, how a metric measures an attribute, and how a question will provide the needed input to a metric. Rationales seem apparent for most of the subgroups, it is not clear for the Ranges subgroup.***

Rationale clarified for Ranges subgroup in the report.

ISG Comments

General Comments… (Page 2, para 1)

- ***Your approach to military value would benefit from a sensitivity analysis…***

Sensitivity analyses were conducted to determine if scoring plans would differentiate among various activities.

- Subgroups adjusted scoring scale for some metrics to provide greater discrimination

ISG Comments

General Comments… (Page 2, para 2)

- ***…it is unclear whether your scoring plan allows for valuing those attributes you consider important. Review your metric scoring and consider whether it will allow you to discriminate among installations but still capture the factors that are important to defend your analysis.***

As a result of the sensitivity analysis, minor adjustments to the scoring scale for some questions (min/max values) were made to ensure the scoring will adequately and fairly discriminate an installation's value for each metric.

- Min/max. values are defined for each metric based on the current parameters/conditions
- Subgroups are confident enough discrimination is built into the scoring plans to satisfactorily compare the military value of the bases

ISG Comments

General Comments…(page 2, para. 3&4)

- ***…Federal Register notice makes a number of commitments related to how the Department will interpret and apply the final selection criteria. Review this notice to determine whether you should build such commitments into your military value approach.***

  Federal Register comments reviewed, no changes to scoring plans were required.

- ***Review questions and resulting data requirements to determine the ability of an installation or facility to answer within the time available.***

  Question reviewed for complexity and answerability. Installations should be able to respond within the time available.

ISG Comments

General Comments…(page 2, para. 5 & 6)

- ***The second data call will provide an opportunity to include questions to support your capacity analysis… These additional capacity-related questions should be included in a new section to your report.***

Subgroups included questions for the second data call to support the military value scoring plan.

- Distinguished between those questions that have already been asked in the first data call & those that will be included in the second data call
- Included additional capacity-related questions in the question attachment that were omitted in the first data call

- ***Questions are due no later than 7 days after submission of the final report***

Will be completed

ISG Comments

General Comments… (page 3, para. 1 &2)

- ***…to ensure data is consistent, we (ISG) will issue policy that will define the "cutoff" dates that should be used in your analysis.***

  No response required at this time

- ***The ISG is generally concerned about the coordination of effort on ranges. The E&T and Technical JCSGs need to coordinate efforts to analyze ranges… Your final report should set out this coordinated process.***

  E&T and Technical JCSG Chairs met 12 Mar 04 and agreed to a coordination process. MOA (codifying procedures) includes E&T JCSG T&E sub-working group requirements.
  - CIT and T&ESWG chairs are expected to routinely coordinate on matters of mutual interest and raise issues early

ISG Comments

General Comments… (page 3, para. 2)

- ***Ranges subgroup needs to develop an integrated methodology for Training and Test & Evaluation Ranges. The presentation of military value scoring plans for the two functions should allow for a more easily understood , side-by-side comparison. For example, the Training Ranges military value scoring plan has 14 attributes, while the Test & Evaluation military value scoring plan identified only 5 attributes. Additionally, the cost of services can be a significant factor in choosing a range for training, and it is not clear whether that cost should be addressed differently in the military value scoring plan.***

Separate scoring plans were developed for the Training and T&E functions within the Ranges subgroup to reflect their respective mission requirements. A table was included in the Military Value Report that cross-walks the attributes from Training and T&E.

We agree cost is a significant factor in choosing ranges for training -- addressed in criteria 4, with a weight of 7% of the total. T&E does not find cost a significant consideration to DOD -- the military value of a range is in its ability and capability to support the mission.

ISG Comments

General Comments… (page 3, para. 3)

- ***…final report should clearly explain why each subgroup places so much weight on criteria 1 & 2 and very little weight on criteria 3 & 4, particularly the minimum weight assigned to criterion 4 by the Ranges subgroup. Please reconsider the current distribution of weights in light of the ISG discussion.***

Subgroups considered and determined weights were appropriate for each of the criteria. After reviewing the Federal Register Notice Vol. 69, No 29, subgroups determined current weights are appropriate with the following explanation: the ability to accommodate mobilization, contingency & future force requirements is an integral part of Selection Criteria 1 & 2, as well as 3.

- Explanations of weights are fully addressed in the Military Value Report

ISG Comments

General Comments… (page 3, para. 4)

- ***Your draft report …correctly reflects the current guidance regarding graduate pilot training, and should continue to do so until the ISG advises otherwise.***

No response needed at this time.

ISG Comments

Specific Comments…

1. ***Update the selection criteria throughout the report to reflect the proposed final criteria published in the Federal Register on February 12, 2004.***

Report reviewed & updated as necessary.

ISG Comments

Specific Comments…

2. *Quality of life*
   a) ***Three of the subgroups used different metrics for quality of life. …consider developing a common set of metrics.***

   b) ***…review the quality of life questions to ensure they are appropriately proportionate to attribute weight.***

- Subgroups established a common set of QoL metrics and questions in order to provide greater uniformity.
- Some questions will be weighted differently, as appropriate, to the different subgroups/functions.

ISG Comments

Specific Comments…

c) ***The metrics used to capture quality of life are not well defined. (e.g. Cost of living and "local school quality index")***

Modified the "Cost of living" question to better-defined measure using "civilian locality pay percentage" which is a Federal standard–reference provided. The weighting for this question was also revised to score on a linear scale between lowest & highest values. Question on school quality was deleted.

d) ***Please reconsider using the number of military housing units as an indicator of quality of life.***

Reconsidered – question deleted. Revised question asked for average "wait time" in weeks for military housing.

ISG Comments

Specific Comments…

3. ***Your subgroups may be using too many attributes and metrics with too little weight….Therefore, consider reducing the number of attributes and metrics that carry limited percentages of weight.***

Subgroups reviewed metrics to ensure each balanced with the weight of the attribute.

- The number of metrics allow discrimination between activities that answer the questions, even if the scores are relatively close
- Information was validated during the subgroups sensitivity analyses

ISG Comments

Specific Comments…

4. ***Many questions ask respondents to rate a particular facility as adequate without defining what adequate means. Consider explaining to respondents how to convert their different rating systems to one that will provide comparable results, similar to the method the Supply and Storage JCSG used.***

The majority of the information needed should be derived from the capacity data call. However, new questions will advise respondents the Condition Code should be entered in as 1, 2, or 3. (Army's Green, Amber, or Red and the Navy's Adequate, Substandard, Inadequate equate to the Air Force 1, 2, 3 respectively).

ISG Comments

Specific Comments…

5. ***The JCSG's weighting plan appears to set the maximum score for every metric at 1, but the report is not entirely clear. Clarify maximum metric scores in the final report.***

- The "1" in the scoring scale means 100% of the value assigned to that question. Report updated with this clarification.

ISG Comments

Specific Comments…

6. Professional Development Education

- *Please reconsider the weight of the location attribute and revise your report accordingly.*

For Military Graduate Education and Other Full-time Education, "location" was assigned the lowest weight (10%) in the score plan. For PME/JPME it is only 20% which is 4th of the 5 attributes. Location has 5 metrics valuable to resident programs: (1) airport (indicating accessibility), proximity to (2) Service, (3) Joint, and (4) NCR centers of excellence, and (5) other PDE which indicates synergy and efficiency.

- *Additionally, the metric "distance to DC" appears to conflict with metrics the HSA JCSG will use in its analysis of the NCR. Please reconsider the use of this metric….*

No conflict noted. PDE is not considering the purchase or leasing of real estate in the NCR. Metric is an indicator of physical accessibility to resources in NCR including senior military, political, & agency leaders as well as symposiums, think tanks, lecture series, seminars, speakers, etc. -- DC is the center of excellence for national security matters.

ISG Comments

Specific Comments…

7. ***Consider revision to this imperative "…to retain unique/one-of-a-kind assets or capabilities…" to show that its intent is to preserve capabilities or access to capabilities as opposed to the preservation of facilities.***

☞ Recommend deletion of this imperative. Imperatives will be vetted through the ISG and provided to the JCSGs.

ISG Comments

Specific Comments…

8. *Flight Training Sub functions*
   - ***The definitions of flight training sub functions appear to show irregularities (e.g., ABM) Please review the training functions in the Flight Training subgroup for consistency.***

☞ Recommend ABM training move from FT to SST.
- The exclusion of UAVs warrants further discussion. The Military Value Report currently reflects limiting UAVs to Global Hawk.

9. *Specialized Skill Training*
   - ***Clarify the role of population density and fully explain the rationale for its inclusion.***

Included for its value to provide a safe, distraction-free environment for Initial Skills Training only. This question is not asked for Skills Progression and Functional Training Sub functions.

ISG Comments

Specific Comments…

10. As discussed at the ISG, the report should clarify that taxiways are captured in any references to runways, aprons, and hangars.

Taxiways are less important than runway, ramp & hangar facilities. Runway exits onto taxiways are considered directly in the runway capacity calculations. Taxiway capacity is assumed sufficient to support normal runway operations.

11. Flight Training, Undergraduate Fixed Wing, Question 2, Environment. Consider whether this question should be scored so that a facility that receives full credit on Question 1 also receives full credit on Question 2.

Questions 1 & 2 under the Environment attribute should be separate questions to maintain the existing weighting scheme. Installations that receive full credit for Question 1 will receive no credit for Question 2.