

JOINT MOBILIZATION MILITARY VALUE SCORING PLAN ADDENDUM 15 March 2005

1. **General:** The following information is intended to provide the necessary detail and clarification to enable the user to extract source data and to calculate military value scores. Military value and/or capacity data questions supporting each metric are identified in the discussion for each metric. The military value targeting list used for the Mobilization military value questions are based on parameters established by the HSA mobilization subgroup. The overarching strategy for the joint mobilization sub-group was to explore joint-basing opportunities in order to enhance existing mobilization processing and pre-deployment activities and to capture savings as possible. Dedicated mobilization processing resources and infrastructure requirements are difficult to determine because the process of mobilization is frequently performed as an adjunct responsibility to non-mobilization missions on an active duty base, utilizing borrowed space and diverted resources. To conduct the mobilization analysis the focus was directed at existing military mobilization sites or platforms. The Army, Navy and Marine Corps all use pre-designated sites, or platforms to conduct a majority of their mobilizations. The Air Force does not stress platform mobilization method; rather they use almost all of their near 160 installations to mobilize. Thus, to narrow the analysis to a meaningful and manageable scope, only those AF bases reporting a mobilization requirement greater than 1900 personnel would be targeted. The minimum 1900 personnel targeted was used for capacity purposes to be able to managed large numbers of personnel from multiple services being able to mobilize from that location. The elements of analysis included a review infrastructure and processing capacities such as lodging, dining, processing, warehouse, maintenance and training capabilities for individuals (small arms ranges/9MM, M16), operational consideration of coastal sites for immediate deployment to overseas destinations, and deployment transportation node availability.

2. **Military Value Target List:** The military value target list was derived from review of capacity questions 337 and 338 for the Air Force and service identified Reserve Component (RC) mobilization sites known as Army Power Projection Platforms (PPPs) and the Power Support Platforms (PSPs). The Service identified RC mobilization sites for the Navy and Marines are Naval Mobilization Processing Sites (NMPS). The AF target list was developed entirely from capacity question 337 and 338. Throughout the process the Mob subgroup maintained continual liaison with the military services to identify any Reserve component mobilization changes that might have a significant impact on the existing structure.

a. Army Designated Mobilization Platforms:

The following Mobilization Platforms are designated by the Army G-3 and FORSCOM: Aberdeen Proving Ground, Fort Benning, Fort Bliss, Fort Bragg, Fort Buchanan, Fort Campbell, Fort Carson, Fort Dix, Fort Drum, Fort Eustis, Fort Hood, Fort Huachuca, Fort Jackson, Fort Knox, Fort Lee, Fort Leonard Wood, Fort Lewis, Fort McCoy, Fort Polk, Fort Richardson, Fort Riley, Fort Rucker, Fort Sill, Fort Stewart, Camp Atterbury, Camp Roberts, Camp Shelby, Gowen Field and Schofield

Barracks. Ft Sam Houston was initially considered because of its large reported mobilization requirement and was later removed from consideration because it is not an existing Mobilization Platform.

b. Navy and Marine Mobilization Sites:

The following list includes all of the CNO designated CONUS bases that serve as Navy Mobilization Processing Sites (NMPS). These bases and the three Navy managed Joint Reserve Bases were targeted for military analysis for the Navy. For the Marine Corps, the two primary mobilization sites (Camp Pendleton and Camp Lejeune) were targeted. Both of these bases also serve as Navy Mobilization Processing Sites.

NAVSTA Pearl Harbor, HI; NAVSTA Norfolk, VA; NAVSTA Great Lakes, IL; SUBASE New London, CT; NAVSTA San Diego, CA ; NAS Jacksonville, FL ; NAS Pensacola, FL; NAVBASE Ventura County Pt Mugu, CA; NAVSUPACT MID SOUTH Millington, TN; SUBASE Bangor, WA (NAVREG NW Seattle, WA); NAVDIST Washington, DC; NAS JRB Ft Worth, TX; NAS JRB New Orleans, LA; NAS JRB Willow Grove, PA; CG MCB Camp Lejeune, NC; CG MCB Camp Pendleton, CA; CBC Gulfport, MS

The following Navy Regional Commands and/or Local Area Coordinators for Mobilization (LACMOB) were also targeted to provide supplemental data for the mobilization sites in their area of responsibility: NAVREG Hawaii Pearl Harbor, HI; NAVREG MIDLANT Norfolk, VA; NAVREG MW Great Lakes, IL; NAVREG NE Groton, CT; NAVREG SW San Diego, CA; NAVREG SE Jacksonville, FL; NAVREG NW Seattle, WA; Three One Seabee Readiness Group, Port Hueneme, CA; NAS JRB Ft Worth, TX; NAS JRB New Orleans, LA; NAS JRB Willow Grove, PA; CG MCB Camp Lejeune, NC; CG MCB Camp Pendleton, CA; CBC Gulfport, MS

c. Air Force Mobilization Sites:

Mobilization processing can take place at any Air Force Base. In an effort to narrow the scope of our study it was deliberated with the members of the HSA-JCSG to look at Air Force installations that had mobilization requirements (Per DoD #337 and #338) of at least 1900 personnel. Billeting and dining capacities or peak loading topped the list of requirements for joint mobilization sites. After looking further into capacity data call one it was determined that the Air Force has mostly air space ranges and very little room for expansion of facilities or small arms ranges. The following Air Force sites were chosen for examination by the Joint Mobilization team:

Barksdale AFB, LA, Carswell ARS, NAS Fort Worth Joint Reserve Base, TX, Davis-Monthan AFB, AZ, Eglin AFB, FL, Elmendorf AFB, AK, Grissom ARB, IN, Hill AFB, UT, Holloman AFB, NM, Homestead ARS, FL, Jackson IAP AGS, MS, Kirtland AFB, NM, March ARB, CA, McGuire AFB, NJ, Minot AFB, ND, Niagara Falls IAP ARS, NY, Robins AFB, GA, Scott AFB, IL, Seymour-Johnson AFB, NC, Tinker AFB, OK, Travis AFB, CA, Westover ARB, MA, Whiteman AFB, MO, Wright-Patterson AFB,

OH, and Youngstown-Warren Regional APT ARS, OH. One exception on this list is Carswell ARS, NAS Ft Worth Joint Reserve Base. The Navy answered for the base.

Military Value Target List

OrgCode	Source	OrgName
24004	USA	ABERDEEN PROVING GROUND
13077	USA	FORT BENNING
48083	USA	FORT BLISS
37099	USA	FORT BRAGG
RQ137	USA	FORT BUCHANAN
21128	USA	FORT CAMPBELL
08135	USA	FORT CARSON
34201	USA	FORT DIX
36216	USA	FORT DRUM
51281	USA	FORT EUSTIS
48396	USA	FORT HOOD
04289	USA	FORT HUACHUCA
45404	USA	FORT JACKSON
21478	USA	FORT KNOX
51484	USA	FORT LEE
29977	USA	FORT LEONARD WOOD
53456	USA	FORT LEWIS
55533	USA	FORT MCCOY
22722	USA	FORT POLK
02736	USA	FORT RICHARDSON
20736	USA	FORT RILEY
01767	USA	FORT RUCKER
48399	USA	FORT SAM HOUSTON
40801	USA	FORT SILL
13834	USA	FORT STEWART
15776	USA	SCHOFIELD BARRACKS
Barksdale AFB	USAF	Barksdale AFB
Carswell ARS, NAS Fort Worth Joint Reserve	USAF	Carswell ARS, NAS Fort Worth Joint Reserve
Davis-Monthan AFB	USAF	Davis-Monthan AFB
Eglin AFB	USAF	Eglin AFB
Elmendorf AFB	USAF	Elmendorf AFB
Grissom ARB	USAF	Grissom ARB
Hill AFB	USAF	Hill AFB
Holloman AFB	USAF	Holloman AFB
Homestead ARS	USAF	Homestead ARS
Jackson IAP AGS	USAF	Jackson IAP AGS
Kirtland AFB	USAF	Kirtland AFB
March ARB	USAF	March ARB
McGuire AFB	USAF	McGuire AFB
Minot AFB	USAF	Minot AFB
Niagara Falls IAP ARS	USAF	Niagara Falls IAP ARS
Robins AFB	USAF	Robins AFB
Scott AFB	USAF	Scott AFB

OrgCode	Source	OrgName
Seymour Johnson AFB	USAF	Seymour Johnson AFB
Tinker AFB	USAF	Tinker AFB
Travis AFB	USAF	Travis AFB
Westover ARB	USAF	Westover ARB
Whiteman AFB	USAF	Whiteman AFB
Wright-Patterson AFB	USAF	Wright-Patterson AFB
Youngstown-Warren Regional APT ARS	USAF	Youngstown-Warren Regional APT ARS
CBC_GULFPORT_MS	USN	CBC_GULFPORT_MS
CG_MCB_CAMP_LEJEUNE_NC	USN	CG_MCB_CAMP_LEJEUNE_NC
CG_MCB_CAMPEN	USN	CG_MCB_CAMPEN
COMNAVDIST_WASHINGTON_DC	USN	COMNAVDIST_WASHINGTON_DC
NAS_JACKSONVILLE_FL	USN	NAS_JACKSONVILLE_FL
NAS_JRB_FT_WORTH_TX	USN	NAS_JRB_FT_WORTH_TX
NAS_JRB_NEW_ORLEANS_LA	USN	NAS_JRB_NEW_ORLEANS_LA
NAS_JRB_WILLOW_GROVE_PA	USN	NAS_JRB_WILLOW_GROVE_PA
NAS_PENSACOLA_FL	USN	NAS_PENSACOLA_FL
NAVBASE_VENTURA_CTY_PT_MUGU_CA	USN	NAVBASE_VENTURA_CTY_PT_MUGU_CA
NAVSTA_GREAT_LAKES_IL	USN	NAVSTA_GREAT_LAKES_IL
NAVSTA_NORFOLK_VA	USN	NAVSTA_NORFOLK_VA
NAVSTA_PEARL_HARBOR_HI	USN	NAVSTA_PEARL_HARBOR_HI
NAVSTA_SAN_DIEGO_CA	USN	NAVSTA_SAN_DIEGO_CA
NAVSUPPACT_MID_SOUTH_MILLINGT ON_TN	USN	NAVSUPPACT_MID_SOUTH_MILLINGTON_T N
SUBASE_BANGOR_WA	USN	SUBASE_BANGOR_WA
SUBASE_NEW_LONDON_CT	USN	SUBASE_NEW_LONDON_CT

3. Following is a discussion of each specific metric included in the Mobilization Military Value Model:

Criterion 1, Attribute 1, Metric 1: Existence of Ranges by Number and Type

Source of Data: Capacity Question DOD #153

Live Fire Training Categories = (all 9)

Small Arms Up to 7.62mm

Small Arms Ranges, Heavy Machinegun (.50 cal and Above)

Static Ranges - Ground Launched Missiles and Rockets

Stationary ranges - Armored Vehicle Gunnery - Crew

Stationary ranges - Armored Vehicle Gunnery - Unit

Explosives and Demolitions Ranges

Hand Grenade Ranges - Live

Hand Grenade Ranges - Inert

Combined Arms Live Fire Areas (CALFEX)

Columns = "Number of Ranges by Category"

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:

This metric is the total number of different types of ranges on the installation. It can be a minimum 0 and a maximum of 9. For each category, the score will either be a 0 or a 1, where a 1 means that the installation has that type of range. Since the responses were in a variety of forms (both text and numerical), the following responses were interpreted to mean there was no range of that type (i.e. a score of 0 was applied): "N/A", "NA", "Zero", "0", "o", "None", " " (a blank response). All other responses were considered as an indication that the installation had that type of range.

Criterion 2, Attribute 1, Metric 1: Acreage Available for Range Expansion

Source of Data: Capacity Question DOD #30

Column = "Training Areas/Ranges Total Buildable Acres_n"

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:

For this metric, select all of the rows provided for each Organization Code (installation) and perform a total of the data in the "Training Areas/Ranges Total Buildable Acres_n" column.

Criterion 2, Attribute 1, Metric 2: Buildable Acreage

Source of Data: Capacity Question DOD #30

Column = "Administrative Total Buildable Acres_n", "Barracks Total Buildable Acres_n"

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:

For this metric select all of the rows provided for each Organization Code (installation) and calculate the totals for both the "Administrative Total Buildable Acres_n" and "Barracks Total Buildable Acres_n" columns. Next, add these two totals to calculate the total Buildable Acreage metric.

Criterion 2, Attribute 2, Metric 1: Dining Facility Condition

Source of data: MV Question DOD#11

(a) Row(s): Use all rows where the OrgCodes map to the target list.

(b) Column(s): (Fields)

1. Org Code
2. Org Name
3. Service Facility Category
4. Service Facility Condition Code
5. Total Size (GSF)

Scope: [Target List for Respondents:](#)

This metric must be created in a number of separate steps. First, match up the Mobilization target list to obtain only the Installations (corresponding Organization Code) considered by the subgroup. Second, select only those Fac codes that the SMEs have identified as Dining Facilities (Table 2). (Note: more than one entry for an organization code (i.e. mess hall, dining, café, etc.) is often listed per organization code.) The following steps were taken after the applicable Fac Codes were identified

Explanation of Calculation:

1. Procedures to Compute Average (and Rounded) Condition Codes. For each MILDEPs only (4th estate not included):

- a. The Q11 data fields used were Org Code, Org Name, Service Facility Category, Service Facility Condition Code, and Total Size (GSF).
- b. The following steps were taken to determine the installation averages:
 - 1) Convert Condition Codes to numeric codes. The following numeric codes/conversions were used.

Service Facility Condition Code Field			
Service	Value	Convert to	
USA	Green	→	2
	Amber	→	3
	Red	→	4
USAF	1	→	1
	2	→	2
	3	→	3
	4	→	4
USN*	Adequate	→	2
	Substandard	→	3
	Inadequate	→	4

- 2) For each facility (record), calculate a “GSF-weighted-by-Condition-Code” (Multiply GSF by numeric code)
- 3) For each installation/fenceline, compute Total GSF and Total weighted-GSF, by adding the GSF and Weighted-GSF for each facility within the installation/fenceline.
- 4) For each installation/fenceline, compute the installation average facility condition. (Divide the Total Weighted GSF by the Total GSF).

- 5) The installation averages are then rounded to the nearest integer (final result).

2. Caveats/Data Anomalies: Where data was corrected /updated from the original DoD Q11 data call, the MILDEP LNO provided a certification or clarification to support the change.

- a. a. Army Data: The Army responses included facilities that were not rated. These buildings (records) were not used in the calculation of installation averages.
- b. Air Force Data: The Air Force has condition codes of "5" and "6;" these were not used in the calculations (no adverse impact on the results) because the facilities had been decommissioned. REF: Air Force Pamphlet 32-1003, Volume 2, "Working in the Resources Flight Real Estate Management" August 1998, p. 13.
- c. Navy Data: Codes other than "adequate", "substandard", "inadequate" were used. Table 1 below lists the conversions to numeric codes used.

Table 2 below lists the service-specific category codes that match to DoD facility codes used for Prison/Confinement Facility space.

Additional Remarks

Each MILDEP provided responses to CDC Q11 using a different system of classifying its buildings. In the absence of a common system of classifying the condition of buildings across the DoD and also in the absence of agreement between the MILDEPs on how to translate their different systems into a common set of codes, the JCSG decided to translate the MILDEP data into "C" Ratings in order to approximate the definitions used by DoD in its Installation Readiness Report. The C Rating definitions are as follows:

- C-1 – only minor facility deficiencies with negligible impact on capability to perform missions.
- C-2 – some facility deficiencies with limited impact on capability to perform missions.
- C-3 – significant facility deficiencies that prevent performing some missions.
- C-4 – major facility deficiencies that preclude satisfactory mission accomplishment.

The Air Force uses a system of six codes, the first four of which were determined to have a reasonably direct correlation to Codes C1-C4 and were translated as such. The last two codes are for buildings targeted for disposal and are not of consequence to the analysis.

- Code 1: Usable – Class A (Adequate) – generally meets criteria. A facility which can be used to house the function for which currently designated through end-position use with reasonable maintenance and without major alteration or reconstruction. Its functional adequacy, physical condition, structural adequacy, location and adequate utility systems (i.e. heating, air conditioning, ventilation,

power) are the major elements of the determination. The use of this code does not prohibit project work; however, any construction project will indicate either a change in use, conversion, or addition. Facilities in Code 1 should be translated to C-1.

- Code 2: Usable – Class B(Substandard) – upgrading required and practical. Structurally sound, can be raised to Class A. Facilities in Code 2 should be translated to C-2.
- Code 3: Force Use (Substandard)- cannot practically be raised to Class A, but can be used for a short duration. Facilities in Code 3 should be translated to Code C-3.
- Code 4: Sterile. Translate to Code C-4.
- Code 5 and Code 6: targeted for disposal. Do not include in list of reported buildings.

Both the Army and Navy used facility rating systems with only three codes. Army used the Green-Amber-Red system with recommended translations as follows:

- Green indicates full support of mission performance and results in either a C-1 or a C-2, depending on individual building circumstances.
- Amber indicates mission performance is impaired and corresponds to C-3.
- Red indicates significant impairment of mission and is a C-4.

Navy evaluated used the Adequate-Substandard–Inadequate system with recommended translations as follows:

- Adequate translates to either a C-1 or a C-2, depending on individual building circumstances.
- Substandard corresponds to C-3.
- Inadequate translates to a C-4.

In reviewing the actual data, the JCSG uncovered patterns in the data that suggest that the MILDEPs have differing internal systems for assessing the condition of its space. For example, the Navy reports approximately 77% of its space in the Adequate category whereas the Army reports 31% as Green, and the Air Force has 95% in its Codes 1 and 2.

In the absence of information on individual building circumstances, a more conservative translation of the Army's Green rating and the Navy's Adequate rating to the more conservative C-2 is appropriate. This decision is supported by subject matter expert property reviews in recent years of both military installations and other government property. Generally, but with certain exceptions of new MILCON, the vast majority of existing space on military installations does not present itself as equating to C-1 with only minor facility deficiencies. This type of space would normally be reserved for new construction or recent renovation. As such, it was determined that the most likely case, again in the absence of better information, was that a Green (Army) or Adequate (Navy) rating should be assigned a C-2 rating. Since the Air Force already had a 4-tier system

that appeared to reasonably well approximate the C Rating system, it was determined to proceed with a direct 4-tier translation.

As a result of this approach, the Air Force data appears to skew higher than that of the Army and Navy for facilities that are C-1 and C-2. This result appears reasonable in light of the following factors:

- Air Force administrative types of facilities tend to play a different role in support of the MILDEPs' warfighting missions than do those of the Army or Navy. Air Force bases are regarded as warfighting platforms and are used directly to fulfill the primary mission of the Air Force. Administrative types of facilities are often used for direct warfighting support and Command and Control functions. As such, the Air Force facilities are generally maintained to a high level of readiness and overall condition. The Army and Navy tend to use their administrative types of space more indirectly in support of their primary missions.
- Based upon a review of total MILDEP data concerning Sustainment Budgets for CONUS installations, contained in the COBRA Static Database, the Air Force maintains approximately 300 million square feet with a total budget of \$1.7 billion. Similarly, the Army maintains 819 million square feet, or 519 million (173%) additional square feet, with a total budget of \$1.8 billion, or only 6% more. The Navy and Marine Corps maintain 498 million square feet, or 66% more square feet, with a total budget of \$2.1 billion, which is only 21% more funding. This supports the previous statement that Air Force facilities tend to be maintained at a generally higher level than those of the other MILDEPs and, as such, would command higher facility condition ratings.
- A review of the same data as cited in the previous point shows that the Air Force has a budget of \$4.42 per square foot of Non-Payroll Sustainment Costs. The other MILDEPs are lower. Army is \$2.61. The Navy and Marines are \$3.95. This fact reinforces the notion that the Air Force funds the support of its installations at higher rates.

Table 1 - Navy Facility Condition Codes –numeric conversions

Service Facility Condition Code	Modified/ Numeric Condition Code
1	2
2	2
	0
1/ADQ	2
A	2
Adaquate	2
ADE	2
ADEQ	2
adeq	2
ADEQ	2
ADEQ/SBST	2
Adequate	2
adequate	2
ADEQUATE	2
ADQ	2
ADQEQUATE	2
C1	2
C-1	2
C1 -ADEQUATE	2
C2-ADEQUATE	2
C3 -SUBSTANDARD	3
C4-INADEQUATE	4
I	4
IADQ	4
INAD	4
Inadaquate	4
INADEQ	4
inadeq	4
Inadequate	4
INADEQUATE	4
S	3
SBD	3
SBST	3
sub	3
SUB	3
SUBSTAND	3
SubStandard	3
SUBSTANDARD	3
Substandard	3
SUB-STANDARD	3
SUBSTD	3
Substandard	3

Table 2 -FAC CODES (A = USA, AF = USAF and N = USN, Taken from the DoD FACILITIES PRICING GUIDE, UFC 3-701-03) Table maps DoD Facility Codes to the Service-Specific category codes.

DoD FAC	Service	CATCODE	CATCODE Title
7220	A	72210	Dining Facility
7220	AF	721215	Dining Hall in Airman Dormitory
7220	AF	722345	Fast Food Service
7220	AF	722351	Airman Dining Hall - Detached
7220	AF	722356	Dining Hall, Officer, Detached
7220	N	72145	Dining-Facility -Built-In/Attached
7220	N	72210	Enlisted Dining-Facility
7220	N	72231	Dining-Facility -Detached-Civ Pers
7220	N	72241	Dining-Facility -Detached-Com Pers
7220	N	72430	Commissioned-Officers Mess -Closed(Blt-In/Atchd)
7333	A	74046	Consolidated Open Dining Facility
7333	A	74047	Enlisted Open Dining Facility
7333	A	74048	Officer Open Dining Facility
7333	AF	740612	Open Mess, Airmen
7333	AF	740615	Consolidated Mess
7333	AF	740617	Enlisted Open Mess
7333	AF	740618	Officer Open Mess
7333	N	74060	Commisioned Officers' Mess Open
7333	N	74063	Enlisted-Personnel Club E1-E3
7333	N	74064	Enlisted-Men Mess-Open -E1 thru E-9
7333	N	74066	Petty-Officers Mess-Open -Staff NCO Club
7333	N	74067	Consolidated Officer/Enlisted Personnel Mess Open
7333	N	74069	Petty-Officers Mess-Open -E4-E5-E6-NCO/Club
7333	N	74070	Petty-Officers Mess-Open -Cheif-E7 thru E9

Criterion 2, Attribute 2, Metric 2: Lodging Condition

Source of Data: Capacity Question DOD #307

Facility Cat Code = 53080, 72010, 72120, 72151, 72152, 72411, 74020, 74022, 74032, 740443, 740455, 740457, 72412, 72413, 72414, 724417, 724433, 72121, 72122, 72123, 72153, 721315, 7212, 7241, 7441, 724-14, 724-13, 721-23, 724-14

Columns = "Facility Condition Code"

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:

This metric must be created in a number of separate steps. First, match the Mobilization target list with Question 307 to obtain only those Installations (corresponding Organization Code) considered by the subgroup. Second, select

only those Fac codes that the SME's have identified as primary mobilization lodging facilities. Then convert each response into a numeric value, using the chart for the previous metric (DoD#11). Finally, for all of the facilities identified for each installation, calculate the average Facility Condition Code. Note: more than one entry for an organization code (i.e. transient quarter, visiting enlisted quarters, etc.) was listed per organization code.

Special Remarks:

The average Facility Condition Code calculation does not consider those facilities that are marked as "Unrated" in the Capacity Analysis Database (CAD).

Criterion 3, Attribute 1, Metric 1: Dental Care Capacity

Source of Data: Capacity Questions DOD #341 and DOD # 530

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:

For each installation asks for the total sum of Gross Square Footage available for Dental Examination Areas, the total sum of Dental Examination Rooms, and the total Dental Examination Areas Max Daily Thru-put in a 12 hour day.

Special Remarks:

The data behind the questions that made up this metric suffered from some significant problems, namely it was largely incomplete (missing) and what was complete was questionable in its accuracy. Subsequent efforts to obtain improved data from the Medical Joint Cross Service Group were unsuccessful, and the metric was dropped from the Final MV model. ISG approved deletion.

Criterion 3, Attribute 1, Metric 2: Medical Care Capacity

Source of Data: Capacity Question DOD # 341

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:

For each installation asks for the total sum of Gross Square Footage available for Medical Examination Areas, the total sum of Examination Rooms, and the Medical Examination Areas Max Daily Thru-Put in a 12 hour day.

Special Remarks:

The data behind the questions that made up this metric suffered from some significant problems, namely it was largely incomplete (missing) and what was complete was questionable in its accuracy. Subsequent efforts to obtain improved data from the Medical Joint Cross Service Group were unsuccessful, and the metric was dropped from the Final MV model. ISG approved deletion.

Criterion 3, Attribute 2, Metric 1: Maintenance Facilities

Source of Data: Capacity Question DOD #343
Column = "Number of Bays_n"

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:

For this metric, take the total number of maintenance bays (All types) for each Organization Code (Installation). All facility types will be totaled.

Criterion 3, Attribute 3, Metric 1: Feeding Capacity

Source of Data: Capacity Question DOD # 340
Column = "Average # Noon Meals Served FY 03_n"

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:

This metric was created by taking the sum of average # noon meals served during FY 03 for each installation. If more than one dining facility type was listed per organizational code, the results were from summing the values.

Criterion 3, Attribute 3, Metric 2: Lodging Capacity

Source of Data: Capacity Question DOD # 339

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:

For each installation asks for the total number of beds for contingency operations. If more than one value was listed per organizational code the sum or total of these rows were used (as opposed to using the "Total" row

which sometimes provided a different total than the sum of the previous 3 rows).

Criterion 3, Attribute 3, Metric 3: Historical Processing Activity

Source of Data: Capacity Question DOD #4097
Columns = "FY01_n", "FY02_n", "FY03_n"

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:

To calculate this metric, first take the total number of IMA's, IRR's and Unit Personnel mobilized by each installation for each of the years (FY01-03). Next, compute the average of the three years' total mobilization to obtain the average number of RC Personnel mobilized by each installation.

Special Remarks:

This metric was originally constructed from DOD #337. Upon inspection, the data that made up that metric were determined to be largely inaccurate (where there were responses). Subsequent data clarification requests did not solve the numerous problems with missing values and inaccurate reporting. As a result, DOD #337 was replaced with DOD #4097 which was virtually complete and accurate. This change was approved by the ISG.

Criterion 3, Attribute 3, Metric 4: Range Throughput

Source of Data: Capacity Question DOD #153

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:

For each installation asks for the total number of firing points for small arms (M16 and 9mm). DOD question #153 was determined to be more appropriate giving the number of firing points available at an installation.

Special Remarks:

This question was poorly constructed by the services and when it was sent back to the HSA JCSG in the CAD, the analysts were forced to manually count the number of ranges in the appropriate rows. When pulling this data, be certain that the **entire** contents of the cell is being viewed. Frequently multiple lines of data were added to one cell that cannot be seen unless the height and/or width of the cell is expanded.

Criterion 3, Attribute 3, Metric 5: Storage/Warehouse

*-- Deliberative Document -- For Discussion Purposes Only --
Do Not Release Under FOIA*

Source of Data: Capacity Questions DOD #342
Facility = "Operational Facilities"
Column = "GSF Available Space_n"

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:
For this metric, select only those facilities marked as "Operational Facilities", and take the results from the "GSF Available Space_N" column.

Criterion 3, Attribute 4, Metric 1: Number and Types of Transportation Ports

Source of Data: MV Question DOD #1965
Type of Port = "Deep Water Port", "Major Civilian/Military Airport, or "Train Station"
Column = "Type of Port"

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:
For this metric, calculate the total number of each type of port. For each "Deep Water Port", multiply this total by 2, for each "Major Civilian/Military Airport", multiply the total by 2, and for each "Train Station", multiply the total by 1 (or leave the total alone). To complete the metric, take the sum of all of these "weighted totals".

Criterion 3, Attribute 4, Metric 2: Distance to Nearest Transportation Nodes

Source of Data: MV Question DOD #1965
Column = "Name of Port", "Distance to Installation_n"

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation:
For this metric, take the minimum distance to any of the transportation nodes identified for the targeted Installations (corresponding Organization Code).

Criterion 4, Attribute 1, Metric 1: Per Diem Costs

Source of Data: JFTR

P:\BRAC Info\Additional DoD Docs\H&SA\MilVal-Docs\Docs\Mobilization\Methodology\MoB Methodology 11 May.doc

Scope: Installations (corresponding Organization Code) conducting Reserve Component mobilization processing operations.

Explanation of calculation: Local area per-diem rate. Per diem rates were determined by using this DOD web site:

<https://secureapp2.hqda.pentagon.mil/perdiem/>

Click on "Per Diem Rates" on the left hand side of the screen. At the next screen, click on "Per Diem Rates" on the left hand side again. Select "Previous Years' Per Diem Rates" under the Contiguous United States column. Select the 2004 directory. Download the file "[Conus2004.txt](#)" (this file is included in "Secondary Source Materials"). Find each installation under the state in which it is located. Take the value under the "Maximum Per Diem" column. If two rates were listed for seasonal costing, the higher of the two is used.