Audit Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

DEFENSE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE BUDGET DATA FOR THE REALIGNMENT OF THE DEPLOYMENT FUNCTION FOR THE 10TH MOUNTAIN INFANTRY (LIGHT) DIVISION TO FORT DRUM; NEW YORK

Report No. 96-204 July 31, 1996

Department of Defense

Additional Information and Copies

To obtain additional copies of this audit report, contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit of the Analysis, Planning, and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or FAX (703) 604-8932.

Suggestions for Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Planning and Coordination Branch of the Analysis, Planning, and Technical Support Directorate at (703) 604-8939 (DSN 664-8939) or FAX (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

OAIG-AUD (ATTN: APTS Audit Suggestions)
Inspector General, Department of Defense
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, Virginia 22202-2884

Defense Hotline

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, contact the Defense Hotline by calling (800) 424-9098; by sending an electronic message to Hotline@DODIG.OSD.MIL; or by writing to the Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of each writer and caller is fully protected.

Acronyms

AFB	Air Force Base
BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
CFR	Crash, Fire, Rescue
MILCON	Military Construction

INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-2884

July 31, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
(FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)
AUDITOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

SUBJECT: Audit Report on Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of the Deployment Function for the 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division to Fort Drum, New York (Report No. 96-204)

We are providing this audit report for your review and comment. This report is one in a series about FY 1997 Defense base realignment and closure military construction costs. Two of the three projects that we reviewed were FY 1998 projects that were included in the current audit coverage because the two FY 1998 projects were interrelated with the FY 1997 project. Management comments on a draft of this report were considered in preparing the final report.

DoD Directive 7650.3 requires that all recommendations and potential monetary benefits be resolved promptly. As a result of the Air Force comments, we deleted a recommendation and added three recommendations. Therefore, we request that the Air Force provide comments on final report Recommendations B.1., B.2., B.3., C.1., and C.2. by August 30, 1996.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the audit staff. Questions on the audit should be directed to Ms. Kimberley A. Caprio, Audit Program Director, at (703) 604-9248 (DSN 664-9248) or Ms. Carolyn R. Davis, Audit Project Manager, at (703) 604-9217 (DSN 664-9217). See Appendix F for the report distribution. The audit team members are listed inside the back cover.

David K. Steensma
Deputy Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. 96-204 **July 31, 1996**
(Project No. 6CG-5001.16)

Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of the Deployment Function for the 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division to Fort Drum, New York

Executive Summary

Introduction. This report is one in a series about FY 1997 Defense base realignment and closure military construction costs. Public Law 102-190, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993," December 5, 1991, directs the Secretary of Defense to ensure that the amount of the authorization that DoD requested for each military construction project associated with Defense base realignment and closure does not exceed the original estimated cost provided to the Commission on Defense Base Closure and Realignment (the Commission). If the requested budget amounts exceed the original project cost estimates provided to the Commission, the Secretary of Defense is required to explain to Congress the reasons for the differences. The Office of the Inspector General, DoD, is required to review each Defense base realignment and closure military construction project for which a significant difference exists from the original cost estimate and to provide the results of the review to the congressional Defense committees. Our audits address all projects valued at more than $1 million.

Audit Objectives. The overall audit objective was to determine the accuracy of Defense base realignment and closure military construction budget data. This report provides the results of the audit of three projects, with a total estimated value of $48 million, for the realignment of the deployment function of the Army 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division from Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, to Fort Drum, New York. One project, valued at $46 million, was submitted as an FY 1997 project and the other two projects, valued at a total of $2 million, were submitted as FY 1998 projects. We included the FY 1998 projects in our audit coverage because the two FY 1998 projects were interrelated with the FY 1997 project. The Air Force must satisfy the requirements associated with all three projects before the deployment function can be transferred to Fort Drum.

Audit Results. Although the majority of the requirements in the project were valid and well supported, we could not verify the cost estimate for the runway expansion site improvements at Fort Drum, New York. As a result, the $5 million cost estimate for site improvements may be overstated (Finding A).

The Air National Guard did not justify the requirements for the construction of a departure airlift group facility. As a result, the Air Force estimate of $1.7 million to construct a departure airlift group facility may be overstated (Finding B).

The Air Force did not support the requirement to construct an addition to the fire station at the Fort Drum Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield for a P-23 crash, fire, rescue vehicle. As a result, use or expansion of the existing fire station bay could reduce or eliminate the $0.3 million cost to construct the addition to the fire station (Finding C).

See Part I for a discussion of the findings. See Appendix D for a summary of invalid and partially valid requirements for the project we reviewed.

Summary of Recommendations. We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) place project WOXG959609 on administrative withhold until the Air Force submits a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Project Data."

We recommend that the Air Force:

o submit revised budget estimates and a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Project Data," for project WOXG959609;

o prepare an economic analysis to determine the appropriate location and size for a departure airlift group facility, revise budget estimates, and submit a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1998 Military Construction Project Data," for project WOXG959613, to include requirements and costs reflecting the analysis and considering existing facilities; and

o determine which crash, fire, rescue vehicles will transfer to Fort Drum and submit a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1998 Military Construction Project Data," for project FPBB969510.

Management Comments. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) agreed to place funds for project WOXG959609 on administrative withhold if the issue is not resolved by the start of FY 1997. The Air Force nonconcurred with placing project WOXG959609 on administrative withhold, but agreed to submit a revised DD Form 1391 for the runway expansion. For project WOXG959613, the Air Force clarified the purpose of the Departure/Arrival Airfield Control Group facility and stated that an economic analysis had not been done because the site survey did not identify existing facilities that could support the requirements. The Air Force nonconcurred with the recommendation for project FPBB969510 stating that a P-23 crash, fire, rescue (CFR) vehicle was never intended to transfer to Fort Drum, but a larger CFR vehicle, a P-15, was to transfer instead. The Air Force stated that a P-23 CFR vehicle is too large to fit in any existing fire station bay at Fort Drum. Although not required to comment on the recommendations, the Army nonconcurred with the findings and recommendations and provided comments that coincided with the Air Force comments. See Part I for a summary of management comments, and see Part III for the complete text of management comments.

Audit Response. For project WOXG959609, the Air Force comments are responsive to the recommendation to submit a revised DD Form 1391. However, for project WOXG959613, the Air Force should conduct an economic analysis that shows existing facilities were considered and includes storage requirements. As a result of management comments, we deleted the recommendation that project FPBB969510 be canceled and added the recommendations that the Air Force make a determination on which CFR vehicles will transfer to Fort Drum and resubmit a DD Form 1391 based on the determination. For the reasons discussed in Part I of the report, we still believe that the other recommendations addressed to the Air Force require additional actions.

We request that the Air Force provide final comments on the unresolved recommendations by August 30, 1996.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

Part I - Audit Results

Audit Background 2
Audit Objectives 2
Finding A. Runway Expansion Site Improvements 4
Finding B. Airfield Departure Airlift Group Facility 7
Finding C. Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield Fire Station 12

Part II - Additional Information

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology 16
Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews 17
Appendix C. Background of Defense Base Realignment and Closure and Scope of the Audit of FY 1997 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Costs 21
Appendix D. Projects Identified as Invalid or Partially Valid 23
Appendix E. Organizations Visited or Contacted 24
Appendix F. Report Distribution 25

Part III - Management Comments

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Comments 28
Department of the Army Comments 29
Department of the Air Force Comments 33

Part I - Audit Results

Audit Background

The Office of the Inspector General, DoD, is performing various audits of the Defense base realignment and closure (BRAC) process. This report is one in a series of reports about FY 1997 BRAC military construction (MILCON) costs. It discusses one FY 1997 project. The report also discusses two FY 1998 projects because the two FY 1998 projects were interrelated with the FY 1997 project. The Army and Air Force must satisfy the requirements associated with all three projects before the deployment function can be transferred to Fort Drum. For additional information on the BRAC process and the overall scope of the audit of BRAC MILCON costs, see Appendix C. See Appendix D for a summary of invalid and partially valid requirements for the projects we reviewed.

The BRAC Commission recommended in its March 1995 Defense base realignment and closure report that the deployment function for the Army 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division be relocated from Griffiss Air Force Base (AFB), New York, to Fort Drum, New York. The Air National Guard is responsible for maintaining and operating the facilities to support the deployment of the Army 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division. Griffiss Air Force Base has provided the Army 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division an airfield for deployment purposes since 1985. The Air Force recommended transferring the deployment function because of the cost benefit associated with upgrading the airfield at Fort Drum, an Army facility, to a viable airfield instead of continuing to contract out the operation at Griffiss Air Force Base.

Audit Objectives

The overall audit objective was to determine the accuracy of BRAC MILCON budget data. The specific objectives were to determine whether the proposed project was a valid BRAC requirement, whether the decision for MILCON was supported with required documentation including an economic analysis, and whether the economic analysis considered existing facilities. Another objective was to assess the adequacy of the management control program as it applied to the overall audit objective.

This report provides the results of one FY 1997 and two FY 1998 BRAC projects, valued at a total of $48 million, for the realignment of the deployment function of the Army 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division from Griffiss AFB, New York, to Fort Drum, New York.

The following table describes the projects that this audit reviewed.

Realignment of the Deployment Function for the Army 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division

Project Number	FY	Project Title	Value (millions)
WOXG959609	1997	Base Closure-Runway/Apron/Instrument Lighting System	$46.0
WOXG959613	1998	Base Closure--Vehicle OPS*/Heated Parking	1.7
FPBB969510	1998	Base Closure--Add to Fire Station	0.3
Total			**$48.0**

*Operation Parking Shed.

See Appendix A for a discussion of the scope and methodology and Appendix B for a summary of prior coverage related to the audit objectives. The management control program objective will be discussed in a summary report on FY 1997 BRAC MILCON budget data.

Finding A. Runway Expansion Site Improvements

Although the majority of the requirements in the project were valid and well supported, we could not verify the cost estimate for the site improvements on project WOXG959609, "Base Closure-Runway/ Apron/Instrument Lighting System," valued at $46 million. We could not verify the cost estimate for the site improvements because the Air National Guard did not provide accurate and complete quantity and unit cost information that it used to develop the cost estimate for the site improvement line item in the DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Project Data." As a result, the $5 million cost estimate for site improvements may be overstated.

Site Improvements

The DD Form 1391 for project WOXG959609 contains a line item for site improvements for $5 million. The Air National Guard combined costs for all Fort Drum airfield infrastructure changes into one site improvement line item. The proposed site improvements include fencing, a tank trail, and a county road. The site improvements also include removal of power lines, trees, well structures, and other obstructions; the construction of a paved road between a county road and the hot cargo pad; and other upgrades to the infrastructure that are necessary to make the facility complete and usable.

Analysis of the DD Form 1391 for Project WOXG959609

Air Force and DoD Guidance. Air Force Instruction 32-1021, "Planning and Programming of Facility Construction Projects," May 12, 1994, requires using strong, accurate justification data when preparing cost estimates for military construction projects, submitting those data as documentation with the DD Form 1391, and developing accurate cost estimates for budget decisionmaking purposes. In addition, the memorandum on the FY 1997 Defense Budget Review, July 10, 1995, written by the Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget), established policy requiring the use of metric units of measure in the preparation of DD Forms 1391 for BRAC.

Supporting Documentation. The DD Form 1391 identifies a $5 million lump sum estimated cost of the site improvements on project WOXG959609. However, the Air National Guard provided insufficient supporting documentation for the $5 million estimated costs. The supporting documentation provided by the Air National Guard included a $0.63 million estimate for site improvements identified in an Air Force and Army trip report

from a fact-finding visit to Fort Drum. The documentation also included a $2.1 million estimate identified in an Air National Guard point paper. Neither of those estimates is valued at the $5 million identified in the DD Form 1391.

In addition, the DD Form 1391 and documentation provided to support the form did not provide a breakdown of estimates for each site improvement by quantity and unit cost. Also, the Air Force did not prepare the DD form 1391 using metric units, as required by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) memo. Without accurate quantity and unit cost information, the $5 million cost estimate identified in the DD Form 1391 for the site improvements for the fencing, tank trail, county road, and other infrastructure changes may be overstated.

Summary

Without adequate support, we could not verify the accuracy of the cost estimate for site improvements. The Air National Guard needs to document the cost estimate for each site improvement. The documentation should include the quantity with the unit of measure in metrics and the unit costs to support each of the various site improvements.

Recommendations, Management Comments, and Audit Response

A.1. We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) place project WOXG959609, "Base Closure-Runway/Apron/Instrument Landing System" at Fort Drum, New York, on administrative withhold until the Air Force submits a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Project Data," containing supporting documentation for the estimated cost of the site improvement line item.

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Comments. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) concurred with the audit finding and recommendation and will place the funds associated with the project on administrative withhold if the issue is not resolved by the start of the FY 1997.

A.2. We recommend that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Installations) direct the Air National Guard to revise budget estimates and submit a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Project Data," that reflects valid Defense base realignment and closure requirements and costs for the site improvement line item. The revised DD Form 1391 should contain supporting documents.

Air Force Comments. The Air Force nonconcurred with placing the funds for project WOXG959609 on administrative withhold until a new DD Form 1391 was submitted. The Air Force stated that the audit only questioned the $5 million cost estimate for the site improvements and not the scope of the project. The Air Force further stated that at the 35-percent design status, the actual quantity of fencing, tank trails, utility relocation, and estimated cost would be reflected in the architect and engineering data. The Air Force agreed to submit a revised DD Form 1391 by September 1996, which is when the 35-percent design is to be completed.

Army Comments. Although not required to comment, the Army provided comments that coincided with the Air Force comments. The 35-percent design cost to be completed in September 1996 would provide a more detailed cost estimate for site improvements.

Audit Response. Because the Air Force agreed to submit a revised DD Form 1391 by September 1996, we considered its comments on Recommendation A.2. to be responsive.

Finding B. Airfield Departure Airlift Group Facility

The Air National Guard did not justify the requirements for project WOXG959613, "Base Closure--Vehicle OPS [Operation Parking Shed]/Heated Parking," valued at $1.7 million, to construct a departure airlift group facility. The requirements were not justified because the Air National Guard did not prepare an economic analysis showing that the proposed project is the most cost-effective means of satisfying the requirement. In addition, the Air National Guard did not provide support for the determination of the size and location of the departure airlift group facility. As a result, the Air Force estimate of $1.7 million to construct a departure airlift group facility may be overstated.

Planning for Departure Airlift Group Facility

The DD Form 1391, "FY 1998 Military Construction Project Data," consists of a 1,340-square-meter requirement for a vehicle operation parking facility for the departure airlift group, estimated to cost $1.7 million. The facility will contain a 1,000-square-meter heated portion and a 340-square-meter unheated portion. The requirement is based on a need for a facility in which to store aerospace ground equipment and material handling equipment and to weigh and inspect vehicles, as well as to build pallets for the deployment of the Army 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division.

Air Force Guidance on MILCON Project Justification

Air Force Instruction 65-501, "Economic Analysis," requires the major command financial offices to prepare an economic analysis when the investment is less than $2 million but the principal justification for a MILCON project is economic. The requirement would apply when the main purpose of the project is to increase efficiency or enhance benefits relative to cost. The guidance further requires the attachment of the economic analysis to the DD Form 1391.

Air Force Instruction 32-1021 stipulates that major commands must prepare strong, accurate justification data for MILCON projects. The justification preparation must be documented with a DD Form 1391. The instruction further requires a confirmation that the requirements cannot be met by use of existing facilities.

Justification Preparation

Adequate Justification. Strong and accurate justification data for a proposed project should include the following:

o a detailed economic analysis including consideration of existing facilities,

o determination of facility size based on the equipment to be stored and personnel to be housed in the structure, and

o criteria that require the proposed type of facility to be close to the flight line.

Justification Provided. Air National Guard personnel provided a DD Form 1391, a site survey, and a fact-finding report that do not support the cost, size, and location of the departure airlift group facility. The documentation provided by the Air National Guard personnel lacked sufficient detail on whether existing facilities could satisfy the requirement and how the appropriate size, location, and cost of the departure airlift group facility were determined.

Lack of an Economic Analysis. Air National Guard personnel did not perform a detailed economic analysis of existing facilities to consider alternate sites to new construction. The DD Form 1391 should have included the results of an economic analysis, including specific buildings considered and the reasons each was ruled out. Performing the analysis may show that other facilities on Fort Drum may be usable for part or all of the departure airlift group facility. For example, the Air National Guard had not shown that it considered use of an existing hangar, the gymnasium, or Fort Drum's existing deployment/staging area located directly behind the proposed new apron to stage troop deployment and why possible alternatives were ruled out. Alteration of a portion of a hangar, gymnasium, or existing deployment/staging area would accommodate the administrative and storage space needed and could be considered as a feasible, lower cost alternative.

Documentation of Required Size and Location. The Air National Guard also did not provide documentation that they used to determine the facility size based on the equipment to be stored and personnel to be housed in the facility. In addition, they did not provide criteria verifying that the facility needed to be located on or near the airfield.

Air National Guard personnel did not provide requested criteria verifying the need for constructing the departure airlift group facility on the airfield. The justification for the project indicated that no facilities were available on the airfield to accommodate the facility. However, without criteria specifying the need to have the facility on the airfield, the Air National Guard should consider other available facilities. The Air Force stated that the Departure/Arrival Airfield Control Group is part of the call-forward area. However, the regulations provided by the Air Force define the Departure/Arrival Airfield Control Group responsibilities and do not specifically state that the Departure/Arrival Airfield Control Group requires a facility on the call-forward area. The use of a hangar, a gymnasium, or the existing deployment/staging area at Fort Drum could satisfy the requirement that the Departure/Arrival Airfield Control Group be located in the vicinity of the departure airfield.

In March 1996, Army personnel provided additional information to support the DD Form 1391 requirements for the departure airlift group facility; however, the information still lacked sufficient detail to support the project. The additional information was intended to support the statement of work for the BRAC expansion of the Fort Drum airfield. The information did not show how the personnel and equipment were used to determine the facility size requested.

Summary

The Air National Guard did not justify the BRAC MILCON project proposed in the DD Form 1391 for a 1,340-square-meter departure airlift group facility as required by Air Force guidance. The information provided by Air National Guard personnel to support the DD Form 1391 lacked sufficient detail regarding the determination of the size and location for the departure airlift group facility and whether existing facilities could satisfy the requirements. As a result, the Air Force may spend $1.7 million to construct a departure airlift group facility that may not be required.

Recommendations, Management Comments, and Audit Response

B. We recommend that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Military Installations) direct the Air National Guard to:

1. Prepare an economic analysis showing the consideration of existing facilities, including renovation of an existing facility, to accommodate the departure airlift group.

2. Submit a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1998 Military Construction Project Data," to:

(a) Reflect requirements and costs for project WOXG959613 based on the results of the economic analysis performed in response to recommendation B.1. above.

(b) Reflect determination of facility size based on the equipment to be stored and personnel to be housed in the structure.

3. Correspondingly adjust the budget estimates by the results of the economic analysis performed in response to Recommendation B.1. above and by the results of facility size determination in response to Recommendation B.2.(b).

Air Force Comments. The Air Force stated that the project title on the DD Form 1391 was misleading and that the DD Form 1391 did not explain the Departure/Arrival Airfield Group facility in detail. The Air Force stated that the Departure/Arrival Airfield Control Group facility requirements will consist of three components: a 145-square-meter scale house, a 1,003-square-meter heated main building to process vehicles and pallets, and a 190-square-meter area designated as parking and storage. The Air Force also stated that a Departure/Arrival Airfield Control Group facility is part of the call-forward area and that the facility has to be on or near the aircraft flight line. The Air Force further stated that an economic analysis was not performed because Fort Drum did not have facilities along the aircraft flight line.

Army Comments. Although not required to comment on the recommendations, the Army provided comments that coincided with the Air Force comments. An economic analysis was not performed because no facilities at Fort Drum can function as a Departure/Arrival Airfield Control Group facility.

Audit Response. We did not consider the Air Force comments to be responsive. The Air Force has not provided verification that existing facilities on or near the flightline were considered, and the reason they were ruled out. Existing facilities on or near the flightline include the deployment/staging area and several existing hangars. Therefore, we still believe that the Air Force should conduct and document an economic analysis that considers the use or renovation of existing facilities. The economic analysis should include storage requirements such as the number and type of vehicles needed to satisfy the essential minimum airfield requirements. Also, the Air Force should submit a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the Departure/Arrival Airfield Control Group facility requirement to reflect the three components: the scale house, the main building, and the parking and storage area.

Finding C. Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield Fire Station

The Air Force did not support the requirement on the DD Form 1391 for project FPBB969510, "Base Closure--Add to Fire Station," valued at $0.3 million, to construct the addition of a bay to the fire station at the Fort Drum Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield for a P-23 (CFR) crash, fire, rescue vehicle. The Air National Guard identified the requirement for the addition to the fire station before it was certain of the actual incoming CFR vehicle. As a result, the $0.3 million cost to construct the addition could not be validated.

Facility Planning for Fire Station Bay

The DD Form 1391, "FY 1998 Military Construction Project Data," contains a requirement for a 140-square-meter addition, estimated to cost $0.3 million, to the Fort Drum Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield fire station. The Air Mobility Command requires that four P-19 CFR vehicles or equivalents be available at Fort Drum to support the deployment function of the Army 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division. The Fort Drum Army Airfield fire station has four bays: two bays occupied by P-19 CFR vehicles, one bay occupied by a P-12 CFR vehicle, and one bay occupied by a tanker. One P-23 CFR vehicle is equivalent in gallons of water pumped per minute to two P-19 CFR vehicles. A P-12 CFR vehicle pumps 83 percent of the gallons of water per minute that a P-19 CFR vehicle pumps.

Review of the Support for the Fire Station Bay

The DD Form 1391 that the Air National Guard submitted for project FPBB969510 requested the addition of a bay to the Fort Drum Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield fire station to accommodate the transfer of a P-23 CFR vehicle from Griffiss AFB. The Air Force did not support the requirement for construction of the bay because the actual receipt of the incoming equipment is uncertain. The Air National Guard proposed a P-23 CFR vehicle for transfer from Griffiss AFB, New York, to Fort Drum, New York, to meet the requirements for the deployment function. According to the Air National Guard Chief, Ready Team-BRAC, the inventory of equipment at Griffiss AFB does not include a P-23 CFR vehicle but a vehicle is expected to be transferred to Fort Drum to satisfy the four P-19 CFR vehicles or equivalent requirement. Air National Guard and Army officials were uncertain as to whether the vehicle will be a P-23 CFR vehicle.

Summary

Section 2905 of Public Law 101-510, "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990," November 5, 1990, stipulates that funds authorized for BRAC should be used only to construct replacement facilities or facilities necessary to meet mission requirements. The Air National Guard determined the need for an additional bay based on the possible transfer of a P-23 CFR vehicle to the Fort Drum Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield. However, Griffiss AFB does not have a P-23 CFR vehicle, and Fort Drum may never receive a P-23 CFR vehicle. As a result, the $0.3 million budgeted for the construction project could not be validated for payment from the FY 1998 Base Closure Account.

Recommendations, Management Comments, and Audit Response

Deleted and Added Recommendations. Based on management comments, we deleted Recommendation C. to cancel the project, and we added the recommendations below.

C. We recommend that the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Military Installations) direct the Air National Guard to:

1. Determine which crash, fire, rescue vehicle will transfer to Fort Drum.

2. Submit a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1998 Military Construction Project Data," to reflect requirements and costs for project FPBB969510, "Base Closure--Add to Station," based on the crash, fire, rescue vehicle transferring to Fort Drum.

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller). The Air Force nonconcurred with the draft recommendation to cancel the project based on our conclusion that a P-23 CFR vehicle could fit in an existing bay. The Air Force stated that a P-23 CFR vehicle is too large to fit in any of Fort Drum's existing fire bays and still meet life safety requirements. The Air Force acknowledged that a difference of opinion existed as to what type of CFR vehicle is to be provided to Fort Drum. The Air Force stated that the only vehicle available at Griffiss AFB to transfer to Fort Drum is a P-15 CFR vehicle, which will not fit in any existing fire station bay at Fort Drum.

Department of the Army (Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management) Comments. Although not required to comment on the recommendations, the Army provided comments that coincided with the Air Force comments. The Army also stated that a difference of opinion exists as to what type of CFR vehicle the Air National Guard will provide to Fort Drum.

Audit Response. As a result of management comments, we revised Recommendation C. The four bays at the Fort Drum fire station are currently occupied by existing fire equipment and the Army does not plan on excessing any of the existing fire equipment. Therefore, the ability of a P-23 to fit in an existing fire station bay is no longer an issue. However, as identified on the DD Form 1391, a P-23 rather than a P-15 CFR vehicle was to be transferred from Griffiss AFB to Fort Drum. A P-15 CFR vehicle is larger in size than a P-23 CFR vehicle. The P-15 CFR vehicle is equivalent in gallons of water to at least three P-19 vehicles, whereas a P-23 CFR vehicle has the equivalent capacity of two P-19 CFR vehicles. If Fort Drum receives a P-15 CFR vehicle, the amount of space needed to accommodate it and the construction cost needs to be determined. The Air National Guard should submit a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the actual type of CFR vehicle transferring to Fort Drum and the cost to construct an addition to the fire station bay to accommodate a larger CFR vehicle.

Part II - Additional Information

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

Scope of This Audit. We examined the FY 1997 BRAC MILCON budget request and related documentation for one BRAC MILCON project for the realignment of the deployment function for the 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division to Fort Drum. We also examined the FY 1998 BRAC MILCON budget request and related documentation for two BRAC MILCON projects because they were interrelated to the FY 1997 BRAC MILCON project. The budget requests and related documents were generated by the Air National Guard at Andrews Air Force Base and the Base Operations Division at Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield, Fort Drum. The three projects are listed below in the table and have total estimated costs of $48 million.

FY 1997 and FY 1998 BRAC MILCON Projects for Realignment of Deployment Function to Fort Drum, New York

Project Number	FY	Project Title	Estimated Cost (millions)
WOXG959609	1997	Base Closure-Runway/Apron/Instrument Lighting System	$46.0
WOXG959613	1998	Base Closure--Vehicle OPS*/Heated Parking	1.7
FPBB969510	1998	Base Closure--Add to Fire Station	0.3
Total			**$48.0**

*Operation Parking Shed.

We also reviewed the working papers for project 5CG-5017.19, "Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Griffiss Air Force Base, New York," April 13, 1995, for documentation and information on the site visit by our office to Griffiss Air Force Base in January 1995.

Audit Period, Standards, and Locations. This economy and efficiency audit was made from December 1995 through March 1996 in accordance with auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. The audit did not rely on computer-processed data or statistical sampling procedures. Appendix E lists the organizations visited or contacted during the audit.

Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews

Since 1991, numerous audit reports have addressed DoD BRAC issues. This appendix lists the summary reports for the audits of BRAC budget data for FYs 1992 through 1996 and BRAC audit reports published since the summary reports.

Inspector General, DoD

Report No.	Report Title	Date
96-191	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Relocation of the Carrier Air Wings From Naval Air Station Mirimar, California, to Naval Air Station Lemoore, California	July 3, 1996
96-171	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Realigning the Office of the Judge Advocate General and the Naval Facilities Engineering Command to the Washington Navy Yard	June 21, 1996
96-170	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of Five Navy Activities From Leased Space in Arlington, Virginia, to the Naval Security Station, Washington, D.C.	June 19, 1996
96-166	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, and Realignment to Sheppard Air Force Base, Texas	June 18, 1996
96-165	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Construction of the Hazardous Material Storage Addition to Warehouse 28 at Defense Distribution Region West Tracy, California	June 17, 1996
96-158	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Redirect of the 726th Air Control Squadron From Shaw Air Force Base, South Carolina, to Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho	June 11, 1996

Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews

Report No.	Report Title	Date
96-154	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of the National Airborne Operations Center to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio	June 10, 1996
96-147	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Naval Training Center Orlando, Florida, and Realignment of Maintenance and Storage Facilities to Taft U.S. Army Reserve Center, Orlando, Florida	June 6, 1996
96-144	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of Grissom Air Reserve Base, Indiana	June 6, 1996
96-142	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Bergstrom Air Reserve Base, Texas, and Realignment of the 10th Air Force Headquarters to Naval Station Fort Worth, Joint Reserve Base, Texas	June 5, 1996
96-139	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Griffiss Air Force Base and Realignment of Rome Laboratory and Northeast Air Defense Sector, Rome, New York	June 3, 1996
96-137	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of March Air Force Base, Riverside, California	May 31, 1996
96-136	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Gentile Air Force Station, Dayton, Ohio, and Realignment of Defense Logistics Agency Components to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio	May 31, 1996
96-135	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Training Center Pacific, San Diego, California	May 30, 1996
96-131	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data for Realigning Elements of Headquarters, Department of the Navy, to the Washington Navy Yard	May 28, 1996

Report No.	Report Title	Date
96-128	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Naval Training Center Great Lakes, Illinois	May 24, 1996
96-127	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Roslyn Air National Guard Base and Realignments to Stewart Air National Guard Base, New York	May 23, 1996
96-126	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base, Ohio	May 21, 1996
96-122	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of the Air Education and Training Command at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California	May 17, 1996
96-119	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Construction of a Multiple Purpose Facility at Fort McCoy, Wisconsin	May 14, 1996
96-118	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Medical and Dental Clinic Expansion Project at Naval Weapons Station Charleston, South Carolina	May 13, 1996
96-116	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Relocation of Deployable Medical Systems to Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah	May 10, 1996
96-112	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Naval Air Station Cecil Field, Florida, and Realignment of the Aviation Physiology Training Unit to Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Florida	May 7, 1996
96-110	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of the 301st Rescue Squadron, Air Force Reserve, From Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, to Patrick Air Force Base, Florida	May 7, 1996

Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews

Report No.	Report Title	Date
96-108	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	May 6, 1996
96-104	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Construction of the Overwater Antenna Test Range Facility at Newport, Rhode Island	April 26, 1996
96-101	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Naval Air Station Barbers Point, Hawaii, and Realignment of P-3 Aircraft Squadrons to Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, Washington	April 26, 1996
96-093	Summary Report on the Audit of Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for FYs 1995 and 1996	April 3, 1996
94-040	Summary Report on the Audit of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Budget Data for FYs 1993 and 1994	February 14, 1994
93-100	Summary Report on the Audit of Defense Base Closure and Realignment Budget Data for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993	May 25, 1993

Appendix C. Background of Defense Base Realignment and Closure and Scope of the Audit of FY 1997 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Costs

Commission on Defense Base Closure and Realignment. On May 3, 1988, the Secretary of Defense chartered the Commission on Defense Base Closure and Realignment (the Commission) to recommend military installations for realignment and closure. Congress passed Public Law 100-526, "Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act," October 24, 1988, which enacted the Commission's recommendations. The law also established the Defense Base Closure Account to fund any necessary facility renovation or MILCON projects associated with BRAC. Public Law 101-510, "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990," November 5, 1990, reestablished the Commission. The law also chartered the Commission to meet during calendar years 1991, 1993, and 1995 to verify that the process for realigning and closing military installations was timely and independent. In addition, the law stipulates that realignment and closure actions must be completed within 6 years after the President transmits the recommendations to Congress.

Required Defense Reviews of BRAC Estimates. Public Law 102-190, "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993," December 5, 1991, states that the Secretary of Defense shall ensure that the authorization amount that DoD requested for each MILCON project associated with BRAC actions does not exceed the original estimated cost provided to the Commission. Public Law 102-190 also states that the Inspector General, DoD, must evaluate significant increases in BRAC MILCON project costs over the estimated costs provided to the Commission and send a report to the congressional Defense committees.

Military Department BRAC Cost-Estimating Process. To develop cost estimates for the Commission, the Military Departments used the Cost of Base Realignment Actions computer model. The Cost of Base Realignment Actions computer model uses standard cost factors to convert the suggested BRAC options into dollar values to provide a way to compare the different options. After the President and Congress approve the BRAC actions, DoD realigning activity officials prepare a DD Form 1391, "FY 1997 Military Construction Project Data," for each individual MILCON project required to accomplish the realigning actions. The Cost of Base Realignment Actions computer model provides cost estimates as a realignment and closure package for a particular realigning or closing base. The DD Form 1391 provides specific cost estimates for an individual BRAC MILCON project.

Limitations and Expansion to Overall Audit Scope. Because the Cost of Base Realignment Actions computer model develops cost estimates as a BRAC package and not for individual BRAC MILCON projects, we were unable to determine the amount of cost increases for each individual BRAC MILCON

project. Additionally, because of prior audit efforts that determined potential problems with all BRAC MILCON projects, our audit objectives included all large BRAC MILCON projects.

Overall Audit Selection Process. We reviewed the FY 1997 BRAC MILCON $820.8 million budget submitted by the Military Departments and the Defense Logistics Agency. We excluded projects that were previously reviewed by DoD audit organizations. We grouped the remaining BRAC MILCON projects by location and selected groups of projects that totaled at least $1 million for each group. We also reviewed those FY 1996 BRAC MILCON projects that were not included in the previous FY 1996 budget submission, but were added as part of the FY 1997 BRAC MILCON budget package.

Appendix D. Projects Identified as Invalid or Partially Valid

Table D-1. Causes of Invalid or Partially Valid Projects

Project Location	Project Number	Causes of Invalid Projects		Causes of Partially Valid Projects	
		Overstated	Unsupported	Overstated	Unsupported
Fort Drum, New York	WOXG959609				X
Fort Drum, New York	WOXG959613		X		
Fort Drum, New York	FPBB969510				X

Table D-2. Recommended Changes in Project Estimates

Project Location	Project Number	Amount of Estimate on DD Form 1391 (thousands)	Recommended Amount of Change	
			Invalid Projects (thousands)	Partially Valid Projects (thousands)
Fort Drum, New York	WOXG959609	$46,000		$5,000
Fort Drum, New York	WOXG959613	1,700	$1,700	
Fort Drum, New York	FPBB969510	300	------	300
Total		**$48,000**	**$1,700**	**$5,300**

Total Invalid and Partially Valid Projects **$7,000**

Appendix E. Organizations Visited or Contacted

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology, Washington, DC
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Washington, DC

Department of the Army

Auditor General, Department of the Army, Washington, DC
Forces Command, Fort McPherson, GA
  10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division, Fort Drum, NY

Department of the Navy

Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller), Washington, DC

Department of the Air Force

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller), Washington, DC
Director, Air National Guard, Washington, DC
  Air National Guard, Andrews Air Force Base, MD
Air Combat Command, Langley Air Force Base, VA
  416th Civil Engineer Squadron, Griffiss Air Force Base, NY

Other Defense Organization

Director, Defense Logistics Agency, Fort Belvoir, VA

Appendix F. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)
  Deputy Chief Financial Officer
  Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Industrial Affairs and Installations)
  Principal Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Industrial Affairs and Installations)
Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)
Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange

Department of the Army

Auditor General, Department of the Army
Commander, Forces Command, Fort McPherson
  Commander, 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division

Department of the Navy

Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Navy

Department of the Air Force

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Installations)
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force
Director, Air National Guard

Defense Organizations

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Agency
Director, National Security Agency
  Inspector General, National Security Agency
Inspector General, Defense Intelligence Agency

Non-Defense Federal Organizations and Individuals

Office of Management and Budget
Technical Information Center, National Security and International Affairs Division, General Accounting Office

Chairman and ranking minority member of each of the following congressional committees and subcommittees:

Senate Committee on Appropriations
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
Senate Subcommittee on Military Construction, Committee on Appropriations
Senate Committee on Armed Services
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
House Committee on Appropriations
House Subcommittee on Military Construction, Committee on Appropriations
House Subcommittee on National Security, Committee on Appropriations
House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
House Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
House Committee on National Security

Part III - Management Comments

Under Secretary of Defense Comments

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
1100 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1100

COMPTROLLER
(Program/Budget)

June 4, 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AUDITING, DOD IG

SUBJECT: DoD IG Draft Report on Defense Base Realignment and Closure 1997 Data for the Realignment of the Deployment Function for the 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division to Fort Drum, New York (Project No. 6CG-5001.16)

This responds to your May 10, 1996, memorandum requesting our comments on the subject report.

The audit states that the Army may have overstated the costs for projects, WOXG959609, "Runway/Apron/Instrument Lighting System;" WOXG959613, "Vehicle Operation Parking Shed;" and FPBB96510, "Add to Fire Station," associated with the realignment of functions to Fort Drum, New York. The audit contends the overstatement of costs occurred because the Army failed to justify and to provide supporting documentation for the requirements.

This audit recommends that the USD(Comptroller) place the funds for these three projects on administrative withhold until the Air Force submits revised DD 1391 forms that accurately reflect the requirements and costs for the projects.

The funding for the projects at issue is included in the fiscal year 1997 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) budget request and fiscal year 1998 program. We generally agree with the audit findings and recommendations and will place the funds associated with the projects on administrative withhold if the issue is not resolved by the start of the fiscal year. Also, we will reprogram any savings resulting from the audit to other BRAC requirements as appropriate.

B. R. Paseur
Director for Construction

Department of the Army Comments

Final Report Reference

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT
600 ARMY PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC 20310-0600

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF

DAIM-FDR (36-5C) 14 JUN 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, 400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE, ARLINGTON, VA 22202-2884

SUBJECT: Draft DODIG Report on the Audit of Base Realignment and Closure Data for the Realignment of the Deployment Function for the 10th Mountain (light Infantry) Division to Fort Drum, New York, Project No. 6CG-5001.16

1. Reference your memorandum, dated 10 May 1996, subject as above, which provided the draft audit report for review and comment.

2. The Army non-concurs with the findings and recommendations of the subject draft audit report. Specific details of the non-concurrence are provided in the responses, initiated by Fort Drum and forwarded by Forces Command, attached as enclosures.

3. The projects to upgrade the runway and support facilities are critical to transferring the deployment function of the 10th Mountain (Light Infantry) Division to Fort Drum and the closure of Griffiss Air Force Base. Request you amend your findings and recommendations to allow the Air Force to proceed with the projects as scheduled.

4. Point of contact at OACSIM is LTC Kelley, (703) 697-4125.

Encls

for J C Thiemig
FRANK L. MILLER, JR.
Major General, USA
Assistant Chief of Staff for
Installation Management

CF:
SAAG-PMF

*

* Enclosures omitted because of length. Copies will be provided upon request.

Finding A
Runway Expansion Site Improvement

Recommendation A.1 - Nonconcur

The project is on a tight schedule. Griffiss Air Force Base is due to close in September 1998 and all of the milestones for this project were established to meet that date. Due to the short construction season at Fort Drum (April - October) even a short delay could delay the entire project for one full construction season. The cost of such a delay will be no less than $12-$15 million to keep Griffiss operational for one additional year.

Fort Drum did not prepare the referenced DD Form 1391, so we can't identify with certainty what the $5 million encompassed. However, the list at Enclosure 1 includes the items and costs we identified locally as site improvements based on information currently available. The range of dollar values, from $4.2 to $5.8 million, is based on preliminary scoping estimates. The 10% design package, which will be completed during the first week of July, will provide more detail than these estimates. The 35% design will be the earliest that we can anticipate a detailed cost estimate for site improvements. The 35% review will be completed by September 1996.

Recommendation A.2 - Nonconcur

Considering the above information, submittal of a new DD 1391 is not warranted.

Finding B
Departure Airlift Group Facility

Recommendations B.1 through B.3 - Nonconcur

There continues to be a misconception by the DODIG on the use of this facility. Unfortunately the project's title on the DD Form 1391, "Vehicle Ops Heated Parking," is misleading. The primary purposes of this facility are to weigh and inspect vehicles and to build and inspect pallets, thereby duplicating the capabilities currently available at Griffiss. Only 190 square meters are intended to garage the most critical pieces of aerospace ground equipment.

The DD Form 1391 doesn't explain the Departure/Arrival Airfield Control Group (D/AACG) facility in detail. It will consist of three components. A 145 square meter scale house will be adjacent to the main building. The 1,003 square meter heated main building will be used for processing vehicles and pallets - Joint Inspection (JI) - just prior to aircraft loading, and 190 square meters of garaged

1

parking and storage will be attached to it. This 190 square meter area is the only area that will be designated as parking and storage on a permanent basis.

An economic analysis was not performed because no facilities currently exist at Fort Drum that could function as a D/AACG facility. The functions at the call forward area dictate that the D/AACG be next to the aircraft flight line for the following reasons:

- The D/AACG is the last point of inspection for both vehicles and pallets prior to marshaling and loading onto an aircraft.
- The aircraft movements coupled with chalk preparation operations at the D/AACG present a largely interrelated process. The personnel who weigh, inspect, marshal, and load on the flight line and chalk area must also interface with the aircraft load master.

The design of the D/AACG facility takes into consideration the following:

- Processing two lines of vehicles simultaneously at 10 pieces per line per hour.
- Accommodating 12-30 persons per shift, to include office area, break area, and latrines for both working crew and vehicle drivers.

Air Force and Army doctrine place the D/AACG facilities on the airfield next to the flight line, exactly as they have been designed. Air Force Regulation No. 76-6 (FM 55-12), Enclosure 2, spells out and defines that doctrine. A second reference supporting the D/AACG location is FM 55-65, Enclosure 3. First, one must understand that the D/AACG facility is part of the call forward area. For departure elements, the call forward area is the focal point of the airfield operation. For arriving elements the off loading ramp areas (part of the call forward area) are the focal point. The above references both graphically detail where such activities take place and clearly place the D/AACG facility next to the flight line.

Furthermore, the Army Strategic Mobility Program's Air Deployment Study identifies and supports the requirement for a D/AACG facility located next to the flight line as do all other doctrine. The ASMP report identified a larger more comprehensive D/AACG facility than we planned under the minimum essential BRAC requirements. ASMP is the independent subject matter expert and their report confirms the requirement for a D/AACG on the airfield.

No personnel will be housed in the D/AACG facility. For this reason, DODIG's reference to using the gymnasium or other existing buildings in lieu of constructing a D/AACG facility is doctrinally unsound. The gym is more than

2

three miles from the flight line and not part of the airfield. The gym was already identified as the passenger processing facility and is barely large enough to accommodate that function. Suggesting the use of the gym for a D/AACG facility implies a misunderstanding of D/AACG functions. Therefore, the recommendation is not in keeping with Army and Air Force doctrine. Any recommendation alluding to use of the gym as a D/AACG facility is invalid.

Finding C
Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield Fire Station

Recommendation C - Nonconcur

Fort Drum and the Air National Guard (ANG) both concur that a P-23 fire truck is too large to fit in any of the existing fire bays in accordance with the existing Life Safety Code. The diagram in DODIG's draft report isn't accurate. The diagram at Enclosure 4 contains the correct dimensions of a P-23 fire truck, the existing bay, and the additional space required to accommodate that vehicle.

As the report points out, a difference of opinion exists as to what type of Airport Fire Rescue Vehicle the USAF/ANG will provide to Fort Drum. To date, the ANG will only confirm that Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield will receive a P-15 vehicle (see Enclosure 5). Its dimensions are 13.77 meters long, 3.1 meters wide, and 3.66 meters high. A P-15 will not fit into any existing fire bay at Fort Drum. Enclosure 6 shows the size requirement for an additional bay based on receipt of a P-15 vehicle.

Fort Drum will continue to pursue obtaining a P-23 or its replacement vehicle per the BRAC action. In the interim, we are now compelled to build the add on bay to accommodate a P-15.

3

Department of the Air Force Comments

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON DC 20330-1000

10 June 1996

MEMORANDUM FOR The Assistant Inspector General for Auditing
Office of the Inspector General
Department of Defense

FROM: SAF/MIIT
1660 Air Force Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330-1660

SUBJECT: Audit Report on Defense base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of the Deployment Function for the 10th Mountain Infantry (Light) Division to Fort Drum, New York (Project NO. 6CG-500.16), May 10, 1996

This is in reply to your memorandum requesting the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller) provide Air Force comments on subject report.

Your first recommendation questioned only the $5.0 Million cost estimate for the site improvements, on the FY 1997 Runway/Apron/Lighting System project at $46 Million total cost. You asked that the project (WOXG959609) be placed on administrative withhold until a new DD Form 1391 was submitted.

We NON-CONCUR since the scope of the project itself was not questioned. Placing the project on administrative withhold does not accomplish any meaningful objective. When the project has reached 35% design status, the actual quantity of fencing, tank trails, utility relocation, etc. (scope) and estimated price (cost) will be reflected in the Architect-Engineer's cost data. A revised DD Form 1391 (with the cost estimate as back-up data) will be prepared at that time and submitted to you for information. The 35% design should be completed by September 1996. The list at attachment 1 includes the items and costs identified as site improvements based on information currently available.

Your second recommendation requested that project WOXG959613, Vehicle Operation Parking Shed/Heated Parking be rejustified to prove it needs to be on the flight line area and why another facility (such as the gymnasium) cannot be used and verification of scope by quantity of vehicles etc.

There continues to be a misconception on the use of this facility. Unfortunately the project's title on the DD Form 1391, "Vehicle Ops Heated Parking," is misleading. The primary purposes of this facility are to weigh and inspect vehicles and to build and inspect pallets, thereby duplicating the capabilities currently available at Griffiss. Only 190 square meters are intended to garage the most critical pieces of aerospace ground equipment.

The DD Form 1391 doesn't explain the Departure/Arrival Airfield Control Group (D/AACG) facility in detail. It will consist of three components. A 145 square meter scale house will be adjacent to the main building. The 1,003 square meter heated main building will be used for processing vehicles and pallets - Joint Inspection (J1) - just prior to aircraft loading, and 190 square meters of garaged parking and storage will be attached to it. This 190 square meter area is the only area that will be designated as parking and storage on a permanent basis.

An economic analysis was not performed because no facilities currently exist at Fort Drum that could function as a D/AACG facility. The functions at the call forward area dictate that the D/AACG be next to the aircraft flight line for the following reasons:

- The D/AACG is the last point of inspection for both vehicles and pallets prior to Marshaling and loading onto an aircraft.

- The aircraft movements coupled with chalk preparation operations at the D/AACG present a largely interrelated process. The personnel who weigh, inspect, marshal, and load on the flight line and chalk area must also interface with the aircraft load master.

The design of the D/AACG facility takes into consideration the following:

- Processing two lines of vehicles simultaneously at 10 pieces per line per hour.

- Accommodating 12-30 persons per shift, to include office area, break area, and latrines for both working crew and vehicle drivers.

Air Force and Army doctrine place the D/AACG facilities on the airfield next to the flight line, exactly as they have been designed. Air Force Regulation No. 76-6 (FM 55-12), attachment 1, spells out and defined that doctrine. A second reference supporting the D/AACG location is FM 55-65, attachment 2. First, one must understand that the D/AACG facility is part of the call forward area. For departure elements, the call forward area is the focal point of the airfield operation. For arriving elements the off loading ramp areas (part of the call forward area) are the focal point. the above references both graphically detail where such activities take place and clearly place the D/AACG facility next to the flight line.

Final Report Reference

Furthermore, the Army Strategic Mobility Program's Air Development Study identifies and supports the requirement for a D/AACG facility located next to the flight line as do all other doctrine. The ASMP report identified a larger more comprehensive D/AACG facility than we planned under the minimum essential BRAC requirements. ASMP is the independent subject matter expert and their report confirms the requirement for a D/AACG on the airfield.

No personnel will be housed in the D/AACG facility. For this reason, references to using the gymnasium or other existing buildings in lieu of constructing a D/AACG facility is doctrinally unsound. The gym is more than three miles from the flight line and not part of the airfield. The gym was already identified as the passenger processing facility and is barely large enough to accommodate that function.

Revised

Your third recommendation is to cancel project FPBB969510, Add to Fire Station, as you considered existing space adequate.

We NON-CONCUR. Fort Drum and the Air National Guard (ANG) both concur that a P-23 fire truck is too large to fit in any of the existing fire bays in accordance with the existing Life Safety Code. The diagram at attachment 3 contains the correct dimensions of a P-23 fire truck, the existing bay, and the additional space required to accommodate that vehicle.

As the report points out, a difference of opinion exists as to what type of Airport Fire Rescue Vehicle the USAF/ANG will provide to Fort Drum. The only vehicle available at Griffiss to transfer to Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield is a P-15 vehicle (see attachment 4). Its dimensions are 13.77 meters long, 3.1 meters wide, and 3.66 meters high. A P-15 will not fit into any existing fire bay at Fort Drum. Attachment 5 shows the size requirement for an additional bay based on receipt of a P-15 vehicle.

RAYMOND A. NEALL, Lt Col, USAF
Chief, Base Transition Division

Attachments: *
1. Site Improvement Spreadsheet
2. AFR 76-6
3. FM 55-65
4. Fire Station Plan P23
5. NGB Memo
6. Fire Station Plan P15

cc:
SAF/MII
SAF/FMBIC
USAF/CEC
ANG/RC
USA/10th Mt Div-AFZS-CG

* Attachments omitted because of length. Copies will be provided upon request.

Audit Team Members

This report was prepared by the Contract Management Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, DoD.

Paul J. Granetto
Kimberley A. Caprio
Carolyn R. Davis
James Wingate
Charlene K. Grondine
Adam S. Weissberg
Tara L. Queen