

Audit



Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

**SUMMARY REPORT ON THE AUDIT OF
DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY 1995
DEFENSE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE
DATA COLLECTION PROCESS**

Report No. 95-241

June 19, 1995

Department of Defense

Additional Copies

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

Suggestions for Future Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Planning and Coordination Branch, Audit 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:

Inspector General, Department of Defense
OAIG-AUD (ATTN: APTS Audit Suggestions)
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 the Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of each writer and caller is fully protected.

Acronyms

BRAC	Base Realignment and Closure
COBRA	Cost of Base Realignment Actions
DLA	Defense Logistics Agency
SAILS	Strategic Analysis for Integrated Logistics Systems



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



Report No. 95-241

June 19, 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, DEFENSE LOGISTICS AGENCY

SUBJECT: Summary Report on the Audit of Defense Logistics Agency 1995
Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process
(Project No. 4CG-5015.49)

Introduction

We are providing this audit report for your information and use. This report summarizes 48 Inspector General, DoD, audit reports that discuss the process that the Defense Logistics Agency (DLA), Alexandria, Virginia, used to collect data to support Defense base realignment and closure (BRAC) recommendations to the 1995 Commission on Defense Base Closure and Realignment (1995 Commission). DLA recommended to the 1995 Commission that two activities be closed, four activities be disestablished, two activities be realigned, and one 1993 BRAC decision be redirected. The recommendations have an anticipated net present value of costs and savings over 20 years of \$1.3 billion. This report focuses on the adequacy and implementation of procedures outlined in the internal control plan that DLA used to collect and document data for the DLA 1995 BRAC data call submission. Enclosure 1 provides a list of the DLA 1995 BRAC audit reports issued.

Audit Results

The DLA data collection process mandated in the internal control plan was found to be generally effective. During the review, we reported deficiencies to management, and management took the appropriate action to correct the deficiencies. The 48 audits showed that:

- the DLA internal control plan contained at least the minimum requirements for internal controls and incorporated the certification procedures set forth in the Office of the Secretary of Defense guidance;
- cost and condition data obtained from the DLA long-range maintenance plan for facilities prepared by the Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia, were consistently developed, generally supported, and reasonably accurate;
- modifications to the DD Form 805, "Storage Space Management Report" (805 Report), preparation process would give the assurance that the 805 Report provides consistent, supportable data for Defense distribution depots;
- Defense distribution depot data developed using the Strategic Analysis for Integrated Logistics Systems (SAILS) model was generally accurate and documented;

-
- the DLA process used during the 1995 BRAC evaluation phase resulted in accurate and supportable data for recommendations;
 - data for 1,606 of the 10,941 responses provided by 40 DLA activities for the 1995 BRAC data call submission required correction, additional supporting documentation, or completion.

Audit Objectives

The overall audit objective was to validate the DLA 1995 BRAC data collection process and the data that DLA provides to support recommendations for the 1995 Commission. The specific objective for the audits was to determine whether the data collection process that DLA used to develop recommendations reported to the 1995 Commission was consistently applied and adequately supported. The audit also reviewed applicable internal controls.

Scope and Methodology

Audit Scope. The audit evaluated the data collection process to determine whether DLA:

- followed the Office of the Secretary of Defense guidance to develop an internal control plan to collect and analyze 1995 BRAC data,
- had adequate documentation to support the data collection process, and
- had internal controls in place to ensure that data call responses developed by the internal control plan were complete and accurate.

Use of Statistical Sampling Methodology. We statistically assessed the accuracy and support for data provided by the 40 DLA activities subject to the 1995 BRAC process. We used a multistage stratified sampling plan developed by the Quantitative Methods Division, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, DoD. Enclosure 2 provides a list of the DLA activities evaluated in the 1995 BRAC process. The projection of the sample results are discussed in the DLA 1995 BRAC Data Analysis section in this report.

Use of Computer-Processed Data. We relied on computer-processed data when reviewing the DLA data collection process. We did not establish the reliability of the systems that generated the data for DLA activities included in the evaluation process. However, because each activity's data were uniformly produced, each activity verified its own data, and we reviewed all adjustments made by the activity, the reliability of the data was considered adequate.

Audit Standards, Period, and Locations. These program audits were conducted from February 1994 through March 1995 and were made in accordance with auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. Accordingly, we included tests of internal controls that were considered necessary. See Enclosure 3 for organizations visited or contacted.

Internal Control Program

On March 16, 1994, the DLA BRAC Executive Group issued the DLA 1995 BRAC internal control plan. The objective of the internal control plan was to ensure that the DLA 1995 BRAC analyses and recommendations were based on accurate data, and that the process was properly documented and verifiable. The internal control plan contained at least the minimum requirements for management controls and incorporated the certification procedures set forth in Public Law 101-510, "Defense Base Realignment and Closure Act of 1990," November 5, 1990, as amended, and the policy guidance issued in the Deputy Secretary of Defense memorandum, "1995 Base Realignment and Closures," January 7, 1994.

Audit Background

Policy Guidance. The Deputy Secretary of Defense memorandum established policy, procedures, authorities, and responsibilities for selecting bases for realignment or closure under Public Law 101-510, as amended. The memorandum established procedures for record keeping, internal controls, and data certification that the Military Departments and Defense agencies follow during the 1995 BRAC analysis process. In addition, the Inspector General, DoD, was directed to assist Defense agencies in developing, implementing, and evaluating the internal control plans.

In compliance with the Deputy Secretary of Defense memorandum, DLA developed an internal control plan to ensure that BRAC analyses and recommendations are based on accurate data and that the process is properly documented and verifiable.

Base Closure Executive Group and Working Group. The Director, DLA, established the DLA 1995 BRAC Executive Group (the Executive Group) to serve as the exclusive deliberative body responsible for directing the DLA 1995 BRAC process, for ensuring that DLA complies with all applicable laws and DoD policies, and for making the final DLA 1995 BRAC recommendations. A DLA 1995 BRAC Working Group (the Working Group) was established under the direction of the Executive Group to develop an analytical process, collect and analyze valid certified data, develop and evaluate alternative scenarios, conduct sensitivity analyses, and document and support the final 1995 BRAC recommendations.

Discussion

DLA Internal Control Plan. DLA developed a general plan and operating instructions to guide the Executive Group and the Working Group in conducting the DLA 1995 BRAC analysis. We verified that the internal control plan contained at least the minimum requirements for internal controls and incorporated the certification procedures as mandated by the Office of the Secretary of Defense. An Inspector General, DoD, memorandum to the Director, DLA, "Defense Logistics Agency Internal Control Plan for the 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process," June 16, 1994, summarizes this issue. The internal control plan established two mechanisms to control the process: organization and documentation.

Implementation of Organizational Controls. Organizational controls consisted of the establishment of three organizations that were segregated by distinct functional boundaries and levels of decisionmaking authorities. We attended meetings and reviewed minutes and briefing charts to determine whether the organizational controls were followed.

Implementation of Documentation Controls. Documentation controls were divided into the following major control elements: documentation and verification of the accuracy of data, safeguarding and storage of documents, and nondisclosure of BRAC-sensitive information. We reviewed the DLA implementation of the controls as they applied to each step of its analysis process.

DLA 1995 BRAC Data Analysis. The DLA analysis effort encompassed the following steps: collect data, analyze military value, develop alternatives, perform return-on-investment analyses, and determine community impact.

Collect Data. The Working Group identified initial data requirements based on the DoD selection criteria and the corresponding measures of merit. The Working Group developed a data call to collect the required data, and the Executive Group approved the data call. DLA then provided the 1995 BRAC data call to commanders and primary-level field activities in July 1994. The Executive Group used the responses to the data call to assist in assessing BRAC options for the DLA 1995 BRAC candidate activities in the BRAC process. We reviewed the DLA data collection process as it related to the facility long-range maintenance plan, storage space management data, responses provided for the DLA 1995 BRAC data call, and Defense distribution depot cost analyses.

Facility Long-Range Maintenance Plan. For the 1995 BRAC effort, the DLA unique mission required detailed data in the area of facility management. DLA contracted with the Navy Public Works Center, Norfolk, Virginia, to prepare a facility long-range maintenance plan. The purpose of the facility long-range maintenance plan was to:

- identify existing and projected facility deficiencies,
- provide detailed cost estimates of corrective action,
- establish priorities, and
- provide alternatives for the corrective actions.

DLA evaluated its facilities based on certain facility long-range maintenance data for the 1995 BRAC process. We verified that the DLA facility long-range maintenance plan data collection process was adequate at two depots. Nothing came to our attention that would cause us to believe that the results would be different for any other DLA site. Also, we considered reasonable the procedures that the Navy Public Works Center used to inspect and develop cost estimates included in the plans for each DLA site. Further, the cost estimates were consistently generated, generally supported, and reasonably accurate.

Storage Space Management Data. To provide storage space capacity for the 1995 BRAC evaluation process, DLA used the 805 Report as the source for required data. The 805 Report is prepared by each of the 23 DLA Defense distribution depots. The 805 Report is then forwarded to one of the two applicable DLA Defense distribution regional commands that consolidate the data for their respective regions and forward the results to DLA headquarters. We reviewed the process that DLA used to develop and to report data on the 805 Report for accuracy and supportable data. We verified that DLA continues to emphasize to its Defense distribution depots the importance of reporting data accurately for the 805 Report. However, modifications to the 805 Report preparation process were identified that would give management the assurance that the 805 Report provides consistent, supportable data. We made recommendations to DLA regarding procedures for calculating and documenting storage space data. DLA agreed with the recommendations and initiated immediate corrective actions.

Data Call Responses. We statistically reviewed 5,772 of the 10,941 responses that the activities provided to the DLA for the 1995 BRAC data call submission. Our review showed that 1,061 responses were incorrect, required additional supporting documentation, or were not answered. Based on the sample results, we projected that 2,362 responses required correction, additional supporting documentation, or completion. The need for correction, additional supporting documentation, or completion was brought to the attention of responsible management officials. Management resolved 756 of the 1,061 responses by the completion of our on-site verification. We estimate that, after management's initial corrective actions, 1,606 responses still required corrective action, additional supporting documentation, or completion. Also, we estimate that for those 1,606 responses, 374* responses (3.4 percent of the universe) contain incorrect data; 730* responses (6.7 percent of the universe) were not properly supported; and 501* data call questions (4.6 percent of the universe) were not answered. In reports on the data collection process at DLA activities, we recommended that activities with unresolved responses review all data call responses completely for accuracy of the response and adequacy of the supporting documentation and submit corrected, certified data as necessary to DLA. The activities agreed with the recommendations and initiated immediate corrective actions, which should have eliminated or greatly reduced the remaining errors.

Defense Distribution Depot Cost Analyses. DLA determined that Defense distribution depot cost could be measured by analyzing transportation cost, infrastructure cost (fixed and variable cost), the maximum utilization of the Defense distribution depot (throughput capacity), and the number of material release orders processed at a Defense distribution depot (the demand history). DLA used the Strategic Analysis for Integrated Logistics Systems (SAILS) model to incorporate that data into the computation of the minimum system operating costs under specific Defense distribution depot configuration. Data obtained from the SAILS model were used to support the DLA 1995 BRAC recommendations. We verified that DLA collected capacity

*Numbers do not add up to 1,606 because of rounding.

and demand history data in an unbiased and impartial manner. Certain cost and capacity calculations contained errors that were entered into the SAILS model. The errors were subsequently corrected. Also, we determined that the SAILS model properly calculated the minimum system operating cost under a specific Defense distribution depot configuration.

Analyze Military Value. The DoD military value selection criteria provided in the Deputy Secretary of Defense memorandum dated November 2, 1994, were designed to cover the many roles and missions of the Military Departments and DoD Components. The Executive Group determined that the same military value selection criteria used in the 1993 BRAC process would be used in the 1995 BRAC process. Those evaluation criteria provided more distinctive measures to assess the military value of DLA activities and met DoD criteria as follows:

- **Mission Scope** (DoD selection criteria 1 and 3). The mission assigned to the installation or activity plays an essential role within DoD and additionally benefits non-DoD customers. The functions performed in accomplishing the mission(s) may be unique. The strategic location of the facility and span of control are important to effective mission accomplishment.

- **Mission Suitability** (DoD selection criteria 1, 2, and 3). The installation or activity supports assigned missions. Suitability includes the age and condition of facilities, quality of life, location, and proximity to transportation links.

- **Operational Efficiencies** (DoD selection criteria 2 and 4). The installation or activity's mission is performed economically. Installation or activity operation costs include transportation, mechanical systems (which include mechanized material handling equipment), space utilization, personnel, and facility operating costs.

- **Expandability** (DoD selection criteria 1, 2, and 3). The installation or activity can accommodate new missions and increased workload, including sustained contingencies. Expandability considerations included requirements for space and infrastructure, community encroachment, and increased workload.

We verified that DLA adequately documented each part of the process including the formulation and allocations of points to the military value analysis, the use of the DLA Strategic Plan, concepts of operations, infrastructure reduction and storage management plans, installation analyses, and expanded environmental data call analysis requirements. We identified eight instances for stand-alone Defense distribution depots and seven instances for collocated Defense distribution depots where current certified data were not used for a data element in computations. Also, we identified three instances where the calculation of the points earned was incorrect. Those immaterial deficiencies were brought to the attention of management and management took appropriate actions to correct the deficiencies.

Develop Alternatives. The Working Group developed alternatives based on military value, in conjunction with military judgment. Once an alternative was conceived, it was evaluated for reasonableness and then either refined or abandoned. The Executive Group reviewed and approved the alternatives. We verified that DLA properly documented the groups' analysis and decision process.

Perform Return-on-Investment Analyses. The Working Group evaluated potential BRAC scenarios that the DLA Executive Group recommended by using the Cost of Base Realignment Actions computer model (COBRA) as directed by DoD BRAC policy. Data for the model consisted of details regarding personnel, military construction or renovation requirements, and specific costs of the individual scenario. The General Accounting Office reviewed the DLA application of COBRA and associated DoD standard factors. We verified that standard factors unique to DLA were documented and that correct information was used for the COBRA analysis.

Determine Community Impact. The scenarios and COBRA results were provided to the Executive Group for approval. The Executive Group considered the economic, infrastructure, and environmental impact on the community for each scenario. We verified that DLA properly documented its analysis and decision process that resulted in the 1995 BRAC recommendations.

Other Controls. The DLA working group controlled all 1995 BRAC documentation. The information was contained in one office within locked file cabinets. DLA required all personnel involved in the 1995 BRAC process to read and sign nondisclosure agreements. The agreements were controlled in one central location within DLA headquarters. We found no problems with controlling documents or the nondisclosure agreements.

Management Comments

Because this report contains no findings or recommendations, written comments were not required, and none were received.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the audit staff. For additional information on this report, please contact Mr. Wayne K. Million, Audit Program Director, at (703) 604-9312 (DSN 664-9312), or Mr. Gary R. Padgett, Audit Project Manager, at (703) 604-9304 (DSN 664-9304). The audit team members are listed inside the back cover.



David K. Steensma
Deputy Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

Enclosures

Summary of Inspector General, DoD, Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Audit Reports

Command and Control Activities

Contract Management Districts

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
95-101	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Contract Management District South, Marietta, Georgia	February 7, 1995
95-098	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Contract Management District West, El Segundo, California	February 3, 1995
95-094	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Contract Management Command International, Dayton, Ohio	February 2, 1995
95-078	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Contract Management District Northeast, Boston, Massachusetts	January 20, 1995

Defense Distribution Regions

95-105	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Region West, Stockton, California	February 7, 1995
95-052	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Region East, New Cumberland, Pennsylvania	December 9, 1994

Reutilization and Marketing Operations

95-096	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Services Operations West, Ogden, Utah	February 3, 1995
95-088	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Services Operations East, Gahanna, Ohio	January 27, 1995

Summary of Inspector General, DoD, Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Audit Reports

Defense Distribution Depots

Stand-Alone Depots

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
95-123	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Richmond, Virginia	February 17, 1995
95-115	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Columbus, Ohio	February 15, 1995
95-091	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, Utah	January 27, 1995
95-090	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin, Lathrop, California	January 27, 1995
95-080	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Susquehanna, New Cumberland, Pennsylvania	January 20, 1995
95-073	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, Tennessee	January 11, 1995

Collocated Depots

95-125	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Warner Robins, Georgia	February 17, 1995
95-124	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania	February 17, 1995
95-118	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Norfolk, Virginia	February 15, 1995
95-116	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Puget Sound, Washington	February 15, 1995
95-114	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Tobyhanna, Pennsylvania	February 10, 1995

**Summary of Inspector General, DoD, Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base
Realignment and Closure Audit Reports**

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
95-113	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Red River, Texarkana, Texas	February 10, 1995
95-112	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Corpus Christi, Texas	February 10, 1995
95-111	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Cherry Point, Marine Corps Air Station, North Carolina	February 10, 1995
95-110	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Barstow, California	February 10, 1995
95-109	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot San Diego, California	February 10, 1995
95-106	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot San Antonio, Texas	February 7, 1995
95-104	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot McClellan, McClellan Air Force Base, California	February 7, 1995
95-103	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Hill, Hill Air Force Base, Utah	February 7, 1995
95-097	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Oklahoma City, Oklahoma	February 3, 1995
95-086	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Albany, Georgia	January 27, 1995
95-085	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Anniston, Alabama	January 27, 1995
95-076	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Distribution Depot Jacksonville, Florida	January 13, 1995

Summary of Inspector General, DoD, Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Audit Reports

Inventory Control Points

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
95-127	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	February 21, 1995
95-122	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia	February 17, 1995
95-117	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Industrial Supply Center, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	February 15, 1995
95-108	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, Ohio	February 10, 1995
95-102	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Fuel Supply Center, Alexandria, Virginia	February 7, 1995

Service and Support Centers

95-121	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Automatic Addressing Systems Center, Dayton, Ohio	February 17, 1995
95-119	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Logistics Agency Systems Design Center, Columbus, Ohio	February 17, 1995
95-093	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Logistics Service Center, Battle Creek, Michigan	February 2, 1995
95-089	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Defense Reutilization and Marketing Services, Battle Creek, Michigan	January 27, 1995

Other Audit Reports

95-187	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Evaluation Phase	May 4, 1995
95-186	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for Reviewing Data Call Information	May 4, 1995
95-169	Defense Logistics Agency Validation of the 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Used in the Strategic Analysis for Integrated Logistics Systems Model	April 11, 1995

Summary of Inspector General, DoD, Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Audit Reports

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
95-168	Procedures Used by Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, Virginia, for the Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process	April 11, 1995
95-135	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Facility Long-Range Maintenance Plan	March 3, 1995
95-015	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for the Facility Long-Range Maintenance Plan	October 21, 1994
94-176	Defense Logistics Agency 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process for Storage Space Management Data	August 19, 1994
Memo*	Defense Logistics Agency Internal Control Plan for the 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Data Collection Process	June 16, 1994

*We did not issue an audit report for the review of the internal control plan. The results of our review were provided to the Director, DLA, in a memorandum dated June 16, 1994.

Defense Logistics Agency Activities Evaluated in the 1995 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Process

Inventory Control Points

Defense Construction Supply Center
Defense Fuel Supply Center
Defense General Supply Center
Defense Industrial Supply Center
Defense Personnel Support Center

Defense Distribution Regions

Defense Distribution Region East
Defense Distribution Region West

Defense Distribution Depots

Defense Distribution Depot Columbus
Defense Distribution Depot Memphis
Defense Distribution Depot Ogden
Defense Distribution Depot Richmond
Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin
Defense Distribution Depot Susquehanna
Defense Distribution Depot Anniston
Defense Distribution Depot Albany
Defense Distribution Depot Barstow
Defense Distribution Depot Cherry Point
Defense Distribution Depot Corpus Christi
Defense Distribution Depot Hill
Defense Distribution Depot Jacksonville
Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny
Defense Distribution Depot McClellan
Defense Distribution Depot Norfolk
Defense Distribution Depot Oklahoma City
Defense Distribution Depot Puget Sound
Defense Distribution Depot Red River
Defense Distribution Depot San Diego
Defense Distribution Depot San Antonio
Defense Distribution Depot Tobyhanna
Defense Distribution Depot Warner Robins

**Defense Logistics Agency Activities Evaluated in the 1995 Defense Base
Realignment and Closure Process**

Defense Contract Management Districts

Defense Contract Management District Northeast
Defense Contract Management District South
Defense Contract Management District West
Defense Contract Management Command International

Service and Support Centers

Defense Logistics Services Center
Defense Automatic Addressing Service Center
Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service
Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service Operations East
Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service Operations West
Defense Logistics Agency Systems Design Center

Organizations Visited or Contacted

Department of the Army

Anniston Army Depot, AL
Letterkenny Army Depot, Chambersburg, PA
Red River Army Depot, Texarkana, TX
Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA

Department of the Navy

Fleet and Industrial Supply Center San Diego, CA
Naval Air Station North Island, CA
Naval Station Long Beach, CA
Naval Station San Diego, CA
Long Beach Naval Shipyard, CA
Naval Base Norfolk, VA
Naval Air Station Jacksonville, FL
Naval Station Mayport, FL
Naval Aviation Supply Office, Philadelphia, PA
Naval Communication Station, Stockton, CA
Naval Air Station Corpus Christi, TX
Marine Corps Logistics Base Barstow, CA
Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA
Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, NC

Department of the Air Force

Dobbins Air Force Base, GA
Hill Air Force Base, UT
Kelly Air Force Base, TX
McClellan Air Force Base, CA
Robins Air Force Base, GA
Tinker Air Force Base, OK
Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH

Defense Organizations

Defense Logistics Agency, Alexandria, VA
Defense Construction Supply Center, Columbus, OH
Defense Electronic Supply Center, Dayton, OH

Organizations Visited or Contacted

Defense Organizations (cont'd)

Defense Fuel Supply Center, Alexandria, VA
Defense General Supply Center, Richmond, VA
Defense Industrial Supply Center, Philadelphia, PA
Defense Logistics Services Center, Battle Creek, MI
Defense Personnel Support Center, Philadelphia, PA
Defense Logistics Agency Systems Design Center, Columbus, OH
 Defense Automatic Addressing Systems Center, Dayton, OH
 Defense Automatic Addressing Systems Center, Tracy, CA
Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service, Battle Creek, MI
 Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service Operations East, Gahanna, OH
 Defense Reutilization and Marketing Service Operations West, Ogden, UT
Defense Contract Management District Northeast, Boston, MA
Defense Contract Management District South, Marietta, GA
Defense Contract Management District West, El Segundo, CA
Defense Contract Management Command International, Columbus, OH

Defense Distribution Region East, New Cumberland, PA
 Defense Distribution Depot Albany, GA
 Defense Distribution Depot Anniston, AL
 Defense Distribution Depot Cherry Point, NC
 Defense Distribution Depot Columbus, OH
 Defense Distribution Depot Jacksonville, FL
 Defense Distribution Depot Letterkenny, Chambersburg, PA
 Defense Distribution Depot Memphis, TN
 Defense Distribution Depot Norfolk, VA
 Defense Distribution Depot Richmond, VA
 Defense Distribution Depot Susquehanna, New Cumberland, PA
 Defense Distribution Depot Tobyhanna, PA
 Defense Distribution Depot Warner Robins, GA

Defense Distribution Region West, Stockton, CA
 Defense Distribution Depot Barstow, CA
 Defense Distribution Depot Corpus Christi, TX
 Defense Distribution Depot Hill, Hill Air Force Base, UT
 Defense Distribution Depot McClellan, Sacramento, CA
 Defense Distribution Depot Ogden, UT
 Defense Distribution Depot Oklahoma City, OK
 Defense Distribution Depot Puget Sound, WA
 Defense Distribution Depot Red River, Texarkana, TX
 Defense Distribution Depot San Antonio, TX
 Defense Distribution Depot San Diego, CA
 Defense Distribution Depot San Joaquin, Lathrop, CA

Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology
Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Management)
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller/Program/Budget)
Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Economic Security)
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations)
Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)

Department of the Army

Auditor General, Department of the Army

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)
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force

Other Defense Organizations

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Agency
Director, National Security Agency
Inspector General, National Security Agency
Inspector General, Central Imagery Office

Report Distribution

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 Committee on Armed Services
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
House 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

Audit Team Members

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

Paul J. Granetto
Wayne K. Million
Gary R. Padgett
A. Christine Grannas
Amy M. Weaver
Eric A. Yungner