

Audit

Report



OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

DEFENSE BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE
BUDGET DATA FOR THE REALIGNMENT OF
GRISSOM AIR RESERVE BASE, INDIANA

Report No. 95-289

August 8, 1995

This special version of the report has been revised to
omit source selection and For Official Use Only information

Department of Defense

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A

Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

20000106 131

AOI 00-04-0869

Additional Copies

To obtain additional copies of this audit 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
MILCON	Military Construction
MWR	Morale, Welfare, and Recreation
NEACP	National Emergency Airborne Command Post
TMO	Traffic Management Office



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



August 8, 1995

**MEMORANDUM FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
(FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)**

**SUBJECT: Audit Report on Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for
the Realignment of Grissom Air Reserve Base, Indiana
(Report No. 95-289)**

We are providing this audit report for your review and comment. This report is one in a series of reports about FY 1996 Defense base realignment and closure military construction costs. Management comments on a draft of this report were considered in preparing the final report.

DoD Directive 7650.3 requires that all recommendations and monetary benefits be resolved promptly. The Air Force comments were not fully responsive to Recommendation 2. Therefore, we request that the Air Force provide comments on the unresolved recommendation by September 8, 1995.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the audit staff. Questions on the audit should be directed to Mr. Joseph P. Doyle, Audit Program Director, at (703) 604-9348 (DSN 664-9348) or Mr. Charles M. Hanshaw, Audit Project Manager, at (703) 604-9294 (DSN 664-9294). See Appendix G for the report distribution. The audit team members are listed inside the back cover.

David K. Steensma

David K. Steensma
Deputy Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

This special version of the report has been revised to omit source selection and For Official Use Only information.

Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. 95-289
(Project No. 5CG-5017.08)

August 8, 1995

Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of Grissom Air Reserve Base, Indiana

Executive Summary

Introduction. 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 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. This report is one in a series of reports about FY 1996 Defense base realignment and closure military construction costs.

Audit Objectives. The overall audit objective was to determine the accuracy of FY 1995 Defense base realignment and closure military construction budget data. This report provides the results of the audit of eight projects, estimated at \$8.6 million, for the realignment of Grissom Air Reserve Base, Indiana. This audit also assessed the adequacy of the management control program as it applied to the audit objective.

Audit Results. The Air Force Reserve adequately justified \$4.5 million on the eight projects. The Air Force Reserve did not adequately justify the remaining requirements and cost estimates for the realignment of the Grissom Air Reserve Base. As a result, the Air Force may unnecessarily spend \$4.1 million of Defense base realignment and closure funds obligated for the realignment. See Part I for a discussion of the finding. See Appendix E for a summary of potential benefits of the audit.

The results of the management control program will be discussed in a summary report on Defense base realignment and closure military construction budget data.

Summary of Recommendations. We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller):

- Reduce the FY 1995 Defense base realignment and closure military construction budget by \$3.3 million for eight projects at Grissom Air Reserve Base and reprogram those funds to other supported and unfunded Defense base realignment and closure military construction projects.

- Suspend project funds totaling \$800,000 for four projects until requirements are adequately validated and documented.

We also recommend that the Air Force Reserve validate and document requirements and submit revised DD Forms 1391, "FY 1995 Military Construction Project Data," for the Grissom realignment projects.

Management Comments. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) concurred with the recommendation and will place funds associated with the Grissom projects on administrative withhold if issues are not resolved by the start of the fiscal year. The Air Force partially concurred with the recommendation to validate and document project requirements. Although the Air Force concurred with recommendations to prepare revised DD Forms 1391, it did not fully agree with all the amounts recommended for reduction and suspension. The Air Force agreed to budget reductions of \$2.6 million and suspensions of \$800,000. See Part II for a summary of Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) comments and Appendix C for a discussion of the Air Force comments on the recommendations. The complete text of the management comments is in Part III.

Audit Response. We believe that the reductions and suspensions in our recommendations are valid. We request that the Air Force reconsider its position on the \$660,000 of reductions on the projects. The Air Force is requested to provide additional comments by September 8, 1995.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Part I - Audit Results	
Audit Background	2
Audit Objectives	2
Requirements and Cost Justification	3
Part II - Additional Information	
Appendix A. Scope and Methodology	12
Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews	13
Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions	19
Appendix D. Background of Defense Base Realignment and Closures and Scope of the Audit of FY 1996 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Costs	32
Appendix E. Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting From Audit	34
Appendix F. Organizations Visited or Contacted	36
Appendix G. Report Distribution	37
Part III - Management Comments	
Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Comments	40
Department of the Air Force Comments	41

Part I - Audit Results

Audit Results

Audit Background

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 1996 BRAC military construction (MILCON) costs. For additional information on the BRAC process and the overall scope of the audit of BRAC MILCON costs, see Appendix D.

Audit Objectives

The overall audit objective was to determine the accuracy of FY 1995 BRAC MILCON budget data. The specific objectives were to determine whether the proposed projects were valid BRAC requirements, whether the decision for MILCON was supported with required documentation including an economic analysis, and whether the economic analysis considered existing facilities. The audit also assessed the adequacy of the Air Force management control program as it applied to the overall audit objective.

This report provides the results of the audit of 42 line items from eight BRAC MILCON projects, estimated at \$8.6 million, for the realignment of Grissom Air Reserve Base. Not included in our review were a corrosion control hangar, funded with FY 1994 BRAC funding, and the relocation of the National Emergency Airborne Command Post. The relocation of the Command Post is addressed in Inspector General, DoD, Report No. 95-257, "Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of the National Airborne Operations Center Forward Operating Base From Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio," June 27, 1995. 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 will be discussed in a summary report on BRAC MILCON budget data. Therefore, this report does not discuss our review of management controls for the Air Force Reserve.

Requirements and Cost Justification

The Air Force Reserve did not adequately justify requirements and cost estimates for the BRAC MILCON projects relating to the realignment of Grissom Air Reserve Base. Existing facilities were not adequately considered, construction was proposed at a higher level than required, and costs not related to BRAC were included in the funding requests. In addition, funds requested for some projects were not supported by the most current construction plans. The Air Force Reserve did not update DD Forms 1391, "FY 1995 Military Construction Project Data," to reflect significant changes in the proposed requirements and estimated costs. As a result, the Air Force may unnecessarily expend \$4.1 million of BRAC MILCON funds for the realignment.

Criteria for BRAC MILCON Funding Requests

Guidance for Establishing and Supporting Requirements. Public Law 101-510, "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990," November 5, 1990, establishes funds to be used for the closure and realignment of military units and support facilities. Section 2905 of Public Law 101-510 states that funds from the Defense Base Closure Account should be used only for the actions that may be necessary to close or realign a military installation. The law also stipulates that funds authorized for BRAC should be used only for facilities necessary to meet mission requirements.

Guidance for Preparing and Submitting Budget Requests. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Installations) and the Chairperson of the Air Force Base Closure Executive Group issued instructions for preparing BRAC funding requests in a memorandum issued in April 1993. Included were instructions to update the DD Forms 1391 when significant changes occur in scope or cost. Also included were guidelines for determining construction qualifying for BRAC funding. Specifically, projects to correct existing deficiencies were not to be included in the funding requests.

Project Justification

The Air Force submitted DD Forms 1391, "FY 1996 Military Construction Project Data," for eight Grissom Air Reserve Base projects as a part of the BRAC II FYs 1996 and 1997 budget estimate submission to the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) (the Comptroller) in September 1994. Those projects were originally submitted for FY 1994 BRAC MILCON funds, but the Comptroller deferred the funding. In January 1995, the Comptroller restored

Requirements and Cost Justification

the deferred funds, and the Air Force submitted revised DD Forms 1391 for FY 1995 funding. The Air Force received FY 1995 BRAC MILCON obligation authority for \$8.6 million and is preparing statements of work for contract solicitations for those projects.

Updated DD Forms 1391. The revised DD Forms 1391 did not reflect significant reductions in proposed requirements and estimated costs. Air Force BRAC funding procedures require that the major command validate all BRAC cost estimates submitted on DD Form 1391 and update those costs when required. For example, the Air Force Reserve estimated costs of * on the FY 1995 DD Form 1391 for project CTGC939005, "Isolate Utilities." The scope of requirements was significantly reduced, and the current estimated MILCON cost is *. Similarly, the Air Force Reserve estimated costs of * on the FY 1995 DD Form 1391 for project CTGC939006, "Alter Heating Plant." The alteration is currently estimated at *.

Existing Facilities. The Air Force Reserve did not adequately consider the use of suitable existing facilities when it proposed new MILCON or extensive renovation. For example, on project CTGC959019, "Munitions Storage," the Air Force Reserve proposed to build a new storage facility for a small arms range when a vacant building in the vicinity could be used. The Air Force Reserve agreed that the vacant building would satisfy the requirement. In addition, on project CTGC939003, "Alter Facilities for Base Support," the Air Force Reserve included costs for renovating a warehouse (building 209) to accommodate the base contracting office. The DD Form 1391 contained an estimate of * for the renovation. The Air Force Reserve did not consider available space in an existing office building (building 669) that could accommodate the contracting function and eliminate the need for extensive renovation.

Construction Criteria. BRAC funds were requested for MILCON that was not necessary to meet mission requirements. On project CTGC959019, "Munitions Storage," the Air Force Reserve proposed a road to the new munitions storage that significantly exceeded requirements. The proposal included lighting along the entire length of the roadway, curbs, gutters, catch basins, and a sewer system. Because the road extends only to the storage facility, it will not have significant traffic on it. Therefore, the estimated costs for more than basic paving were overstated by *.

Non-BRAC Projects. The Air Force Reserve proposed requirements and cost estimates for MILCON that should not be funded from the BRAC appropriation. On project CTGC939003, "Alter Facilities for Base Support," the Air Force Reserve proposed costs to repair the floors in two unheated covered storage buildings (buildings 213 and 214). The function of the storage buildings did not change with the Grissom Air Reserve Base realignment. Therefore, the repair of the buildings is not within the scope of BRAC. On project CTGC959008, "Vehicle Maintenance," the Air Force Reserve proposed BRAC MILCON to repair that portion of the petroleum storage area used to load and off-load fuel. That repair was for a preexisting condition that did not relate to BRAC.

Requirements and Cost Justification

Current Construction Plans. The Air Force Reserve estimated costs on DD Forms 1391 for MILCON that did not conform to the current plans for Grissom Air Reserve Base. For example, on project CTGC939003, "Alter Facilities for Base Support," the Air Force Reserve included costs for altering building 596 to provide space for a medical clinic. However, the Air Force Reserve decided to relocate the clinic to building 669 at a later date, but did not revise project cost estimates to eliminate the MILCON required in building 596.

The specific details on recommended budget reductions and suspensions for the BRAC MILCON projects proposed for the realignment of Grissom Air Reserve Base are discussed in Appendix C.

Summary

The Air Force did not effectively implement the established guidance in developing BRAC MILCON requirements and cost estimates. As a result, the Air Force Reserve submitted DD Forms 1391 with proposed requirements that were not justified and estimated costs that were questionable. Implementation of the recommendations would result in more accurate BRAC MILCON project requirements and cost estimates.

The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) should reduce the budget for the Grissom Air Reserve Base realignment by \$3.3 million for BRAC MILCON that is not required and suspend \$800,000 from estimated funding until the Air Force Reserve sufficiently justifies and documents requirements and cost estimates. Table 1 shows the recommended costs, by project, to be reduced.

Table 1. Project Costs Recommended for Reduction

<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Amount</u>
CTGC939001	Base Boundary Fence/Main Gate	\$ *
CTGC939003	Alter Facilities for Base Support	*
CTGC939004	Add to and Alter Operational Facilities	*
CTGC939005	Isolate Utilities	*
CTGC939006	Alter Heating Plant	*
CTGC959006	Alter Maintenance Facilities	*
CTGC959008	Vehicle Maintenance	*
CTGC959019	Munitions Storage	*
Total		\$3,288,000

Requirements and Cost Justification

Table 2 shows the recommended costs, by project, to be suspended pending requirements validation and documentation and submission of revised DD Forms 1391.

Table 2. Project Costs Recommended for Suspension

<u>Project</u>	<u>Project Title</u>	<u>Amount</u>
CTGC939001	Base Boundary Fence/Main Gate	\$ *
CTGC939003	Alter Facilities for Base Support	*
CTGC959006	Alter Maintenance Facilities	*
CTGC959008	Vehicle Maintenance	*
Total		\$797,000

Recommendations, Management Comments, and Audit Response

1. We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller):

a. Adjust the funding in the Air Force FY 1995 Defense base realignment and closure budget for Grissom Air Reserve Base as follows:

(1) Reduce funds for project CTGC939001, "Base Boundary Fence/Main Gate," by * .

(2) Reduce funds for project CTGC939003, "Alter Facilities for Base Support," by * .

(3) Reduce funds for project CTGC939004, "Add to and Alter Operational Facilities," by * .

(4) Reduce funds for project CTGC939005, "Isolate Utilities," by * .

(5) Reduce funds for project CTGC939006, "Alter Heating Plant," by * .

(6) Reduce funds for project CTGC959006, "Alter Maintenance Facilities," by * .

(7) Reduce funds for project CTGC959008, "Vehicle Maintenance," by * .

(8) Reduce funds for project CTGC959019, "Munitions Storage," by * .

b. Suspend the funding in the Air Force FY 1995 Defense base realignment and closure budget for Grissom Air Reserve Base for the following:

(1) Project CTGC939001, "Base Boundary Fence/Main Gate," by * until the Air Force Reserve provides validated cost estimates for the new location.

(2) Project CTGC939003, "Alter Facilities for Base Support," by * until the Air Force Reserve provides validated cost estimates for the new location.

(3) Project CTGC959006, "Alter Maintenance Facilities," by * until the Air Force Reserve provides adequate documentation to support requirements and cost estimates.

(4) Project CTGC959008, "Vehicle Maintenance," by * until the Air Force Reserve provides documentation justifying the number of refueling vehicle parking spaces required and prepares a revised DD Form 1391 eliminating non-BRAC items.

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Comments. The Comptroller concurred with the recommendations and will place funds associated with the Grissom projects on administrative withhold if issues are not resolved by the start of the fiscal year.

Air Force Comments. Although not required to comment, the Air Force also provided comments on the recommendations. Because Recommendation 1. involves one or more line items detailed in Appendix C, the discussion of Air Force comments and our audit responses appear in Appendix C for easy reference.

2. We recommend that the Chief, Air Force Reserve:

a. Prepare a revised DD Form 1391, "FY 1995 Military Construction Project Data," for project CTGC939001, "Base Boundary Fence/Main Gate," to reflect the budget reduction in Recommendation 1.a.(1) and new validated cost estimates in Recommendation 1.b.(1) as detailed in the notes to Appendix C.

b. Prepare a revised FY 1995 DD Form 1391 for project CTGC939003, "Alter Facilities for Base Support," to reflect the budget reduction in Recommendation 1.a.(2) and new validated cost estimates in Recommendation 1.b.(2) as detailed in the notes to Appendix C.

Requirements and Cost Justification

c. Prepare a revised FY 1995 DD Form 1391 for project CTGC939004, "Add to and Alter Operational Facilities," to reflect the budget reduction in Recommendation 1.a.(3) as detailed in the notes to Appendix C.

d. Prepare a revised FY 1995 DD Form 1391 for project CTGC939005, "Isolate Utilities," to reflect the budget reduction in Recommendation 1.a.(4) as detailed in the notes to Appendix C.

e. Prepare a revised FY 1995 DD Form 1391 for project CTGC939006, "Alter Heating Plant," to reflect the budget reduction in Recommendation 1.a.(5) as detailed in the notes to Appendix C.

f. Prepare a revised FY 1995 DD Form 1391 for project CTGC959006, "Alter Maintenance Facilities," to reflect the budget reduction in Recommendation 1.a.(6) and justified requirements and cost estimates in Recommendation 1.b.(3) as detailed in the notes to Appendix C.

g. Prepare a revised FY 1995 DD Form 1391 for project CTGC959008, "Vehicle Maintenance," to reflect the budget reduction in Recommendation 1.a.(7) and justified requirements and cost estimates in Recommendation 1.b.(4) as detailed in the notes to Appendix C.

h. Prepare a revised FY 1995 DD Form 1391 for project CTGC959019, "Munitions Storage," to reflect the budget reduction in Recommendation 1.a.(8) as detailed in the notes to Appendix C.

Air Force Comments. The Air Force concurred with the recommendations and stated that revised DD Forms 1391 will be prepared upon completion of project designs. Estimated completion date is October 15, 1995. The Air Force agreed to budget reductions of \$2.6 million and suspensions of \$800,000 on the projects. The details of Air Force comments appear in Appendix C.

Audit Response. We still believe that the reductions and suspensions in our recommendations are valid. We request that the Air Force reconsider its position on the \$660,000 of reductions on the projects. The Air Force should provide additional comments and documentation on the recommended reductions that it did not agree with. Details of the audit responses appear in Appendix C.

Response Requirements Per Recommendation

Responses to the final report are required from the Air Force for the items indicated in the following chart.

<u>Number</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Amount</u>
4.e.	CTGC939003 Alter Facilities for Base Support, Civil Engineer Shop	\$ *
4.f.	CTGC939003 Alter Facilities for Base Support, TMO & Contracting	*
5.b.	CTGC939004 Add To or Alter Operational Facilities, Flight Simulator Support	*
5.c.	CTGC939004 Add To or Alter Operational Facilities, Command Post	*
10.c.	CTGC 959019 Munitions Storage, Range Storage Facility	<u>*</u>
Total		\$660,000

This page was left out of original document

Part II - Additional Information

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

Scope of This Audit. We examined the FY 1995 BRAC MILCON budget request and related documentation for eight projects proposed for the realignment of the Grissom Air Reserve Base. The eight projects in the table below were estimated to cost \$8.6 million.

Audited FY 1995 BRAC MILCON Projects for Realignment of Grissom Air Reserve Base		
Project Number	Project Title	Estimated Cost
CTGC939001	Base Boundary Fence/Main Gate	\$ *
CTGC939003	Alter Facilities for Base Support	*
CTGC939004	Add to and Alter Operational Facilities	*
CTGC939005	Isolate Utilities	*
CTGC939006	Alter Heating Plant	*
CTGC959006	Alter Maintenance Facilities	*
CTGC959008	Vehicle Maintenance	*
CTGC959019	Munitions Storage	*
Total		\$8,610,000

Review Methodology. We reviewed 42 line items for the 8 projects. Details of the review are discussed in Appendix C. All the projects related to the renovation of existing buildings, except for projects for a new simulator bay, a munitions storage facility, and a small arms range. The Air Force reported all the projects at 90- to 100-percent design, had received FY 1995 obligation authority, and was prepared to advertise the MILCON for bids. We reviewed the requirements as they related to BRAC funding guidelines. If the requirements were justified, we reviewed the blueprint design and cost estimates for reasonableness. We also reviewed the accuracy of proposed requirements and estimated costs in DD Forms 1391.

Audit Period, Standards, Potential Benefits, and Locations. This economy and efficiency audit was made January through March 1995 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 management controls considered necessary. The audit did not rely on computer-processed data or statistical sampling procedures. See Appendix E for the potential benefits resulting from the audit. Appendix F 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 selected DoD BRAC reports.

Inspector General, DoD

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
95-287	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Construction of the Special Purpose Vehicle Storage Facility at Vandenberg Air Force Base, California	August 4, 1995
95-286	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey	August 4, 1995
95-283	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Fort Devens, Massachusetts	August 1, 1995
95-282	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Realignment of the HAVE NAP Maintenance Complex from Castle Air Force Base, California to Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana	August 1, 1995
95-278	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data, Fort Huachuca, Arizona, Family Practice Clinic	July 14, 1995
95-276	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Naval Air Station Barbers Point, Hawaii, and Realignment to Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, Washington	July 7, 1995
95-272	Defense Information School at Fort George G. Meade Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Project	June 30, 1995
95-258	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Naval Hospital Lemoore, California	June 28, 1995

Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews

Inspector General, DoD (cont'd)

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
95-257	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of the National Airborne Operations Center Forward Operating Base From Grissom Air Force Base, Indiana, to Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio	June 27, 1995
95-250	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Budget Data for Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas	June 23, 1995
95-249	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Budget Data for Goodfellow Air Force Base, San Angelo, Texas	June 23, 1995
95-248	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Budget Data for Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas	June 23, 1995
95-247	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Budget Data for the Naval Aviation Depot North Island, California	June 23, 1995
95-226	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base, Ohio	June 8, 1995
95-223	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Marine Corps Air Stations El Toro and Tustin, California, and Realignment to Naval Air Station Miramar, California	June 8, 1995
95-222	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Proposed Construction of the Automotive Vehicle Maintenance Facility, Guam	June 7, 1995
95-221	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Naval Training Center San Diego, California	June 6, 1995

Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews

Inspector General, DoD (cont'd)

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
95-213	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Naval Training Center Great Lakes, Illinois	June 2, 1995
95-212	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Fort Jackson, South Carolina	June 2, 1995
95-208	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of Construction Battalion Unit 416 From Naval Air Station Alameda, California, to Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada	May 31, 1995
95-205	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Relocation of Marine Corps Manpower Center at Marine Corps Combat Development Command, Quantico, Virginia	May 26, 1995
95-203	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Budget Data for the Army Reserve Center, Sacramento, California	May 25, 1995
95-198	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of the Underway Replenishment Training Facility, Treasure Island, California, and Realignment to the Expeditionary Warfare Training Group Atlantic, Norfolk, Virginia	May 19, 1995
95-196	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Naval Air Station Alameda, California, and Realignment to Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Washington	May 17, 1995
95-191	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Naval Reserve Readiness Center San Francisco, California, and Realignment to Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center Alameda, California	May 15, 1995

Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews

Inspector General, DoD (cont'd)

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
95-172	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Griffiss Air Force Base, New York	April 13, 1995
95-154	Audit of Construction Budget Data for Realigning Naval Training Centers Orlando and San Diego to Various Locations	March 21, 1995
95-150	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Closing Naval Station Charleston, South Carolina, and Realigning Projects to Various Sites	March 15, 1995
95-051	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Closing Mare Island Naval Shipyard, California, and Realigning Projects to Various Sites	December 9, 1994
95-041	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Marine Corps Air Stations El Toro and Tustin, California, and the Realignment to Naval Air Station Miramar, California	November 25, 1994
95-039	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Naval Air Station Miramar, California, Realigning to Naval Air Station Fallon, Nevada	November 25, 1994
95-037	Realignment of the Fleet and Mine Warfare Training Center From Naval Station Charleston, South Carolina, to Naval Station Ingleside, Texas	November 23, 1994
95-029	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Naval Air Station Miramar, California, and Realigning Projects to Various Sites	November 15, 1994
95-010	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Marine Corps Air Station Tustin, California, and Realignment to Marine Corps Air Station Camp Pendleton, California	October 17, 1994

Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews

Inspector General, DoD (cont'd)

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
94-179	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey; Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana; and Fairchild Air Force Base, Washington	August 31, 1994
94-146	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Closing Naval Air Station Cecil Field, Florida, and Realigning Projects to Various Sites	June 21, 1994
94-141	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Naval Air Stations Dallas, Texas, and Memphis, Tennessee, Realigning to Carswell Air Reserve Base, Texas	June 17, 1994
94-127	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of the Defense Personnel Support Center to the Naval Aviation Supply Office Compound in North Philadelphia, Pennsylvania	June 10, 1994
94-126	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Naval Air Station Glenview, Illinois, and Realignment Projects at Fort McCoy, Wisconsin, and Carswell Air Reserve Base, Texas	June 10, 1994
94-125	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Naval Medical Center Portsmouth, Virginia	June 8, 1994
94-121	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Naval Air Technical Training Center, Naval Air Station Pensacola, Florida	June 7, 1994
94-109	Quick-Reaction Report on the Audit of Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Naval Training Center Great Lakes, Illinois	May 19, 1994
94-108	Quick-Reaction Report on the Audit of Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Naval Station Treasure Island, California	May 19, 1994

Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews

Inspector General, DoD (cont'd)

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Report Title</u>	<u>Date</u>
94-107	Griffiss Air Force Base, New York, Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for Military Construction at Other Sites	May 19, 1994
94-105	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for a Tactical Support Center at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, Washington	May 18, 1994
94-104	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Defense Contract Management District-West	May 18, 1994
94-103	Air Force Reserve 301st Fighter Wing Covered Aircraft Washrack Project, Carswell Air Reserve Base, Texas	May 18, 1994
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. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

Project Number and Title	Project Estimate	Recommended Budget Reductions	Recommended Funding Suspensions	Notes (see end of table)
Project CTGC939001, Fencing and Main Gate				
Fencing	\$	*	*	3.a
Main Gate/Gatehouse	*	*	*	3.b
Utilities	*	*	\$	3.c
Pavements	*	*	(incl above)	3.c
Site Improvements	*	*	(incl above)	3.c
Rounded Amount	*	*		2
Total Requested	*	*	*	1
Project CTGC939003, Alter Facilities for Base Support				
Medical Clinic (Building 596)	\$	*	*	4.a
Misc Group Support (Building 670)	*	\$	*	4.b
Communication Facility (Building 427)	*	(incl above)	*	4.c
Squadron Training (Building 427)	(incl above)	*	*	4.c
Physical Fitness (Building 563)	*	*	*	4.d
Base Civil Engineer Shops (Buildings 448,213,214)	*	*	*	4.e
TMO & Contracting/Sitework	*	*	*	4.f
Rounded Amount	*	*		2
Total Requested	*	*	*	1
Project CTGC939004, Add to and Alter Operational Facilities				
Add Flight Simulator Bay	\$	*	*	5.a
Add Flight Simulator Support (Building 668)	*	*	*	5.b
Alter Command Post (Building 671)	*	*	*	5.c
Alter Weather and Base Operations	*	*	*	5.d
Modify Support Utilities (Building 667)	*	*	*	5.e
Rounded Amount	*	*	*	2
Total Requested	*	*	*	1

Note: See acronym list at end of table.

*Source selection information deleted.

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

<u>Project Number and Title</u>	<u>Project Estimate</u>	<u>Recommended Budget Reductions</u>	<u>Recommended Funding Suspensions</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Project CTGC939005, Isolate Utilities				
Isolate Utility Systems	\$ *	\$ *		6
Relocate Utilities	*	*		6
Demolish Buildings	*	*		6
Site Preparation	*	*		6
Rounded Amount	*	*		2
Total Requested	*	*		1
Project CTGC939006, Alter Heating Plant				
Demolition	\$ *	\$ *		7
Control System	*	*		7
Utilities	*	*		7
Site Improvements	*	*		7
Total Requested	*	*		1
Project CTGC959006, Alter Maintenance Facilities				
Alter Maintenance Shop	\$ *	\$ *		8.a
Alter Services/MWR (Building 330)	*	*		8.b
Alter Maintenance Squadron	*	*		8.c
Alter Security Police (Building 430)	*	*		8.d
Alter NEACP Alert Facility (Building 600)	*	*	\$ *	8.e
Alter Dining Facility (Building 325)	*	*		8.f
Alter Pavement/Grounds (Building 436)	*	*		8.g
Alter Logistics (Building 431)	*	*		
Rounded Amount	*	*		2
Total Requested	*	*	*	1

Note: See acronym list at end of table.

*Source selection information deleted.

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

<u>Project Number and Title</u>	<u>Project Estimate</u>	<u>Recommended Budget Reductions</u>	<u>Recommended Funding Suspensions</u>	<u>Notes</u>
Project CTGC959008, Vehicle Maintenance				
Refueling Vehicle Parking	\$ *		\$ *	9.a
Support Facility/Site Improvement	*		(incl above)	9.a
Fuel Pumphouse System	*	\$ *		9.b
Rounded Amount	*			2
Total Requested	*		*	1
Project CTGC959019, Munitions Storage				
Munitions Storage (Igloo)	\$ *	\$ *		10.a
Small Arms Range	*	*		10.b
Range Storage Facility	*	*		10.c
Utilities	*	*		10.d
Pavements	*	(incl above)		10.d
Site Improvements	*	(incl above)		10.d
Rounded Amount	*		*	2
Total Requested	*		*	1
Totals for All Projects	\$8,610,000	\$3,288,000	\$797,000	1

Acronyms

MWR Morale, Welfare, and Recreation
 NEACP National Emergency Airborne Command Post
 TMO Traffic Management Office

*Source selection information deleted.

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

Note 1. The amounts on the appendix include the appropriate contingency and supervision, inspection, and overhead factors. Each DD Form 1391 included a 5-percent contingency factor for new construction and a 10-percent contingency factor for renovating existing buildings. The supervision, inspection, and overhead factors were 6 percent of estimated cost for all line items.

Note 2. Total project costs were rounded up or down. We netted those costs against the total recommended funding reductions.

Note 3. Project CTGC939001, Fencing and Main Gate, Estimated at * :

3.a. Fencing, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not validate requirements for 16,000 linear feet of fencing for the air reserve base, estimated at * per foot. Approximately 7,900 feet of fencing is required for the area. Based on the 1993 architect and engineering 95-percent design, adjusted for profit and inflation, the estimated cost is * per foot. The total estimated cost of the fencing, including contingency, supervision, inspection, and overhead, is * . The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by the overstated amount of * .

3.b. Main Gate and Gatehouse, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not revise DD Form 1391 to reflect the 95-percent design estimate for the main gate and gatehouse. The 1993 architect and engineering 95-percent design estimate, adjusted for inflation, is * . Although the exact location of the main gate was only recently approved, the cost estimate for the gate and gatehouse should remain valid. The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * .

3.c. Utilities, Pavements and Site Improvements, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not have current cost estimates for these items to establish a main entrance to the base. Thus, the estimates could not be validated. The original architect and engineering design was for a main entrance at a different location. The new main entrance area will have reduced parking. Also, a planned access road to surrounding facilities will not be required. The estimated * should be suspended until requirements at the new site are validated and related costs are estimated.

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed with the amounts recommended for reduction and suspension and concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget reductions and suspension and new validated cost estimates.

Note 4. Project CTGC939003, Alter Facilities for Base Support, Estimated at * :

4.a. Medical Clinic, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not revise the DD Form 1391 to reflect the change in location of the medical clinic. Current plans are to relocate the clinic in a different building at a later date.

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

The estimated * should be suspended until MILCON requirements at the new site are validated and documented and new cost estimates are determined. The Air Force should submit a new project request for the line item.

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed with the recommended suspension and concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget suspension and the new validated cost estimates.

4.b. Miscellaneous Group Support, Estimated at * . The line item is for modifications to building 670 to accommodate the Mission Support Group, Information Air Force, Chaplain's Office, and Social Services. The 100-percent design, November 1994, estimated the cost at * . Thus, the original cost estimate was overstated by * . The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * .

4.c. Communication Facility and Squadron Training, Estimated at * . Those line items were identified as modifications to building 427 to accommodate Communications, Avionics, and Data Processing. The 100-percent design, November 1994, estimated the cost at * . The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * .

4.d. Physical Fitness, Estimated at * . The item was identified as modification to the former Youth Center in building 563. The 100-percent design, November 1994, estimated the cost at * . The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * .

Air Force Comments. The Air Force did not provide specific comments on the amounts of the budget reductions discussed in Notes 4.b. through 4.d. but concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget reductions and new validated cost estimates.

4.e. Base Civil Engineer Shops, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not justify the requirement for BRAC funding for two of the three buildings included in the line item. The cost estimate is primarily for the modification of building 448 to accommodate the Air Reserve Base Civil Engineers. However, a portion relates to the renovation of two storage buildings, 213 and 214, to repair existing floor problems. The facilities were used for unheated covered storage before Grissom Air Force Base closed and, according to planning documents, the realignment requirement is for the same type of storage. Although the floors are subject to flooding when it rains, the possibility of damage to items stored on pallets is minimal. Air Force guidance clearly states that the correction of an existing deficiency does not qualify for BRAC funding. The floor problems are pre-existing conditions, and repairs are not BRAC-related. The cost of repairing the two storage facilities should be

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

eliminated from the pending contract solicitation, Grissom closure budget, and DD Form 1391. We validated a cost of * for modifying building 448. The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * (* minus *) to correct the overstatement.

Air Force Comments. The Air Force did not agree with the amount of the recommended reduction. The Air Force stated that building 213 was to be upgraded for use as a civil engineer material control and contractor operated supply store and building 214 was to be upgraded for use as a mobility material storage facility. The Air Force further stated that Base Civil Engineer functions need heated space. The Air Force concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget reduction and new validated cost estimates.

Audit Response. The documentation supporting the cost proposal was clear that buildings 213 and 214 "... are currently used as unheated storage space for base supply. They will remain as unheated storage space for Base Civil Engineering and the 434th Civil Engineering Squadron." Further, buildings 213 and 214 are metal sided pole barns and the cost to elevate the floors, build insulated interior walls and ceilings, install insulated sliding barn and access doors, and provide heating systems would be excessive. The Air Force did not provide any documentation to substantiate the requirement for heated storage space for the Base Civil Engineering and Civil Engineering Squadron functions.

4.f. TMO and Contracting/Sitework, Plus Access Road, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not effectively consider using existing facilities before submitting the BRAC funding request for relocating the Traffic Management and Contracting functions. The line item is for altering warehouse space in building 209 to provide office space for those functions. However, the alteration is unnecessary because the traffic management function can be relocated to suitable existing office space within building 209. Further, the contracting function can be relocated to suitable existing office space in building 669. Alterations to building 209 should be eliminated from the pending contract solicitation. We validated requirements for an access road estimated to cost * . The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * .

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed to eliminate one of the two offices and the restroom for the TMO function but stated that the contracting function will be relocated to building 209 and there will be no existing office space available for the remaining TMO office requirement. The Air Force concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget reduction and new validated cost estimates.

Audit Response. The Air Force did not provide documentation to justify the relocation of the contracting function to building 209. If the contracting function is relocated to building 669, it will make adequate office space available in building 209 to support the TMO function without new

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

construction. Building 669 has adequate space to accommodate the clinic and the contracting function. The contracting function is basically an office operation and needs to be located in an office building, not a warehouse. The Air Force can relocate the contracting function within building 669 at minimal cost when compared with constructing new offices in the warehouse-building 209. Further, the contracting function does not have to be located in a warehouse to improve efficiency and integrity of the supply process, as claimed by the Air Force. The Air Force can more efficiently use for heated storage the warehouse area planned for the contracting function if the Base Civil Engineering function needs the warehouse area. The Air Force should provide additional documentation and comments to support its position on this line item.

Note 5. Project CTGC939004, Add To and Alter Operational Facilities,
Estimated at * :

5.a. Add Flight Simulator Bay, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not review architect and engineering designs, validate requirements, or revise estimated costs before submitting DD Form 1391. The line item was for the construction of a new KC-135 simulator bay and support buildings behind and connected to building 668. The 100-percent design estimate indicates that * will be necessary to construct the new buildings. The design includes landscaping, estimated at * , behind the simulator building, which does not face onto a street. According to the design analysis, the landscaping is to shield the Wing headquarters, next door, from the view of the simulator bay. The landscaping is unnecessary and not related to the requirement to relocate the simulator. The Air Force should remove landscaping from the pending contract solicitation and reduce the design estimate to * . The Air Force should increase the cost estimate for this line item on the DD Form 1391 by * to reflect the current design estimate.

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed with the amount of the recommended increase and concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget increase.

5.b. Add Flight Simulator Support, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not provide adequate documentation to justify BRAC funding for flight simulator support. That line item was identified as a modification to the interior of the adjacent building (building 668). The documented requirement is to provide two simulator instructor offices and a classroom. However, adequate space already exists in the building for the two offices and classroom. The architect and engineering design and drawings also included extensive renovation to the map room and Intelligence area that do not relate to the requirement and appear to repair existing conditions. The use of the building before base closure, with the exception of three simulator support personnel, is the same as after realignment. The line item for renovation of building 668 should be eliminated from the pending contract solicitation, and the Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * .

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

Air Force Comments. The Air Force did not agree with the amount of the recommended reduction and stated that the funding should be reduced by only *. The Air Force contended that an estimated * was required to construct space for the instructor and the classroom that supports simulator training. The Air Force concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 based on new validated cost estimates.

Audit Response. The Air Force did not justify its position that the estimate should be reduced by only *. Instructor office and classroom space are to be located within the existing building and the cost for constructing a new wall and door should be minimal. The Air Force should provide justification for the * estimated cost for the new construction.

5.c. Alter Command Post, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not provide documentation to justify that the planned modifications to building 671 were required because of the realignment. The 100-percent design cost estimate for the renovation of the interior of building 671 is *. The design analysis states that the renovation is to provide space for scheduling, operations, alert crew facilities, and 434th Operations Group, as well as the command post. The Air Force provided a list of buildings remaining in the Grissom Air Reserve Base area that indicated that building 671 was used as a command post before the realignment. The additional activities, such as base operations, flight planning, and transient alert, are now scheduled to be in building 431 under project CTGC959006. MILCON planned for building 671 should be eliminated from the pending contract solicitation. The Grissom closure budget and cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * because the construction is not BRAC-related.

Air Force Comments. The Air Force did not agree with the amount of the recommended reduction because the reduction eliminated the estimated costs for all work to alter the command post. The Air Force stated that the command post was left totally unusable by the previous command and changes are required for the training area in the building. The Air Force agreed that cost savings should be realized under this line item. However, the exact amount will not be available until after final design. The Air Force concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget reduction.

Audit Response. The Air Force did not substantiate its position that the facility was left totally unusable by the former tenant. We reviewed the condition of the building and found that it was in use as a command post and had only minor wall damage. The damage was apparently caused by the former tenant's removal of equipment from the building. The repair costs should be paid from the Operation and Maintenance, Air Force, appropriation rather than the BRAC MILCON appropriation. The changes to the training area involve only minor drywall work that can be accomplished at minimal cost. The Air Force should provide additional documentation to substantiate the assertion that construction to alter the command post is BRAC-related.

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

5.d. Alter Weather and Base Operations, Estimated at * .
The estimate was for relocating the Weather and Base Operations functions. However, modifications to building 431 to accommodate Weather and Base Operations are being funded on project CTGC959006. The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * to eliminate the line item.

5.e. Modify Support Utilities, Estimated at * . The Air Force canceled the construction because it was not BRAC-related. The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * to eliminate the line item.

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed with the amount of the recommended reductions in Notes 5.d. and 5.e. and concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget reduction.

Note 6. Project CTGC939005, Isolate Utility Systems, Relocate Utilities, Demolish Buildings, and Site Preparation, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not revise the DD Form 1391 to reflect the current scope of work and cost. The cost is currently estimated at * . The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * .

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed with the amount of the recommended reduction and concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget reduction.

Note 7. Project CTGC939006, Alter Heating Plant, Estimated at * . The current estimate is * . The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * .

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed with the amount of the recommended reduction and concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget reduction.

Note 8. Project CTGC959006, Alter Maintenance Facilities, Estimated at * :

8.a. Alter Maintenance Shop, Estimated at * . The Air Force could not identify the construction to be done under this line item. The Grissom closure budget and cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * to eliminate the line item.

8.b. Alter Services/MWR, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not provide documentation to justify the requirement for MILCON. The MWR sports and recreation equipment rental function is to be located in building 330. Building 330 is next to the transient billeting quarters in an area away from the main air base. Based on a design by the Grissom civil engineers, the construction includes a new parking lot, fencing, and access road for recreational vehicles. The recreational vehicles, consisting of trailers, campers,

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

and boats, are currently in an unpaved, fenced area within the air base. Appropriated funds generally are not used for this type of low priority nonappropriated fund activity according to the Air Force General Counsel memorandum issued June 14, 1993. Further, such decisions must be coordinated with the offices of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management) on a case-by-case basis. Although the new location might be more convenient, it does not appear to be necessitated by the Grissom Air Reserve Base realignment. The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by *.

8.c. Alter Maintenance Squadron, Estimated at *. The Air Force could not identify the construction to be done under this line item. The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * to eliminate the line item.

8.d. Alter Security Police, Estimated at *. The current estimate is * to provide secure gun storage. The Grissom closure budget and cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by the * difference.

8.e. Alter NEACP Alert Facility, Estimated at *. The Air Force did not justify this alteration. Mission and personnel requirements were not documented. The 434th Refueling Wing Alert Crew is slated to occupy a small portion of the facility. Alteration costs related to that occupancy were estimated at *. That cost is questionable because the requirement for the alteration was neither validated nor documented. The Air Force stated that the alteration was required to provide a sectioned-off portion of the building for the alert crew, space for weather personnel, and interim classified storage. The stated requirement did not match the floor plan and the * cost estimate provided by the Grissom civil engineers. Further, the planned alteration appeared to double the size of three crew rooms and to provide new carpeting. Another questionable requirement was to connect the area to emergency power, for an estimated *. As a former alert facility, the building should already contain provisions for emergency power. Further, it was not clear exactly what the planned MILCON would provide. The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by *, and the * estimated for alterations should be suspended until the requirements and costs are validated and documented.

8.f. Alter Dining Facility, Estimated at *. The Air Force did not justify BRAC funding for a portion of the materials to renovate the dining hall in building 325. The building will also be used as a club, resulting in both an appropriated and a nonappropriated activity in the same building. Materials and bar fixtures for the club portion do not qualify for BRAC funding without specific approval of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Force Management). The material costs for the dining hall portion of this project are *. The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by the balance of *

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

8.g. Alter Pavement/Grounds, Estimated at * . The costs are currently estimated at * . The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by the * difference.

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed with the amounts of the recommended reductions and suspensions in Notes 8.a. through 8.g. and concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget reduction.

Note 9. Project CTGC959008, Vehicle Maintenance, Estimated at * . This project contains costs for the construction of a parking lot for refueling vehicles within the air reserve base, the modification of the fuel pumping system in the aircraft hangar area, and site improvements.

9.a. Refueling Vehicle Parking and Support Facility/Site Improvement, Estimated at * . The Air Force did not justify requirements for the refueling vehicle parking lot and support facility/site improvements. The Grissom Air Reserve Base civil engineers designed the parking for eight refueling vehicles, but only six refueling vehicles are authorized for the base. Further, the Grissom Air Reserve Base proposed to construct a 12-foot by 24-foot insulated brick veneer concrete block building with heat, lighting, water, and air conditioning. The Air Force indicated that the only building that may be needed with the vehicle parking is a small tool shed near the parking lot. The guardhouse directly across the road from the proposed site for the tool shed could be used to store any necessary tools. Costs were also estimated for repairing preexisting conditions in the petroleum storage loading and off-loading area. The entire * should be suspended until requirements are validated and documented based on the number of refueling vehicles authorized. Any revised DD Form 1391 should not contain costs for a new tool shed or for the repair of any preexisting condition.

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed with deleting the repair of the petroleum storage loading and off-loading area and the 12-foot by 24-foot building but did not agree with the recommendation to reduce the refueler parking area. The Air Force concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect justified requirements and revised cost estimates.

Audit Response. The Air Force did not substantiate its position on the requirements for the eight refueling vehicles and should submit additional documentation to support vehicle and parking requirements and related cost estimates.

9.b. Fuel Pumphouse System, Estimated at * . The Grissom Air Reserve Base cost estimate for modifying the fuel pumping system is * . Accordingly, the Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * .

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed with the amount of the recommended reduction and concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget reduction.

Note 10. Project CTGC959019, Munitions Storage, Estimated at * . The project is for MILCON related to a new munitions storage facility, small arms range, and range storage/facility within Grissom Air Reserve Base. Existing facilities are located outside the perimeter of the Grissom Air Reserve Base.

10.a. Munitions Storage (Igloo), estimated at * . The cost estimate was not adequately documented. The Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence provided a cost estimate of * for a munitions igloo similar to that included in the DD Form 1391. The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by *

10.b. Small Arms Range, Estimated at * . The cost estimate was not adequately documented. The Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence provided a cost estimate of * , based on the cost of a similar range under construction at Homestead Air Force Base. The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by *

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed with the amount of the recommended reductions in Notes 10.a. and 10.b. and concurred with the recommendation to prepare a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the budget reduction.

10.c. Range Storage Facility, Estimated at * . The line item estimate is for the construction of a new range storage facility. The Grissom Air Reserve Base did not consider an existing facility located in the vicinity of the range that can be used for storage with only minor modifications. The Grissom closure budget and cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by *

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed that the existing building could be used for receiving and administrative functions but did not agree that the existing building could support storage and classroom space requirements without modification. The Air Force estimated the modification at *

Audit Response. The Air Force did not justify the modification and did not document the * cost estimate. The Air Force did not include any justification or estimated costs in the FY 1995 DD Form 1391 for the classroom that it now contends is required. The Air Force should reevaluate the existing facility for suitability and provide documentation to demonstrate that the facility cannot satisfy the requirements. The Air Force should also provide documentation that supports the need for new or modified facilities and the associated cost estimates.

Appendix C. Recommended Budget Reductions and Suspensions

10.d. Utilities, Pavements, and Site Improvements, Estimated at
* . The DD Form 1391 cost estimate submitted by the Air Force contained excessive requirements. Examples are 3,700 feet of concrete curbing for the road to the munitions storage building, * ; roadway edge drains, manholes, and catchbasins, * ; roadway and parking lighting, * ; and a 200,000-gallon-per-day sewer lift station to service the igloo and firing range, * . The roadway to the munitions storage area is not a primary road. Because it will have minimal traffic, the roadway has no need for lights, curb, gutters, or storm sewer. Further, the sewer lift station is not required, because neither the range or the igloo has toilet facilities. The cost estimate was reduced to * during the audit. The Grissom closure budget and the cost estimate on the DD Form 1391 should be reduced by * (the balance of the line item estimate, allowing * for valid requirement costs).

Air Force Comments. The Air Force agreed with the amount of the recommended reduction and concurred with the recommendation to provide a revised DD Form 1391 to reflect the reduction.

Appendix D. Background of Defense Base Realignments and Closures and Scope of the Audit of FY 1996 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 DoD 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. The following table summarizes the current estimated costs and net savings for the previous three BRAC actions and the actions recommended in the 1995 Commission decisions:

BRAC Costs and Savings
(Billions of FY 1996 Dollars)

	<u>BRAC Actions</u>		<u>Closure Costs</u>	<u>6-Year Net Savings</u>	<u>Recurring Annual Savings</u>	<u>Total Savings</u>
	<u>Realignments</u>	<u>Closures</u>				
1988	86	59	\$ 2.2	\$0.3	\$0.7	\$ 6.8
1991	34	48	4.0	2.4	1.6	15.8
1993	130	45	6.9	.4	1.9	15.7
Subtotal	250	152	13.1	3.1	4.2	38.3
1995	113	33	3.8	4.0	1.8	18.4
Total	363	185	\$16.9	\$7.1	\$6.0	\$56.7

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.

Appendix D. Background of Defense Base Realignments and Closures and Scope of the Audit of FY 1996 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Costs

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 (COBRA). COBRA 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 1996 Military Construction Project Data," for each individual MILCON project required to accomplish the realigning actions. COBRA 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 COBRA 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 1996 BRAC MILCON \$1.4 billion 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.

Appendix E. Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting From Audit

Recommendation Reference	Description of Benefit	Amount or Type of Benefit
1.a.(1)	Economy and Efficiency. Reduces funding for BRAC MILCON project based on current design estimates.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.
1.a.(2)	Economy and Efficiency. Reduces funding for BRAC MILCON project based on current design estimates and unjustified requirements.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.
1.a.(3)	Economy and Efficiency. Reduces funding for BRAC MILCON projects based on current design estimates and unjustified requirements.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.
1.a.(4)	Economy and Efficiency. Reduces funding for BRAC MILCON projects based on revised requirements and costs.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.
1.a.(5)	Economy and Efficiency. Reduces funding for BRAC MILCON projects based on revised requirements and costs.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.
1.a.(6)	Economy and Efficiency. Reduces funding for BRAC MILCON projects based on unjustified requirements.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.
1.a.(7)	Economy and Efficiency. Reduces funding for BRAC MILCON projects based on unjustified requirements.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.

Appendix E. Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting From Audit

Recommendation Reference	Description of Benefit	Amount or Type of Benefit
1.a.(8)	Economy and Efficiency. Reduces funding for BRAC MILCON projects based on unjustified requirements.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.
1.b.(1)	Economy and Efficiency. Suspends funding for BRAC MILCON projects until requirements and cost estimates are adequately supported.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.*
1.b.(2)	Economy and Efficiency. Suspends funding for BRAC MILCON projects until requirements and cost estimates are adequately supported.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.*
1.b.(3)	Economy and Efficiency. Suspends funding for BRAC MILCON projects until requirements and cost estimates are adequately supported.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.*
1.b.(4)	Economy and Efficiency. Suspends funding for BRAC MILCON projects until requirements and cost estimates are adequately supported.	* of funds put to better use in the Air Force FY 1995 Base Closure Account.*
2.	Compliance. Results in properly developed and documented project requirements and cost estimates.	Nonmonetary.

* Subject to change based on the submission of documented justification.

Appendix F. Organizations Visited or Contacted

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Washington, DC

Department of the Army

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Louisville District, KY

Department of the Air Force

Secretary of the Air Force, Washington, DC

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

Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, Installations, and
Environment), Washington, DC

Office of the Chief of Staff (Base Realignment and Transition), Washington, DC

Air Force Center for Environmental Excellence, Brooks Air Force Base, TX

Headquarters, Air Force Reserve, Robins Air Force Base, GA

434th Air Refueling Wing, Grissom Air Reserve Base, IN

Appendix G. Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)
 Deputy Chief Financial Officer
 Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)
Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Economic Security)
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Reserve Affairs)
Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations)
Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange

Department of the Army

Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Army
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Louisville District

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)
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, Installations, and Environment)
 Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Installations)
Deputy Chief of Staff Plans and Operations
Special Assistant to the Chief of Staff for Base Realignment and Transition
Chief, Air Force Reserve
 Vice Commander, Air Force Reserve
 Commander, 434th Air Refueling Wing
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force

Appendix G. Report Distribution

Defense Organizations

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

Honorable Dan Coats, U.S. Senate
Honorable Richard G. Lugar, U.S. Senate
Honorable Stephen F. Buyer, U.S. House of Representatives

Part III - Management Comments

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Comments



COMPTROLLER
(Program/Budget)

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



June 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AUDITING, DOD IG

SUBJECT: Draft Audit Report on Defense Base Realignment and
Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of Grissom
Air Reserve Base, Indiana (Project No. 5CG-5017.08)

This responds to your May 24, 1995, memorandum requesting
our comments on the subject report.

The audit recommends that the USD (Comptroller) reduce
\$4.1 million for eight projects at Grissom Air Reserve Base
since these projects were not valid BRAC requirements.

The funding for these projects is included in the FY 1996
BRAC budget request. We generally agree with the audit and
recommendations and will place funds associated with these
projects on administrative withhold if these issues are not
resolved by the start of the fiscal year. Further, any savings
resulting from the audit will be reprogrammed to other valid
BRAC requirements as appropriate.


B. R. Faseur

Director for Construction



Department of the Air Force Comments



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

28 JUN 1995



MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AUDITING
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

FROM: HQ USAF/RT
1670 Air Force Pentagon
Washington DC 20330-1670

SUBJECT: Draft Audit Report, Realignment of Grissom Air Reserve Base, Indiana (Project No. 5CG-5017.08)

1. This is in reply to your Memorandum to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller) requesting Air Force comments on the report.
2. The first DoD (IG) recommendation is to reduce the budget for the Grissom Air Reserve Base realignment by \$3.3 million for BRAC MILCON that is not required and suspend \$800,000 from estimated funding until the Air Force Reserve sufficiently justifies and documents requirements and costs estimates.

a. Adjust the funding in the Air Force FY 1995 realignment and closure budget for Grissom Air Force Base as follows:

- (1) Reduce funds for project CTGC939001, "Base Boundary Fence/Main Gate," by *
- (2) Reduce funds for project CTGC939003, "Alter Facilities for Base Support," by *
- (3) Reduce funds for project CTGC939004, "Add to and Alter Operational Facilities," by *
- (4) Reduce funds for project CTGC939005, "Isolate Utilities," by *
- (5) Reduce funds for project CTGC939006, "Alter Heating Plant," by *
- (6) Reduce funds for project CTGC959006, "Alter Maintenance Facilities," by *
- (7) Reduce funds for project CTGC959008, "Vehicle Maintenance," by *
- (8) Reduce funds for project CTGC959019, "Munitions Storage," by *

Department of the Air Force Comments

b. Suspend the funding in the Air Force FY 1995 base realignment and closure budget for Grissom Air Force Base for the following:

(1) Project CTGC939001, "Base Boundary Fence/Main Gate," by * until the Air Force Reserve provides validated cost estimates for the new location.

(2) Project CTGC939003, "Alter Facilities for Base Support," by * until the Air Force Reserve provides validated cost estimates for the new location.

(3) Project CTGC959006, "Alter Maintenance Facilities," by * until the Air Force Reserve provides adequate documentation to support requirements and cost estimates.

(4) Project CTGC959008, "Vehicle Maintenance," by * until Air Force Reserve provides documentation justifying the number of refueling vehicle parking spaces required and prepares a revised DD Form 1391 eliminating non-BRAC items.

AIR FORCE COMMENTS: PARTIALLY CONCUR.

A general reduction in funding requirements for the Grissom Realignment Program was acknowledged by Air Staff and the Major Air Command when the confinement area was relocated and the newer A-10 facilities designated for alteration. The command was requested to complete final project design prior to revising the DD Form 1391's and indicating the new programmed amounts (reflecting current working estimates). Designs should be complete on all but two projects by 15 August 95. The two remaining projects (boundary fence/main gate and munitions storage) will not be design complete until 1 October 95 based on revised requirements from the local Grissom Redevelopment Authority (GRA).

We FULLY CONCUR in reducing the funding for the following projects:

Base Boundary Fence/Main Gate
Isolate Utilities
Alter Heating Plant
Alter Maintenance Facilities

We PARTIALLY CONCUR in the following three projects:

a. Add/Alter Operational Facilities. Concur with additional funding for the simulator bay (IG proposed * increase). Landscaping should be restricted to that which is compatible with surrounding area and only for the addition. The modification in the support facility should be restricted to that essential to accommodate the instructor and classroom which supports simulator training. Design guidance has been issued to delete all other work requested by the building user. Expect savings of *. Nonconcur with deleting all work in the Command Post at *. This facility was left totally unusable by SAC active duty. New equipment has been temporarily installed; however, changes are required for a training area and access control. Savings should be

realized; however, exact amount will not be available until after final design. Concur with the remaining deletions.

b. Vehicle Maintenance. Concur with deleting repair of the petroleum storage loading/off loading area and the 12 foot X 24 foot building from this project. Nonconcur in reducing the refueler parking area below eight spaces. This is the number of vehicles as shown on the Command Vehicle Authorization List (VAL) dated 12 May 1995.

c. Munitions Storage. This project was driven by a request from the Grissom Redevelopment Authority (GRA) for the existing munitions storage area which lies along US Highway 31 on the SE side of the base. The minimum-essential facilities are: munitions storage, two small buildings for Class I, Class III, and IV storage; a small arms range with training room, maintenance facility and receiving control facility. Concur with deleting the curb/gutter and street lighting from the project. The munitions igloo and multi-cube storage are the minimum standard size for Air Force facilities. The range design is to be based on the latest Air Force criteria to include bullet catch and other features to make it environmentally compatible. The estimate of * for the range storage facility is excessive and should be reduced. A small storage room and classroom as part of the range is needed for adequate training. We do not concur that the existing facility located in the vicinity (dog kennel) could meet these requirements and the entire * deleted. The kennel facility is proposed to be used for range receiving (computer room) and administrative facility with small renovation cost of approximately *. Reduction of the remaining items are valid and accepted.

We DO NOT CONCUR in the full reduction of "Alter Facilities for Base Support" (*). Base Civil Engineer Shops had project estimate of * with proposed IG reduction of *. Nonconcur with this reduction. Bldgs 213 and 214 were used by Base Supply prior to BRAC for outside covered storage. Bldg 448 (17,000 SF) was determined to be the most economic fit for the Base Engineer function to accommodate the administrative area and key shops. However, this building is 10,000 short of the total requirement of Base Civil Engineer. These functions require heated space. The proposal was to upgrade Bldg 213 for Civil Engineer Material Control and Contractor Operated Supply Store (COCESS) and upgrade Bldg 214 for mobility material (vice bldg 21). The additional justification for upgrading Bldgs 213 and 214 was that completing two other buildings which had been started but were not completed due to contractor default would cost \$1.7 million and still be on the fringe of the proposed cantonment. No other facilities in the cantonment area could meet the Base Engineer Requirements. The * cost is justified as the most economic solution for Base Engineer material storage. Bldg 21 is currently by Base Supply to store additional mobility material but is outside the cantonment area. To adequately protect this material, the building 214 must have a floor and drainage protection. To improve efficiency and integrity of Supply processes, the TMO, Contracting and Mobility weapons storage were consolidated into Bldg 209 (vice bldg 22 outside the cantonment area). The TMO function is primarily a warehouse (packing and crating) type function. We concur with removing the restroom and second office for this function. The IG recommendation was to relocate Contracting into suitable space in Bldg 669. At the time this program was developed, Bldg 669 was identified for clinic and support group personnel. Subsequent to the design start, mission changes made other facilities more cost effective for a clinic (Bldg 596). However, as design progressed to 100%, an effort to consolidate the support group customer-oriented function into one area required space identified for clinic functions in Bldg

Department of the Air Force Comments


596. As a result, space for the clinic was reassigned to Bldg 669. Contracting should remain in Bldg 209 and the * left in this project.

3. The second DoD (IG) recommendation is to prepare revised DD Forms 1391 for projects.

- a. CTGC939001, Base Boundary Fence/Main Gate.
- b. CTGC939003, Alter Facilities for Base Support
- c. CTGC939004, Add to and Alter Operational Facilities.
- d. CTGC939005, Isolate Utilities.
- e. CTGC939006, Alter Heating Plant.
- f. CTGC959006, Alter Maintenance Facilities.
- g. CTGC959008, Vehicle Maintenance.
- h. CTGC959019, Munitions Storage.

AIR FORCE COMMENTS: CONCUR. Revised DD Forms 1391 will be prepared upon completion of project design. Estimated completion date is 15 October 95.

4. Our point of contact for this report is Mr. Lester R. Schauer, HQ USAF/CEC, DSN 227-6559.


JAY D. BLUME JR, Major General, USAF
Special Assistant to the Chief of Staff
for Realignment and Transition

Audit Team Members

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

Paul J. Granetto
Joseph P. Doyle
Charles M. Hanshaw
Michael J. Tully
Joyce S. McCutcheon
Sanford J. Stone
Robin A. Hysmith

INTERNET DOCUMENT INFORMATION FORM

A . Report Title: Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Realignment of Grissom Air Reserve Base, Indiana

B. DATE Report Downloaded From the Internet: 01/05/99

C. Report's Point of Contact: (Name, Organization, Address, Office Symbol, & Ph #):
OAIG-AUD (ATTN: AFTS Audit Suggestions)
Inspector General, Department of Defense
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, VA 22202-2884

D. Currently Applicable Classification Level: Unclassified

E. Distribution Statement A: Approved for Public Release

F. The foregoing information was compiled and provided by:
DTIC-OCA, Initials: __VM__ Preparation Date 01/05/99

The foregoing information should exactly correspond to the Title, Report Number, and the Date on the accompanying report document. If there are mismatches, or other questions, contact the above OCA Representative for resolution.