Audit Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

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

Report No. 95-276 July 7, 1995

20000107 089

Department of Defense

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for Public Release
Distribution Unlimited

AQI00-04-0886

Additional Copies

Copies of the report can be obtained from the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate, (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, (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
GSE	Ground Support Equipment
MILCON	Military Construction
NAS	Naval Air Station

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

July 7 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE (COMPTROLLER)
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)

SUBJECT: Audit of 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 (Report No. 95-276)

We are providing this report for review and comment. This report is one in a series of reports about FY 1996 Defense base realignment and closure military construction costs. The report provides the audit results of the review of two base realignment and closure projects. We considered comments on a draft of this report from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) in preparing the final report.

DoD Directive 7650.3 requires that all recommendations and potential monetary benefits be resolved promptly. Because the Navy did not comment on the draft of this report, we request that the Navy provide comments on the final report by September 7, 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 Ms. Judith I. Padgett, Audit Project Manager, at (703) 604-9423 (DSN 664-9423). 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

Office of the Inspector General, DoD

Report No. 95-276 **July 7, 1995**
(Project No. 5CG-5017.09)

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

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 Defense base realignment and closure military construction budget data. This report provides the results of the audit of two projects, valued at $5.9 million, for the closure of Naval Air Station Barbers Point, Hawaii, and realignment to Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, Washington. This audit also assessed the adequacy of the management control program as it applied to the audit objective.

Audit Results. The Navy overestimated requirements for two construction projects at Naval Air Station Whidbey Island to support a tentative realignment of six P-3 aircraft squadrons resulting from the closure of Naval Air Station Barbers Point.

o The Navy overestimated space requirements for constructing a ground support equipment shop. As a result, project P-600T was overstated by between $1.3 million and $1.8 million, depending on the number of squadrons realigned (Finding A).

o The Navy overestimated space requirements for constructing a sonobuoy storage facility. As a result, project P-615T was overstated by $0.8 million (Finding B).

The results of the review of the management control program will be discussed in a summary report on Defense base realignment and closure military construction budget data. See Appendix E for a summary of potential benefits of the audit.

Summary of Recommendations. We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) reduce construction funding for the two projects and reprogram the funds to other supported and unfunded Defense base realignment and closure military construction projects. In addition, we recommend that the Navy suspend action on the ground support equipment shop. We also recommend that the Navy revise and resubmit construction estimates for the ground support equipment shop and the sonobuoy storage facilities.

Management Comments. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) concurred with the findings and recommendations, but considered it premature to take action at this time. If the issue is not resolved by the start of FY 1996, the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) will place funds associated with the projects on administrative withhold. A summary of management comments is in Part I, and the complete text of management comments is in Part III of the report. The Navy did not comment on a draft of this report. Therefore, we request the Navy to provide comments by September 7, 1995.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary i

Part I - Audit Results

Audit Background 2
Audit Objectives 2
Finding A. Ground Support Equipment Shop 3
Finding B. Sonobuoy Storage Facility 7

Part II - Additional Information

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology 12
Appendix B. Summary of Prior Audits and Other Reviews 13
Appendix C. Background of Defense Base Realignment and Closures and Scope of the Audit of FY 1996 Defense Base Realignment and Closure Military Construction Costs 19
Appendix D. Comparison of Ground Support Equipment Space Requirements by Facility Type and Number of P-3 Squadrons 21
Appendix E. Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting From Audit 22
Appendix F. Organizations Visited or Contacted 23
Appendix G. Report Distribution 24

Part III - Management Comments

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Comments 28

Part I - 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 C.

Audit Objectives

The overall audit objective was to determine the accuracy of BRAC MILCON budget data. The specific objectives were to determine whether the proposed 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 Naval Air Station (NAS) Whidbey Island management control program as it applied to the overall audit objective.

This report provides the results of the audit of two BRAC MILCON projects, valued at $5.9 million, resulting from the closure of NAS Barbers Point, Hawaii, and realignment to NAS Whidbey Island, Washington. See Appendix A for a discussion of the scope and methodology and Appendix B for a summary of prior coverage relevant 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 at NAS Whidbey Island.

Finding A. Ground Support Equipment Shop

NAS Whidbey Island overestimated space requirements for project P-600T, valued at $3.7 million. NAS Whidbey Island overestimated space requirements because management misinterpreted Navy guidance for computing the size of a ground support equipment (GSE) shop and did not consider the alternative of expanding existing facilities when planning project P-600T. As a result, NAS Whidbey Island overstated project P-600T by between $1.3 million and $1.8 million, depending on the number of squadrons realigned.

Requirements Depend on the Number of Squadrons Realigned

Proposed Project for Six Realigned Squadrons. NAS Whidbey Island planned construction for a GSE shop to support a tentative realignment of six P-3 aircraft squadrons to NAS Whidbey Island. On April 15, 1994, NAS Whidbey Island submitted a DD Form 1391, "FY 1996 Military Construction Project Data," for an 18,030-square-foot GSE shop, project P-600T, valued at $3.7 million. However, the Navy may realign only four P-3 aircraft squadrons to NAS Whidbey Island, thus significantly reducing the space requirements for a GSE shop.

Pending Decision for Four or Six Realigned Squadrons. The Navy is considering alternative realignment plans that may impact space requirements. The types and numbers of aircraft that the maintenance division supports are factors that determine the size of a GSE shop. An August 5, 1994, memorandum from the Department of the Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, to the Director of Facilities and Engineering Division states that:

> The future basing of PACFLT [Pacific Fleet] MPA [Maritime Patrol Aircraft] squadrons remains an issue affecting the implementation of BRAC 93. The final closure plan for NAS Barber's [sic] Point is dependent on a relocation decision for PACFLT MPA squadrons to other naval air stations [and]. . . outlines two possible scenarios (single site or dual site) for basing MPA squadrons at NAS Whidbey Island and MCAS [Marine Corp Air Station] Kaneohe Bay [Hawaii]. The current preferred scenario is single siting all PACFLT MPA squadrons at NAS Whidbey. . . . However, the dual siting scenario at NAS Whidbey and MCAS Kaneohe remains a possibility. At this time, depending on which scenario is chosen, we know that between four and six MPA squadrons will relocate to NAS Whidbey. The final number of squadrons will be determined by SECNAV [Secretary of the Navy] at a later date.

As of March 30, 1995, the Secretary of the Navy had not determined whether the Navy would realign four or six P-3 aircraft squadrons to NAS Whidbey Island.

Navy Planning Standards

Whether the Navy realigns four or six P-3 aircraft squadrons, NAS Whidbey Island overestimated the project size approved in the Navy budget compared with the Navy sizing standards, documented in "Naval Aviation Maintenance Facilities Work Center Sizing, Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Avionics and Ground Support Equipment Divisions and Maintenance Hangars," May 1983. Applying Navy standards, NAS Whidbey Island could reduce the space requirements by 10,033 square feet if six P-3 aircraft squadrons realign to NAS Whidbey Island and by 14,116 square feet if four aircraft squadrons realign to NAS Whidbey Island. See Appendix D for computations of the GSE space requirements.

Existing Facilities at NAS Whidbey Island

When planning project P-600T, NAS Whidbey Island did not consider the alternative of expanding the existing facilities instead of constructing new facilities.

Economic Analysis Criteria for Alternatives. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) issued a memorandum on August 2, 1991, that requires the Military Departments to prepare an economic analysis for all military construction, major repairs, or renovation projects estimated to cost more than $2 million. In addition, Naval Facilities Engineering Command Instruction 11010.44E, "Shore Facilities Planning Manual," December 15, 1987, requires an economic analysis with the preliminary construction project documentation when alternatives exist. NAS Whidbey Island did not prepare such an economic analysis.

Existing GSE Shop. The existing GSE shop consists of a maintenance area (9,706 square feet) and a storage shed area (13,048 square feet). The ground support division performs equipment inspections, repairs, and administrative functions in the maintenance area and houses equipment that is not in use or undergoing inspections and repairs in the storage shed area.

Although no major barriers appear to preclude expanding the existing facility, NAS Whidbey Island did not conduct an economic analysis to determine whether expansion would be more cost-effective than new construction.

Ground Support Planning Criteria

NAS Whidbey Island overestimated space requirements for the GSE shop because management misinterpreted Navy criteria for computing the size of a

GSE shop. NAS Whidbey Island calculated new construction requirements for the maintenance area using the allowable standards and adding 7,518 square feet for functions such as painting and sand blasting. Because such functions are part of standard maintenance areas, the additional square footage resulted in double counting of that space. In addition, NAS Whidbey Island did not use the allowable standard for the storage shed area and overestimated that space by 2,515 square feet.

Adjustments to Project Estimates

As a result of misinterpreting the GSE shop planning criteria, NAS Whidbey Island overstated project P-600T on the DD Form 1391 by between 10,033 square feet, valued at $1.3 million, and 14,116 square feet, valued at $1.8 million, depending on the number of squadrons realigned. The Navy could put to better use at least $1.3 million on other BRAC MILCON projects by adjusting project P-600T space requirements.

Recommendations, Management Comments, and Audit Response

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

a. Suspend all funding for the ground support equipment shop until the Secretary of the Navy determines the number of P-3 aircraft squadrons that will be realigned to Naval Air Station Whidbey Island.

b. Reduce and reprogram the funding allocated for project P-600T, "Ground Support Equipment Shop," by $1.3 million or $1.8 million, depending on the number of squadrons realigned, to other supported and unfunded Defense base realignment and closure military construction projects.

Management Comments. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) concurred with our recommendations, but stated that it was premature to take action at this time because the funding for the five projects is included in the FY 1996 base realignment and closure budget request. Therefore, if the issue is not resolved by the start of FY 1996, the funds associated with the projects will be administratively withheld pending resolution of the issues. The complete text of the comments of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is in Part III.

A.2. We recommend that the Commander, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island:

a. Suspend action on project P-600T, "Ground Support Equipment Shop," until the Secretary of the Navy determines the number of P-3 aircraft squadrons that will be realigned to Naval Air Station Whidbey Island.

b. Complete an economic analysis that considers expansion of the existing ground support equipment facilities as an alternative. The economic analysis data should be consistent with "Naval Aviation Maintenance Facilities Work Center Sizing, Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department Avionics and Ground Support Equipment Divisions and Maintenance Hangars," May 1983, and the Secretary of the Navy decision regarding realignment of the P-3 aircraft squadrons.

c. Revise and resubmit the DD Form 1391, "FY 1996 Military Construction Project Data," for project P-600T, "Ground Support Equipment Shop," to accurately represent requirements for the project.

Management Comments and Audit Response. The Navy did not respond to a draft of this report. Therefore, we request the Navy provide comments to the final report by September 7, 1995.

Finding B. Sonobuoy Storage Facility

NAS Whidbey Island overestimated space requirements for a sonobuoy (a sound receiving and transmitting device treated as ordnance for planning and storage purposes) storage facility, project P-615T, to support tentative realignment of six P-3 aircraft squadrons to NAS Whidbey Island. NAS Whidbey Island overestimated space requirements because management used outdated ordnance prepositioning and training requirements when planning project P-615T. As a result, NAS Whidbey Island overstated project P-615T by $0.8 million.

Sonobuoy Storage Facility Requirements Depend on Ordnance Levels

Proposed Project for Ordnance Level. NAS Whidbey Island planned construction for a sonobuoy storage facility to support storing 65,804 sonobuoys. On May 12, 1994, NAS Whidbey Island submitted a DD Form 1391 for a 20,000-square-foot sonobuoy storage facility, project P-615T, valued at $2.2 million.

Pending Decision for Four or Six Realigned Squadrons. The Navy decision to realign four or six P-3 squadrons to NAS Whidbey Island does not significantly impact the space requirements for the sonobuoy storage facility. The factors influencing size for sonobuoy storage facilities are more closely associated with prepositioning and training requirements for sonobuoys.

Navy Planning Standards for Sonobuoy Storage Facilities

The Navy has not developed specific formal standards for determining sonobuoy storage space requirements. Project P-615T, "Sonobuoy Storage Facility," will provide facilities for receiving, maintaining, storing, and issuing sonobuoys. Sufficient space is needed to store sonobuoys for P-3 training exercises and prepositioned ordnance. NAS Whidbey Island based the sonobuoy storage facility size on the following relevant sonobuoy storage factors:

- the number of sonobuoys to be stored as prepositioned ordnance,
- the number of sonobuoys required for operational training exercises,
- the time required to resupply sonobuoys from supply points,
- the physical characteristics of a fully loaded pallet of sonobuoys, and
- an adjustment factor to convert net space to gross space.

Changes in Sonobuoy Storage Requirements

NAS Whidbey Island overestimated space requirements because the estimates for prepositioned ordnance decreased from the initial planning estimates. In addition, the documented average time to resupply sonobuoys that P-3 squadrons expended during operational training was less than the resupply time used in the initial planning estimates.

Facility Storage Space Impacted by Preposition Ordnance Requirements. Management based the initial planning estimate on storing 61,804 sonobuoys to satisfy prepositioned ordnance requirements. On January 12, 1995, the Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, issued a memorandum, "Ordnance Positioning Plan," that presented a draft positioning plan. That plan reduced the prepositioned ordnance requirements to 10,535 sonobuoys. As a result, the space attributable to preposition ordnance material should be reduced.

Facility Storage Space Impacted by Resupply Time. The number of sonobuoys needed for operational training and the time required to resupply sonobuoys from the supply depots are factors that determined sonobuoy storage space requirements. NAS Whidbey Island estimated resupply time for operational training sonobuoys to be 120 days. However, records indicated the resupply time to be 26 days. DoD officials with supply responsibilities stated that resupply sonobuoys could be delivered to users within 23 days. As a result, the space attributable to sonobuoys for operational training should be reduced.

To meet P-3 squadron requirements, NAS Whidbey Island will need to store fewer sonobuoys than initially planned. NAS Whidbey Island overestimated the sonobuoy storage requirements by 16,410 square feet. The following table shows the computation of the sonobuoy storage space using prepositioned and operational training requirements.

Sonobuoy Prepositioned and Operational Training Requirements

	Operational Requirements (number of sonobuoys to be stored)			Space Requirements (square feet)
Estimate	Prepositioned Ordnance	Training	Total	
Initial	61,804	4,000	65,804	20,000
Audit	10,535	2,289*	12,824	3,590
Amount of Overestimate	**51,269**	**1,711**	**52,980**	**16,410**

*The computation is based on a P-3 aircraft squadron using 9,155 sonobuoys a year and 30 days to obtain replacement sonobuoys from the supply system.

Adjustments to Sonobuoy Storage Facility Estimates

As a result of overestimating the sonobuoy storage facility requirements, NAS Whidbey Island overstated the scope of project P-615T in the DD Form 1391 by 16,410 square feet, valued at $0.8 million. The Navy could put $0.8 million to better use on other BRAC MILCON projects by adjusting the scope of project P-615T.

Recommendations for Corrective Action

B.1. We recommend that the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) reduce the funding allocated for project P-615T, "Sonobuoy Storage Facility," by $0.8 million and reprogram the $0.8 million to other supported and unfunded Defense base realignment and closure military construction projects.

Management Comments. The Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) concurred with our recommendations, but stated that it was premature to take action at this time because the funding for the five projects is included in the FY 1996 base realignment and closure budget request. Therefore, if the issue is not resolved by the start of FY 1996, the funds associated with the projects will be administratively withheld pending resolution of the issues. The complete text of the comments of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) is in Part III.

B.2. We recommend that the Commander, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, revise and resubmit the DD Form 1391, "FY 1996 Military Construction Project Data," for project P-615T, "Sonobuoy Storage Facility." The revised data should be consistent with the Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, Ordnance Positioning Plan and the resupply time identified in this report.

Management Comments and Audit Response. The Navy did not respond to a draft of this report. Therefore, we request the Navy provide comments to the final report by September 7, 1995.

This page was left out of orignial document

Part II - Additional Information

Appendix A. Scope and Methodology

Scope of This Audit. We examined the FY 1996 BRAC MILCON budget request and associated documentation for two realignment projects regarding the closure of NAS Barbers Point and the realignment to NAS Whidbey Island. Details of those two projects, estimated to cost a total of $5.9 million, are in the following table.

FY 1996 BRAC MILCON Projects for Realignment to NAS Whidbey Island

Project Number	Project Title	Estimated Cost
P-600T	Ground Support Equipment Shop	$3,660,000
P-615T	Sonobuoy Storage Facility	2,200,000
Total		**$5,860,000**

Audit Period, Standards, Potential Benefits, and Locations. This economy and efficiency audit was made from December 1994 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 and Navy BRAC reports.

Inspector General, DoD

Report No.	Report Title	Date
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 23, 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

Inspector General, DoD (cont'd)

Report No.	Report Title	Date
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
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 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

Inspector General, DoD (cont'd)

Report No.	Report Title	Date
95-196	Defense Base Realignment and Closure Budget Data for the Closure of Naval Air Station Alameda, California, and Realignment to Puget Sound Naval Air 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
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 at 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, and 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

Inspector General, DoD (cont'd)

Report No.	Report Title	Date
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
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

Inspector General, DoD (cont'd)

Report No.	Report Title	Date
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
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

Naval Audit Service

Report No.	Report Title	Date
041-S-94	FY 1995 Military Construction Projects From Decisions of 1993 Base Closure and Realignment Commission	April 15, 1994
023-S-94	Military Construction Projects Budgeted and Programmed for Bases Identified for Closure or Realignment	January 14, 1994
028-C-93	Implementation of the 1993 Base Closure and Realignment Process	March 15, 1993

Appendix C. Background of Defense Base Realignment 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)

	BRAC Actions		Closure	6-Year Net	Recurring Annual	Total
	Realignments	Closures	Costs	Savings	Savings	Savings
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.

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 D. Comparison of Ground Support Equipment Space Requirements by Facility Type and Number of P-3 Squadrons

Table D-1. Six P-3 Squadrons Relocating to NAS Whidbey Island

	Space Requirements (gross square feet)				
Facility	Before[1] BRAC	After[2] BRAC	Increase Because[3] of BRAC	Per DD Form 1391	Over-[4] Estimated
Maintenance	12,148	16,320	4,172	11,690	7,518
Storage	16,678	20,503	3,825	6,340	2,515
Total	**28,826**	**36,823**	**7,997**	**18,030**	**10,033**

Table D-2. Four P-3 Squadrons Relocating to NAS Whidbey Island

	Space Requirements (gross square feet)				
Facility	Before BRAC	After[5] BRAC	Increase Because of BRAC	Per DD Form 1391	Over-Estimated
Maintenance	12,148	14,172	2,024	11,690	9,666
Storage	16,678	18,568	1,890	6,340	4,450
Total	**28,826**	**32,740**	**3,914**	**18,030**	**14,116**

[1]NAS Whidbey Island has a total of 81 aircraft.

[2]NAS Whidbey Island will have 141 aircraft.

[3]The amount was computed by subtracting the space requirement after BRAC from the space requirement before BRAC.

[4]The amount was computed by subtracting the space requirement listed on DD Form 1391 from the increase because of BRAC.

[5]NAS Whidbey Island will have 117 aircraft.

Appendix E. Summary of Potential Benefits Resulting From Audit

Recommendation Reference	Description of Benefit	Amount and Type of Benefit
A.1., B.1.	Economy and Efficiency. Adjusts the FY 1996 BRAC MILCON budget for project P-600T, "Ground Support Equipment Shop," and project P-615T, "Sonobuoy Storage Facility," for overestimated facilities space.	FY 1996 Base Closure Account funds between $2.1 million and $2.6 million put to better use.*
A.2.a.	Economy and Efficiency. Avoids using BRAC MILCON funds to build facilities larger than needed to meet the mission.	Undeterminable.*
A.2.b.	Economy and Efficiency. Ensures that the most cost-effective alternative is used to meet mission requirements.	Undeterminable.*
A.2.c., B.2.	Economy and Efficiency. Revises and resubmits military construction program estimates for the ground support equipment shop and sonobuoy storage facility.	Undeterminable.*

*Exact amount of additional benefits to be realized will be determined by future budget decisions and budget requests.

Appendix F. Organizations Visited or Contacted

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), Washington, DC

Department of the Navy

Chief of Naval Operations, Washington, DC
- Naval Air Systems Command, Arlington, VA

Commander in Chief, U. S. Pacific Fleet, Pearl Harbor, HI
- Patrol Wings Pacific, Naval Air Station Barbers Point, HI
  - Patrol Wings Ten, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA
- Naval Air Station Barbers Point, HI
  - Command Evaluation Office, HI
  - Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, HI
  - Weapons Department, HI
- Naval Air Station Whidbey Island, WA
  - Command Evaluation Office, WA
  - Aircraft Intermediate Maintenance Department, WA
  - Public Works Department, WA
  - Weapons Department, WA

Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Alexandria, VA
- Atlantic Division, Norfolk, VA
- Engineering Field Activity, Northwest, Poulsbo, WA

Unified Command

Commander in Chief, U. S. Pacific Command, Camp H.M. Smith, HI

Other Defense Organizations

Defense Logistics Agency, Alexandria, VA
- Defense Distribution Depot Susquehanna, New Cumberland, PA

Appendix G. 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 Chief Financial Officer
  Deputy Comptroller (Program/Budget)
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)
Deputy Chief of Naval Operations (Logistics)
Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet
  Commander, Naval Air Pacific
    Commander, Naval Air Station Barbers Point
    Commander, Naval Air Station Whidbey Island
Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command
  Commander, Southwest Division
    Commander, Engineering Field Activity, Northwest
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

Unified Command

Commander in Chief, U. S. Pacific Command*

Other 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 Daniel K. Akaka, U.S. Senate
Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Senate
Honorable Slade Gorton, U.S. Senate
Honorable Patty Murray, U.S. Senate
Honorable Neil Abercrombie, U.S. House of Representatives
Honorable Randy Jack Metcalf, U.S. House of Representatives

This page was left out of orignial document

Part III - Management Comments

Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Comments

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

COMPTROLLER
(Program/Budget)

MAY 23 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR AUDITING, DOD IG

SUBJECT: Audit Report on 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 (Project No. 5CG-5017.09)

This responds to your May 18, 1995, memorandum requesting our comments on the subject report.

The audit recommends that the USD(Comptroller) reduce funding by $3.6 million for Military Construction projects, P-600T and P-615T associated with the closure of NAS Barbers Point and realignment to NAS Whidbey Island.

The funding for the two projects at issue is included in the FY 1996 BRAC budget request. We generally agree with the audit and recommendations; however, since the Navy has yet to comment formally on the audit and the amount of the savings has not been resolved, it is premature to take action at this time. However, if the issue is not resolved by the start of the fiscal year, we will place funds associated with the project on administrative withhold. Further, any savings resulting from the audit will be reprogrammed to other BRAC requirements as appropriate.

B. R. Paseur
Director for Construction

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
Judith I. Padgett
Joe E. Richardson
Monica Graves
Joan E. Fox
Robin A. Hysmith

INTERNET DOCUMENT INFORMATION FORM

A . Report Title: 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

B. DATE Report Downloaded From the Internet: 01/07/99

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 01/07/99

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.