

MEMORANDUM FOR AFAA (Mr. Fred Jones )

FROM: SAF/IEB  
1665 Air Force Pentagon  
Washington DC 20330-1665

SUBJECT: Installation Visualization Tool (IVT) Data Reliability (Project F2003-  
FB4000-0854.000)

1. The Air Force has reviewed your talking paper and email of 28 April 04 ref the audit of IVT data reliability. The talking paper noted several differences between Data Call #1 and IVT data as was identified in Base Boundaries, ESQD-Arcs, Noise contours and Wetlands. Many of these differences are attributed to the way in which the questions were asked in Data Call #1 verses the information collected to produce IVT templates.
2. The Base Closure Executive Group (BCEG) will consider these differences during the deliberative process. It should, however, be noted that IVT will be used for realignment purposes and will not be used as a deliberative tool. The certified data within the Web-based Installation Data Gathering and Entry Tool (WIDGET) will be used as the primary source. The purpose of IVT is to give the BCEG a picture of each installation and to focus concerns with respect to base boundaries, ESQD arcs, noise contours and wetlands for further discussion.

MICHAEL A. AIMONE, P.E.  
Deputy Assistant Secretary  
(Basing & Infrastructure Analysis)

**TALKING PAPER**  
**Air Force Audit Agency Review of**  
**2005 BRAC Installation Visualization Tool Data Reliability**

**PURPOSE**

Provide preliminary results of audit of 2005 BRAC - Installation Visualization Tool (IVT) Data Reliability (Project F2003-FB4000-0854.000)

**DISCUSSION**

Audit review of 20 installations identified inconsistencies between IVT data and Data Call 1 responses in WIDGET:

IVT Base Boundary Versus WIDGET 4.198:

Differences in acreage ranging from .04 to 54 percent identified for 19 installations

Cause – 7 of the 14 installations erroneously included easements as part of WIDGET responses; could not determine cause(s) for differences for remaining 7 installations

--- IVT ESQD-Arcs Versus WIDGET 12.243:

---- Differences in acreage ranging from .60 to 2,614 percent identified for 17 installations

Cause - IVT includes collective acres encumbered by arcs while acreage of individual arcs reported in WIDGET, double-counting acres within overlapping arcs

IVT Noise Contours Versus WIDGET 12.239:

Only 14 of the 20 installations reviewed had noise contours, but all 14 had differences in acreage ranging from .01 to 187 percent

Cause – The cause for the differences could not be determined.

--- IVT Wetlands Versus WIDGET 12.257:

Only 14 of the 20 installations reviewed had wetlands, but all 14 had differences in acreage ranging from 3 to 145 percent

---- Cause – IVT used all identified wetlands while WIDGET contained only jurisdictional wetlands