



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMAND

DCN: 9570

MEMORANDUM FOR SAF/IEB

5 Mar 2004

FROM: HQ AETC/AXP
244 F Street East, Suite 2
Randolph AFB, TX 78150-4321

SUBJECT: Certification of MAJCOM Data and Information for BRAC 2005

References: (a) Public Law 101-510, as amended, The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990
(b) Air Force Internal Control Plan, change 1 incorporated 28 July 2003

As directed by Headquarters USAF and in support of BRAC 2005 data collection efforts, AETC has completed the BRAC 2005 Data Call #1 questionnaire.

I certify in accordance with Public Law 101-510, as amended, Section 2903(c)(5), and the Air Force Internal Control Plan that all data and information provided by AETC installations is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief with the following exceptions:

Section 31 Supply and Storage. The inherent ambiguity of section 31 questions make validation of most of the data impossible. As discussed with SAF/IEBB at the 17-18 Feb 04 BRAC Conference, we input N/A for data points AETC/LG is unable to positively validate. Request OSD and HAF re-address supply and storage in data call #2 using better defined questions and guidance. AETC is available to help define supply and storage questions.

Runway Capacity Data. This question forced answerers to use a 20-year-old FAA capacity model centered on civilian airport traffic to assess the air traffic system capacity of AETC installations. The FAA model does not consider Air Force waivers to FAA air traffic control criteria, specifically RSU-controlled runways, reduced runway separation standards and formation flights. It also does not include factors for heavy closed-traffic pattern training operations. AETC/DO developed a standard methodology to answer these questions within the provided parameters.

Outlying Fields (OLFs). AETC does not collect detailed data about operations at most OLFs. Data was either unavailable or not verifiable, but to document use of OLFs, we listed airfield names, but reported data as N/A.


MICHAEL J. SNEDEKER
Deputy Director of Plans and Programs

2 Attachments:

1. AETC/LG Memo, 27 Feb 04
2. AETC/DO Memo, 3 Mar 04

Memorandum

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT-FOR DISCUSSION ONLY-DO NOT RELEASE UNDER FOIA

AETC AXP

From: ALG

Date: 2/27/2004

Review and Validation of BRAC Data Call #1, Section 31

1. AETC, Air Staff and OSD have interpreted the definition of "supply and storage" differently from the very start of Data Call 1. Attempts to acquire a clear definition and direction have failed and SAF/IEBB acknowledges the problem. Subsequently, validity of data submitted by AETC bases is suspect for much of Section 31.
2. I concur with HQ AETC/XPPB guidance as discussed with SAF/IEBB at 17-18 Feb 04 BRAC Conference to change answers to N/A if the reviewer cannot validate the bases' inputs. AETC/LGRX coordinated this approach with other MAJCOMs and is in line with their certification plans.
3. I recommend AETC request OSD readdress Supply and Storage in a subsequent data call as part of the MAJCOM certification memo.



JOE F. HARRISON, Colonel, USAF
Deputy Director of Logistics



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
AIR EDUCATION AND TRAINING COMMAND

MEMORANDUM FOR HQ AETC/AXP

03 MAR 2004

FROM: HQ AETC/DO
1 F Street Suite 2
Randolph AFB TX 78150-4325

SUBJECT: HQ AETC/DO BRAC 2005 Data Call #1 Concerns

1. During MAJCOM validation of Data Call #1, my staff highlighted two areas that raised concern about data accuracy, reliability of sources, and applicability to military operations. More detailed information about Runway Capacity Data and data requested for our Out Lying Fields (OLFs) is summarized below.
2. Runway Capacity Data - Question 1.91 required AETC to calculate runway capacities based on FAA Circular 150/5060-5 - an FAA model that defines capacity in terms of runway 'operations' (arrivals/departures/touch and go's). The FAA calculations require multiple assumptions to force military operations into a model based on civilian operations. On more than one occasion, AETC/XP Trusted Agents attempted to have 1.91 withdrawn based on incompatibility, but the request was denied. Accordingly, AETC/DORA developed a consistent methodology that was applied to all flying training installations; although data has been provided, it must be recognized that it was calculated utilizing a model that correlates little to military flying training.
3. Out Lying Fields (OLFs - Quest 1.91, 1.92, 1.138, 1.140, 1.141, 1.142) - Several questions utilized the term OLF to capture data about AETC flying training at other than the home field. For the purpose of these questions, we defined OLFs as any airfield used for training other than those controlled by the installation. Although AETC relies heavily on the use of OLFs, it does not collect detailed data about operations at those locations, nor does it have any means of compelling civilian airfields to provide data they may possess. Answers to these questions could have been estimated but sources are inadequate and proposed methodology would be inaccurate. In order to document our use of OLFs we have elected to list applicable airfield names but report the requested operational data as "N/A" (not available).
4. We feel it critical that these issues be highlighted as our Data Call response goes forward. Please include this document as an attachment to AETC's Data Call #1 certification memo.


WILLIAM M. FRASER III
Major General, USAF
Director of Operations

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT-FOR DISCUSSION ONLY-DO NOT RELEASE UNDER FOIA