



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE OHIO

DCN: 9571

MEMORANDUM FOR SAF/IEB

MAR 05 2004

FROM: AFMC/XP
4375 Chidlaw Road, B205
Wright-Patterson AFB OH 45433-5006

SUBJECT: Certification of Installation 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

1. As directed by Headquarters USAF and in support of BRAC 2005 data collection efforts, Air Force Materiel Command (AFMC) has completed the BRAC 2005 Data Call #1 questionnaire. Answers requiring clarification/explanation are attached.

2. 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 AFMC installations is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Barbara A. Westgate", is positioned above the printed name.

BARBARA A. WESTGATE
Director
Directorate of Plans and Programs

Attachment:
AFMC Concerns/Issues

AFMC Concerns/Issues with BRAC 05 Data Call #1

Section 4:

Questions 30, 31 and 198. Base 75 counted only land within the Air Force leasehold. But, much additional land at this installation is available to the Air Force at little or not cost under the terms of the documents creating this City-Base.

Section 9:

For installations 23, 79 and 81, we are unable to certify data provided for questions 9.502 “Required Capacity Index” (columns 4 and 5), 9.504 “Installation Core Capability Requirement by Depot Commodity Group” (columns 3 and 4) and 9.506 “Funded and/or Programmed Workloads” (columns 12, 13, 16 and 17) due to the lack of approved core capability requirements for FY05 and FY09.

Section 11:

Due to the nature of the questions contained in this section, as well as the unavailability of data sources for validation purposes, MAJCOM reviewers relied heavily on communications with installation level reviewers.

Section 25:

Due to the nature of the questions contained in this section, as well as the unavailability of data sources for validation purposes, MAJCOM reviewers relied heavily on communications with installation level reviewers.

Section 31:

We had difficulty answering the questions in this section. The structure did not lend itself to the sustainment mission at the Air Logistics Centers (ALCs), Product Centers, or Test Centers. We were dependent on clarifying guidance from the AFBRAC Help Desk to further define overly broad categories of data, or redefine data requested from, but not collected by AFMC. Several questions requested supply activity in tons or by class of supply. Because our logistics systems do not collect data by either category, installations extrapolated the data from supply records where possible. Questions that had both “above installation” and “below installation” responses were difficult to answer because the Web-based Installation Data Gathering Entry Tool (WIDGET) data base could not accommodate more than one answer per installation. A large number of supply and storage activities at the ALCs are the responsibility of DLA and will be counted separately through their channels, while many of the below installation supply activities are contracted operations and do not lend themselves to the nature of the questions asked.

Section 31 (continued):

Other questions regarding types and color of money were difficult to answer despite repeated requests for clarification from the AFBRAC Help Desk. These questions were not well defined in terms of Budget Programs and Program Element Codes (PECs), or how money is actually programmed for and distributed to supply and storage activities. Assumptions were made based on the mission area structure and alignment of PECs within that structure.

Installations 174, 175 and 176:

ASC/ENV reviewer and approved the data and it was verified at MAJCOM level to insure source documentation was included and that there were no administrative errors. AFAA validated findings at Installation 176 were corrected as required.