



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
U.S. ARMY AUDIT AGENCY
Office of the Deputy Auditor General
Acquisition and Logistics Audits
3101 Park Center Drive
Alexandria, VA 22302-1596

DCN: 9841

SAAG-IMT

29 September 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR

Commander, 3^d Infantry Division (Mechanized) and Fort Stewart, Georgia
31314-3470

Commander, U.S. Army Garrison, Fort Stewart and Hunter Army Airfield,
Georgia 31314-3470

SUBJECT: Validation of Data for Base Realignment and Closure 2005,
Fort Stewart, Georgia (Project Code A-2003-IMT-0440.059), Audit Report:
A-2004-0537-IMT

1. **Introduction.** The Director, The Army Basing Study Group asked us to validate data that the Study Group and six Joint Cross-Service Groups¹ will use for Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 analyses. This report summarizes the results of our validation efforts at Fort Stewart, Georgia, which included Hunter Army Airfield. We will include these results in a summary report to the director and in our overall report on the 2005 Army basing study process.

2. **Background**

a. **BRAC 2005 Effort.** The Secretary of Defense initiated BRAC 2005 on 15 November 2002. The Secretary of the Army established the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Infrastructure Analysis) to lead the Army's efforts to support BRAC 2005. The Deputy Assistant Secretary directs The Army Basing Study Group, an ad hoc, chartered organization that serves as the Army's single point of contact for planning and executing the Army's responsibilities in the development of BRAC 2005 recommendations. The Study Group will gather and analyze certified data to assess the capacity and military value of Army installations, evaluate base realignment and closure alternatives, and develop recommendations for BRAC 2005 on behalf of The Secretary of the Army. The BRAC 2005 process requires certification of all data from Army

¹ The Study Group didn't collect capacity data for a seventh group—the Intelligence Cross-Service Group. Accordingly, we will report data validation results for that group to the Deputy Chief of Staff, G-2.

SAAG-IMT

SUBJECT: Validation of Data for Base Realignment and Closure 2005, Fort Stewart, Georgia (Project Code A-2003-IMT-0440.059), Audit Report: A-2004-0537-IMT

installations, industrial base sites and leased properties; Army corporate databases; and open sources. A flowchart of the 2005 Army basing study process is at the enclosure.

b. **Military Value Data Call.** Often referred to as data call no. 2, the military value data call was issued in phases as follows:

Phase	Question Categories	Issue Date	Certification Deadline
I	Army/Cost of Base Realignment Action Model	19 Apr 04	7 Jun 04
IIa	Medical*, Supply and Storage Activities*, and Community**	4 Jun 04	11 Aug 04
IIb	Industrial*, Headquarters and Support Activities*	18 Jun 04	11 Aug 04
III	Education and Training*	9 Jul 04	25 Aug 04
IV	Technical*	21 Jul 04	8 Sep 04

* Joint Cross-Service Groups.

** BRAC 2005 Selection Criterion 7: Impact on Local Community.

3. Objectives, Scope and Methodology

a. **Objectives.** Our objectives were to determine if:

- Certified data provided to The Army Basing Study Group and Joint Cross-Service Groups was adequately supported with appropriate evidentiary matter.
- Certified data was accurate.
- BRAC 2005 management controls were in place and operating at installations.

b. **Scope.** Fort Stewart received 543 questions during the military value data call. To answer our first 2 objectives, we validated responses to 49 judgmentally selected questions that the installation received. This table shows the question population and our sample size for each phase:

SAAG-IMT

SUBJECT: Validation of Data for Base Realignment and Closure 2005, Fort Stewart, Georgia (Project Code A-2003-IMT-0440.059), Audit Report: A-2004-0537-IMT

Phase	Question Population	Sample Size
I	35	19
IIa	83	16
IIb	297	9
III	128	5
IV	0	0
Total	543	49

We reviewed the responses for phase I after the installation certified its answers on 7 June 2004. We reviewed the responses for phases II and III before the installation's initial certifications on 11 August 2004 and 25 August 2004, respectively. To answer the third objective, we evaluated BRAC 2005 controls related to installations.

c. **Methodology.** We conducted our review from July through September 2004 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards, which include criteria on the adequacy and appropriateness of evidentiary matter, accuracy and management controls. We assessed the accuracy of installation answers using these specific criteria:

- For questions with a single answer and minimal support requirements, we didn't allow any margin for error except for answers reporting square footage.
- For questions with answers involving square footage, we defined significant errors as greater than 10 percent.
- For questions with multiple answers and single answers with voluminous supporting documentation, we allowed errors up to 25 percent in the samples we reviewed, provided the errors weren't significant (determined by auditor judgment except for answers reporting square footage).

We didn't rely on computer-generated data to validate responses from Army corporate databases, but instead validated the accuracy of the data by comparison with source documents or physical attributes. When practicable, we also validated installation responses from other

SAAG-IMT

SUBJECT: Validation of Data for Base Realignment and Closure 2005, Fort Stewart, Georgia (Project Code A-2003-IMT-0440.059), Audit Report: A-2004-0537-IMT

databases in the same manner. For all other responses, we worked with the installation administrator to obtain the evidence needed to answer all three objectives.

4. Results

a. **Adequacy of Support.** All 49 responses we validated for Fort Stewart were adequately supported with appropriate evidentiary matter.

b. **Accuracy.** Responses to 41 of the 49 questions we validated were accurate. Fort Stewart should have answered three of the questions as “not applicable.” For five questions, the installation incorrectly included additional data or didn’t include some relevant data the questions required because of calculation or oversight errors. For example, the installation:

- Overstated the plant capacity and personnel staffing for two questions pertaining to munitions storage facilities. The installation didn’t conduct wholesale munitions storage functions and should have answered the questions as “not applicable.”
- Understated the inventory of medical and dental facilities because seven facilities were inadvertently excluded from the answer.

c. **Management Controls.** In our opinion, appropriate management controls for BRAC 2005 were in place and operating at Fort Stewart. The senior mission commander had certified the responses submitted to The Army Basing Study Group, and all personnel required to sign nondisclosure statements had done so.

d. **Other Matters.** During our validation effort, we recognized that answers for questions not selected for review (but related to the selected questions) were possibly inaccurate. Therefore we notified the installation administrator of the need to review answers to questions related to the questions selected for review. The installation administrator initiated action to review the answers to related questions.

SAAG-IMT

SUBJECT: Validation of Data for Base Realignment and Closure 2005,
Fort Stewart, Georgia (Project Code A-2003-IMT-0440.059), Audit Report:
A-2004-0537-IMT

e. **Action Taken.** Fort Stewart personnel corrected two phase I responses, and recertified and resubmitted the changes to the Study Group. Installation personnel also corrected six phase II responses before certification on 11 August 2004.

5. **Contacts.** This report isn't subject to the official command-reply process described in AR 36-2. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Mr. John Lipham at 404-464-0524 or Mr. Robert Richardson at 404-464-0516. You can also e-mail them at John.Lipham@aaa.army.mil or Robert.Richardson@aaa.army.mil.

FOR THE AUDITOR GENERAL:



DAVID H. BRANHAM
Program Director
Installation Studies

Encl

CF:

Director, The Army Basing Study Office
Commander, U.S. Army Forces Command
Director, U.S. Army Installation Management Agency, Southeast
Region


Acronyms and Abbreviations Used:

ASIP = Army Stationing and Installation Plan
 COBRA = Cost of Base Realignment Action Model
 ECON = Economic Model
 ENV = Environmental Model
 GOCO = Government-Owned, Contractor-Operated
 HQEIS = Headquarters Executive Information System

ISR = Installation Status Report
 IVT = Installation Visualization Tool
 JCSG = Joint Cross-Service Group
 MVA = Military Value Analyzer Model
 ODIN = Online Data Interface Collection
 OSAF = Optimal Stationing of Army Forces

OSD = Office of the Secretary of Defense
 PL = Public Law
 RC = Reserve Components
 RPLANS = Real Property Planning and Analysis System
 SRG = Senior Review Group

FLOWCHART OF 2005 ARMY BASING STUDY PROCESS



Enclosure