

HSA JCSG

26 April 2005

## MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Responses to Inspector General Department of Defense (DoD IG) Audit of the Major Administrative and Headquarters Activities (MAH) Military Value

1. The purpose of this memorandum is to illustrate corrective actions that have been taken to correct issues highlighted in the initial DoD IG audit of the MAH military value data. Each section will begin with a reference to the question that generated the IG concern. The specific issue will then be identified, and the resolution will be presented. For many issues, the data was provided via secondary sources. The parent file name for the data will be presented in this memorandum; the actual files will be resident within the secondary source file directory provided with the MAH methodology. If the secondary source value matched the value used for the final military value run, we considered the issue as resolved.

2. Question 1959.

a. Issue. Patuxent River Webster Field and Saufley Field, “data appears to be switched.”

b. Resolution. The data used to run the military value model was generated through a secondary source, (Webster Field’s source is NSA PAX DODI959\_HAS\_16March03 rev1.doc. Saufley’s field’s data source is Saufley answer-ddc3 025v1(18mar05)[1] 1901 1959 1960.doc). The data for Webster field is 1.0 and for Saufley field is 0.275. These values are consistent with the secondary data source and the model run.

3. Question 1901.

a. Issue.

(1) MacDill AFB, Coronado, and Scott AFB—“Don’t match.”

(2) MCAS Hawaii Camp Smith/Kanehoe—“Not broken out.”

(3) Patuxent River/Webster Field—“Cannot locate.”

b. Resolution.

(1) MacDill AFB, and Scott AFB—MacDill and Scott AFB responses were provided by secondary sources—MacDill was USAF.xls and Scott was USAF(29MAR05).xls.

(2) Coronado value comes from the database. MCAS Hawaii Camp Smith/Kanehoe were all provided by the Navy LNO in a secondary source (DDC 3028 HSA MILVAL 17 JUN(SER H2297)[1].doc).

(3) Patuxent River/Webster Field—provided by secondary source in file NSA PAX\_DOD1901\_HSA16March03\_REV1.doc.

4. Question 28 (SCC).

a. Issue. NAVSUPACT Indian Head, issue not clear.

b. Resolution. Data was received as a secondary source from LNO, with a “Yes” response (mah data pulls usn fencelines 8 march-warhola(3).xls). The information is located on the Q28 COMNAVDIST tab (worksheet) of the spreadsheet.

5. Question 319 (SCC).

a. Issue. There were several issues, not clearly identified in the IG spreadsheet, associated with the following locations: NAS Corpus Christi, NAS Jacksonville, NAS Point Magu, NAVSTA Pearle Harbor, NAVSTA San Diego, SUB Base Bangor, NAVSUPACT Norfolk, and Saufley Field.

b. Resolution. Naval Air Station Point Magu should be rolled up according to the target list; as a result according to the methodology and database, it should be given a 1.0 value. The Navy did provide a clarification memo that would also clarify the N/A responses to 1.0. In both cases, the methodology/database approach and the Navy clarification, the answer should be 1.0. Corpus Christi, NATNAVMEDCEN Bethesda, NAS Jacksonville, NAVSTA Pearle Harbor, SUB Base Bangor, NAVSUPACT Norfolk, and WPN Charleston are also roll-ups according to the methodology. By following the instruction, you will obtain a 1.0 score. NAVSTA San Diego and Saufley Field provided an N/A responses; the Navy provided a clarification memo (Navy ReconciloffIT-Comm Questions 1901 1959 319.pdf). The memo is located with secondary source data. For the classified portion of the response, if there was an N/A for the unclassified side, the classified side may be blank. Based on the methodology document, roll-up methodology, and the Navy clarification memo, the value is assessed as 0.0 in these cases.

6. SCC. Anacostia Annex.

a. Issue. “Certified in two places, submission conflicted.”

b. Resolution. Anacostia Annex answers N/A in the database. Therefore, the Navy clarification memo (Navy ReconciloffIT-Comm Questions 1901 1959 319.pdf) provides disposition. For the classified portion of the response, if there was an N/A for the unclassified side, the classified side may be blank. Based on the methodology document,

roll-up methodology, and the Navy clarification memo, the value is assessed as 0.0 in these cases.

7. Question. FEMA

a. Issue. Cannon AFB, “couldn’t find.”

b. Resolution. If there were no historic FEMA incidents, there will be no entries in the FEMA database. Cannon AFB does not have an entry in the database, therefore it is assessed a score of 0 in accordance with the methodology.

8. Question 1964.

a. Issue. MCAS Cherry Point “Doesn’t match.”

b. Resolution. There was an error in the methodology. The installation name in the OSD database should be CG MCAS CHERRY POINT NC. When pulling this data, the response should be “yes.” Our final MV listed the response as “no;” military value sensitivity analysis was performed to gauge the impact of the change. The Cherry Point military value with the “No” response was 0.854704 and with the “Yes” response was 0.888412178. Although this is a difference in military value, it does not affect any candidate recommendations and is judged to be practically insignificant.

9. Question. Census.

a. Issue. Homestead “couldn’t find.”

b. Resolution. In July 1999, the FIPS code for Dade County, FL was changed. Now, there are two possible values for FIPS code: 12025 (old) and 12086 (new). Our target list was modified to reflect the current code—12086. The Dade County FIPS code is used for Homestead AFB. If the database is queried against this code, it retrieves the value \$124,000. This value matches the run used in our final military value analysis.

10. Question. 1416.

a. Issue. NAS North Island, “7.82 in column, 7.93 in \_n columns;” Saufley Field “Couldn’t locate data.”

b. Resolution. NAS North Island was provided in a secondary source file, which overrides the database answer (NASNI to SAN.pdf). Saufley Field was provided in a secondary source file (Saufley Answer-DDC3025v1(18Mar05)[1] 1416.doc).

11. Question. 558.

a. Issue. Fort Benning, “Has one airfield accompanying all aircraft except B-52.” MARCORSUP\_Kansas City, “Doesn’t match.” Coronado, “Certified as N/A, but lists

aircraft the location can handle.” Peterson AFB, “Don’t own, only have joint use, analyzed as a yes response.” Potomac Annex, “, “Certified as N/A, but lists aircraft the location can handle.” Schofield Barracks, “Lists a b06 as an aircraft able to utilizes one of the airfields.” And Washington Navy Yard, “Certified as N/A, but lists aircraft the location can handle.”

b. Resolution. The response by Schofield barracks was for B06 aircraft; this specific aircraft is rotary wing. Therefore, the score for Schofield is 0, in accordance with the methodology and scoring plan. Fort Benning’s data point is in error in the final military value run—its value should be “Yes.” Military value sensitivity analysis was performed to gauge the impact of the change. The Benning military value with the “No” response was 0.842497 and with the “Yes” response was 0.853733. This difference is not substantially significant, and it also does not affect any candidate recommendations. MARCORSUP\_Kansas City, Washington Navy Yard, and Potomac Annex are N/A in the database, the LNO provided an answer via secondary source in the file: MAH DATA PULLS USN FENCELINES 8 March-Warhola(3).xls. The response from the LNO was No for each. The response for Coronado was clarified by the Navy LNO for Coronado in file MAH DATA PULLS USN FENCELINES 8 March-Warhola(3).xls; the value was 0. Peterson AFB was clarified in a secondary source (usaf.xls) and in an email from Kathy Simonton dated 10 Mar 05.

## 12. Question 11.

a. Issue. Ft. AP Hill, Ft. Detrick, MCAS Cherry Point, MCAS Miramar, MCAS Lejeune, Camp Smith, Camp Kanehoe, NAVAIRENSTA Lakehurst, NSA Brunswick, NAS Point Magu, and Coronado all had a comment of “Doesn’t match.” NAVSTA Annapolis, NAVSUPACT Dahlgren, NAVSUPACT Indian Head, Potomac Annex, Saufley Field, and Washington Navy Yard all had comments of “Couldn’t locate information.” NAS Patuxent Webster had a comment “All facilities are listed as 0 GSF, impossible to calculate.” NAS Point Magu had a comment “Didn’t match based on North Island info.”

b. Resolution. For all COMNAVDIST Washington Navy entities referred to in secondary sources, one must refer to the file “Update(2a) 7 March of MAH Data Pulls USN Fencelines-Warhola(2).xls,” and use multiple worksheets within the file name. The worksheet, DOD11 Fenceline Mappings, will provide the appropriate respondent for each installation. After obtaining the name of the respondent, one needs to use the worksheet, 1.2.F(DoD11), to find the data values for each fenceline. This will resolve data issues for NAVSTA Annapolis, NAVSUPACT Dahlgren, NAVSUPACT Indian Head, Potomac Annex, Arlington Service Center, and Washington Navy Yard. This description has been clarified in the methodology.

For the Fort Detrick, Fort AP Hill, Mirimar, Cherry Point, NAS Bunswick, and Point Magu scores, the values obtained from the database using the updated methodology match the values in the data set used to run the final MV models. As a result, there are no remaining issues with these installations.

The Navy provided the same ORG CODE for Camp Smith and Kanehoe, but indicated the two needed to be separated. However, the methodology for separating the data was not obtained. As a result, following the intent of applying fairness the single value for the ORG CODE (CG\_MCB\_HAWAII) for the Facility Condition Code was used for both installations; these values match the database using the updated methodology. This is also true of Pensacola and Saufley Field, Coronado and North Island, and Patuxent River and Webster Field.

For NAS Patuxent Webster Field and NAS Patuxent, it also appears that the total square feet were mistakenly transposed in the quantity field. As a result, we used the numbers reported in the quantity field\_n as opposed to the numbers Total GSF field for this case. This is verified by looking within the DONBITS format, where the GSF information is reported in a field titled "Quantity."

For NAVAIENGSTA Lakehurst, the C1 rating used for LDW was an error. According to the Navy convention for answering the Question 11, Lakehurst should have reported as adequate, inadequate, or substandard. Lakehurst answered with a 1.0, which we mistakenly translated to a C1. The value of Lakehurst, according to the MAH methodology should be a C2 for adequate. Assessment of the impact via sensitivity analysis shows little effect. Lakehurst with a C1 rating as used in the final MV report yields a military value score of 0.762298084. Lakehurst with the correction to a C2 rating provides a military value score of 0.753871111. This difference is not significant, and it does not currently affect any candidate recommendations.

For MCB Lejeune, the final military value run used data from the OSD database, which resulted in an FCC score of C2. Using C2 provides a military value score of 0.868848332. This method was incorrect, as the Navy LNO provided a secondary source that overrides the database values. Using the corrected data from the LNO, the FCC score should be C3. Sensitivity analysis reveals that using C3 results in a military value score of 0.851994385. This is not a practically significant difference in value, and it does not affect any candidate recommendations.

c. The DoD (IG) raised an issue with respect to the method for assessing how the four condition codes for DoD (C1-C4) mapped to each of the service specific assessments. A section has been added into the base methodology document to address this issue.

### 13. Question 31.

a. Issue. NAS Corpus Christi, NAS North Island, SUBBASE Kings Bay, and Army National Guard Readiness Center have issues relating to the phrase "doesn't match." Fort Bliss has a comment "information may be incorrectly certified."

b. Resolution. Corpus Christi and SUBBASE Kings Bay had minor mathematic errors. Corpus Christi ran in the final military value model with a value of 3.4996, when the correct value was 3.8326. Sensitivity analysis shows this change will modify military

value from 0.85694173 in the final run to 0.857219587. This change is not significant. Kings Bay had a score of 0.4167 for the buildable parcels metric in the final military value run, when it should have been 0.7497. This modification changes military value from 0.833382091 to 0.833610624. This change is also not significant.

The Army National Guard Readiness Center data was provided via secondary source. The IG audit did point out an error in the calculation of this installation's value for this metric. The final military value model was run with 0.0, when it should have been 0.083. This change in score should change the military value from 0.831220158 in the final run to 0.831277119 with corrected data. This sensitivity analysis shows that the change is not significant.

The Fort Bliss responses were non-integer, but were certified and available from the OSD database. Using the values retrieved from the database matches the scores used to run the military value model. Therefore there are no issues with this installation.

There are multiple rows for NSA North Island within the database; however, if the methodology is followed explicitly, the results will match.

#### 14. Question 305.

a. Issue. The following locations had an issue comment of "couldn't locate information:" Anacostia Annex, Arlington Service Center, Coronado, NAVSTA Annapolis, NAVSUPACT Dahlgren, NAVSUPACT Indian Head, Potomac Annex, and Washington Navy Yard. NAVSTA Newport had a comment, "doesn't match."

b. Resolution. Anacostia Annex, Arlington Service Center, Coronado, NAVSTA Annapolis, NAVSUPACT Dahlgren, NAVSUPACT Indian Head, Potomac Annex, and Washington Navy Yard are all provided by a Navy secondary data sources, and the methodology has been updated to reflect such (in the spreadsheet used to run the military value models—MAH Installation Data (14 APRO5).xls). NAVSTA Newport is a rolled-up response. The two components, the Navy are explicitly addressed in the target list; when the methodology is followed, the answer matches the value used in the final military value run.

#### 15. Question. DTIC—BAH.

a. Issue. "Couldn't find" Fort McCoy and Fort Polk

b. Resolution. Fort McCoy used a zip code of 54754. This gives a value of 903, which matches the response used to run the military value model. Fort Polk has a zip of 71065, which provides a data point of 842; this matches the value used to run the final military value number.

16. Question OPM—Locality pay.

a. Issue. Various issues with finding locations, some of which needed a reference to Alaska and Hawaii. Sites with issues include: Eielson, Elmendorf, Fort Polk, Fort Shafter, Fort Wainwright, Hickam, MCAS Hawaii Camp Smith Kanehoe, Pearl Harbor, Schofield barracks, Homestead, NAVAIRENGSTA Lakehurst, and NAVSTA Newport.

b. Resolution. The methodology refers to the source of data required based on the entity's location—inside or outside the contiguous United States. Following this methodology will lead to the data used to run the military value model. This accounts for issues associated with Eielson, Elmendorf, Fort Shafter, Fort Wainwright, Hickam, MCAS Hawaii Camp Smith, Kanehoe, Pearl Harbor, and Schofield barracks. Fort Polk has a 22115 FIPS Code, but there is no entry for LA in the data source. As stated in the methodology, the resulting answer for Fort Polk should be “rest of the United States.” For Homestead, in July 1999, the FIPS code for Dade County, FL was changed. Now, there are two possible values for FIPS code: 12025 (old) and 12086 (new). Our target list was modified to reflect the current code—12086. The Dade County FIPS code is used for Homestead AFB; using this code will provide the value used in the final military value run. Lakehurst has a FIPS code of 34029; using this FIPS code provides the same value as used in the final military value run. Newport FIPS code is 44005, and this provides the same value as used in the final military value run.

17. Because the final military value run and report had been submitted before this response to the audit was complete, the results presented within this document will accompany the final report, much like an errata sheet. The final military value report will not be reconstructed, since none of these issues significantly or adversely affect any of our current candidate recommendations.

18. Please refer any questions or concerns to the undersigned by email to Christopher.Hill@wso.whs.mil or by phone at 703.696.9448, extension 148.



CHRISTOPHER M. HILL  
LTC, AR  
Operations Research Analyst