Audit Report

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

EXPANSION OF THE CENTRALIZED INTEGRATION SUPPORT FACILITY AT PETERSON AIR FORCE BASE

Report No. 96-031 December 1, 1995

Department of Defense

Additional Copies

To obtain additional copies of this audit report, contact the Secondary Reports Distribution Unit, Audit Planning and Technical Support Directorate, at (703) 604-8937 (DSN 664-8937) or FAX (703) 604-8932.

Suggestions for Future Audits

To suggest ideas for or to request future audits, contact the Planning and Coordination Branch of the Analysis, Planning, and Technical Support Directorate, at (703) 604-8939 (DSN 664-8939) or FAX (703) 604-8932. Ideas and requests can also be mailed to:

Inspector General, Department of Defense
OAIG-AUD (ATTN: APTS Audit Suggestions)
400 Army Navy Drive (Room 801)
Arlington, Virginia 22202-2884

Defense Hotline

To report fraud, waste, or abuse, contact the Defense Hotline by calling (800) 424-9008; by sending an electronic message to Hotline@DODIG.OSD.MIL; or by writing the Defense Hotline, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C. 20301-1900. The identity of each writer and caller is fully protected.

Acronyms

AFB	Air Force Base
ALC	Air Logistics Center
BRAC	Commission on Defense Base Closure and Realignment
CISF	Centralized Integration Support Facility

INSPECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
400 ARMY NAVY DRIVE
ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22202-2884

Report No. 96-031 December 1, 1995

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
(FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND COMPTROLLER)

SUBJECT: Audit of the Expansion of the Centralized Integration Support Facility at Peterson Air Force Base (Project No. 5LB-8015)

Introduction

We are providing this report for your information and use. The audit was performed in response to an allegation received through the Defense Hotline relating to the need for the Air Force to construct an addition to a software support facility at Peterson Air Force Base (AFB) in Colorado Springs, Colorado.

The Air Force authorized the construction of a building on Peterson AFB to accommodate software maintenance support for Air Force space and missile early warning systems. The construction project for the Centralized Integration Support Facility (CISF) was authorized in two phases. Phase I of the CISF was completed in 1993 at a cost of $18 million to accommodate technical and administrative support for software maintenance of Air Force missile early warning systems. Phase II was authorized in FY 1994 to expand the CISF for software maintenance support of Air Force space systems. The Air Force was authorized $16.4 million to complete the phase II expansion of the CISF. Additional background information on CISF is in Enclosure 1, definitions of technical terms are in Enclosure 2, and descriptions of space and missile early warning systems are in Enclosure 3.

On June 5, 1995, we requested that the Air Force suspend for 60 days the award of the contract for phase II of the CISF construction, pending the completion of an accelerated audit. On August 3, 1995, based on the audit results, we formally advised the Commander, Air Force Materiel Command, that there was no reason to further delay the award of the contract for the expansion of the CISF.

Audit Results

The allegation to the Hotline that the Air Force had excess capacity for software maintenance support of weapon systems at its air logistics centers (ALCs) that was not adequately evaluated as an alternative to the expansion of the CISF was valid when it was received in May 1995. However, because of 1995

Commission on Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) and DoD downsizing decisions, Air Force reorganizations, and the requirements for reevaluating the programs and redesigning the CISF, further analyses coupled with additional delays to evaluate the feasibility of ALCs as alternatives would not be cost-effective.

Audit Objectives

The audit objective was to evaluate the need to expand the CISF for space systems at Peterson AFB, Colorado. We also reviewed the management control program as it related to the audit objective.

Scope and Methodology

Scope and Methodology. We evaluated the Air Force justification to build a 104,000-square foot addition to an existing 90,000-square foot facility at Peterson AFB. Military construction funds totaling $16.4 million were authorized in FY 1994.

We reviewed February 1987 through July 1995 program data on the justification for building the CISF. We examined DD Forms 1391, "Military Construction Project Data"; economic analyses; floor plans; program floorspace requirements; project books; and program utilization rates for the facility. We also evaluated merit analyses and personnel requirements for the programs and systems designated for phase II of the CISF. We inspected and evaluated the available technical and administrative floorspace at the Sacramento ALC. We reviewed workload and capacity projections for FY 1999 submitted to the 1995 BRAC for the five Air Force ALCs and evaluated the methodology for calculating capacity at Sacramento ALC.

Audit Period, Standards, and Locations. This economy and efficiency audit was performed from May through September 1995 in accordance with auditing standards issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, as implemented by the Inspector General, DoD. We included tests of management controls considered necessary. We did not use computer-processed data or statistical sampling procedures for this audit. Enclosure 4 lists the organizations we visited or contacted during the audit.

Management Control Program

DoD Directive 5010.38, "Internal Management Control Program," April 14, 1987, requires DoD organizations to implement a comprehensive system of management controls that provides reasonable assurance that programs are operating as intended and to evaluate the adequacy of the controls.

Scope of Review of the Management Control Program. We reviewed the adequacy of management controls related to the construction of the CISF expansion. We reviewed the Air Force Materiel Command and the Sacramento ALC annual statement of assurance for FYs 1993 and 1994. Neither the Air Force Materiel Command nor the Sacramento ALC had assessable units for military construction or software maintenance. As of August 1995, the Space Systems Support Group (the Support Group) at the CISF in Colorado Springs was establishing its management control program.

Adequacy of Management Controls. Management controls applicable to the construction of the CISF expansion were deemed to be adequate in that we identified no material management control weakness.

Prior Audits and Other Reviews

In the past 5 years, there were no audits of the CISF at Peterson AFB.

Audit Background

The Air Force completed the Pacer Frontier Study in 1987 recommending that Air Force command responsibilities for developing, operating, and maintaining software for space and missile early warning systems be the same as for other weapon systems in the Air Force by 1992. That is, the development, operation, and maintenance of software for space and missile early warning systems would be appropriately divided among the Air Force Systems Command, the Air Force Space Command, and the Air Force Logistics Command. The Pacer Frontier Study also recommended that the sustainment support, including software support, for space and missile early warning systems be centralized in a single facility at Colorado Springs.

Acting on the recommendations of the Pacer Frontier Study, the then Air Force Logistics Command submitted DD Form 1391 for approving the construction of phase I of the CISF in 1989. Congress approved the project in December 1991 and authorized $21 million for the construction of phase I of the CISF, which was completed in October 1993 at a cost of $18 million.

For phase II of the CISF, the Air Force Space Command prepared an economic analysis in February 1992 supporting the DD Form 1391. The economic analysis concluded that expanding the CISF was more cost-effective than leasing contractor facilities in the Colorado Springs area. In November 1993, Congress authorized $16.4 million for the phase II expansion of the CISF.

With downsizing and Air Force reorganizations, the Commander, Air Force Materiel Command, anticipated a change in program requirements for the CISF. Consequently, in March 1994, the Commander suspended the award of the contract for the expansion of the CISF until the program requirements for phase II could be reassessed.

After the Support Group was established in October 1994 at Peterson AFB, it reevaluated the program requirements for phase II of the CISF. In February 1995, based on the Support Group's reevaluation, the Commander approved the construction of phase II of the CISF.

Discussion

Software Maintenance Capacity. When the allegation to the Hotline was made in May 1995, the Air Force had potential excess capacity for software maintenance support of weapon systems. The Air Force submitted certified data to the 1995 BRAC in February 1995 projecting that FY 1999 software maintenance work load would be 483,000 direct labor hours less than the available capacity at the five Air Force ALCs. Sacramento ALC had about 70 percent of the projected excess capacity, or 336,000 of the 483,000 excess direct labor hours. The Air Force-prepared economic and merit analyses were not updated to evaluate potential excess capacity as an alternative to expanding the CISF.

Air Force Evaluation of Software Maintenance Facilities. The Air Force Space Command certified an economic analysis for phase II of the CISF in accordance with DoD procedures contained in DoD Instruction 7040.4, "Military Construction Authorization and Appropriation," March 5, 1979, and DoD Instruction 7041.3, "Economic Analysis and Program Evaluation for Resource Management," October 18, 1972. The February 1992 economic analysis did not include evaluations of alternative sites external to the Colorado Springs area because the 1987 Pacer Frontier Study recommmended that the facility be located in Colorado Springs. A primary consideration in excluding facilities remote to Colorado Springs was the criticality of certain space and missile early warning systems to national security. The maintenance responsibilities of those systems were so interwoven into software operations that a 2-hour response time for anomalies in software operations was required by the Air Force Space Command for level 1 (organizational) and level 2 (depot) maintenance functions.

Economic Analyses. The Support Group did not update the 1992 economic analysis for phase II of CISF. Although the Commander, Air Force Materiel Command, directed that program requirements be reevaluated, the Support Group did not follow DoD guidance in updating the 1992 economic analysis. Instead, the Support Group prepared an informal cost analysis for a briefing to the Commander, Air Force Materiel Command, to justify the expansion of CISF. The cost analysis relied on merit analyses that Air Force system directors prepared for space and missile early warning systems. The merit analyses were to justify the cost-effectiveness of locating software support at the CISF and to quantify the systems' floorspace requirements.

Merit Analyses. The merit analyses for the four primary space systems that were scheduled for phase II of the CISF were unreliable. The Air Force system directors did not follow any specific guidelines in preparing the merit analyses. Consequently, the merit analyses had irreconcilable inconsistencies. For example, two systems, Milstar and the Global Positioning System, each had the 2-hour response time requirement for software maintenance. The system director for the Milstar updated the system merit analysis after the Commander, Air Force Materiel Command, approved the construction of the CISF. The updated Milstar merit analysis included alternate options that accommodated the 2-hour response time. The updated Milstar merit analysis concluded that the remote Sacramento ALC would be a more cost-effective alternative to the CISF by locating a small, onsite contingent in Colorado Springs for emergencies. Conversely, the system director for the Global Positioning System did not update the system merit analysis and did not evaluate Sacramento ALC as an alternative.

Program Floorspace Requirements. The Support Group did not prepare a new, certified economic analysis that reflected changes in technical and administrative floorspace requirements for phase II of CISF. The program requirements for software maintenance floorspace in CISF had changed since February 1992, when the DD Form 1391 was prepared, causing the floorspace requirements for the expansion of CISF to be overstated. Instead of updating the economic analysis, the Support Group did an informal analysis to determine the utilization rate for phase II of CISF, which was briefed to the Commander, Air Force Materiel Command, in February 1995.

The Support Group analysis concluded that although the program requirements had changed, phase II of the CISF would exceed an 85-percent utilization rate that the Commander had established as the criterion for continuing the construction project. We determined that the Support Group's analysis was flawed because it did not follow Air Force Manual 86-2, "Standard Facility Requirements," March 1973, for calculating utilization rates. Additionally, the Support Group's analysis did not include changes in program requirements and the analysis had invalid assumptions. We recalculated the utilization of phase II

of the CISF following Air Force guidance. As a result of our calculations, the utilization of phase II was 65 percent, not 85 percent as briefed by the Support Group.

Recommendations from 1995 BRAC. The 1995 BRAC recommendations reduced the potential Air Force capacity for software maintenance at ALCs. On June 22, 1995, the 1995 BRAC recommended closure of the Sacramento and San Antonio ALCs. Consequently, the excess capacity for software maintenance that the Air Force projected for FY 1999 virtually could be eliminated. For example, the certified FY 1999 capacity data indicated that if the entire work load from the Sacramento and San Antonio ALCs were transferred to the remaining three ALCs, the Air Force would no longer have excess capacity and would actually have a deficit of 475,000 direct labor hours. However, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Air Force have not completed evaluations of the DoD work loads and redistributions and the privatization of depot maintenance related to the recommended closures and realignments. As a result of the closure and realignment recommendations, Air Force capacity at ALCs is uncertain; but, the 1995 BRAC decisions essentially eliminated ALCs as viable alternatives to expanding CISF until work load and privatization analyses are completed.

Requirements for Floorspace in Colorado Springs. Additional requirements for floorspace in Colorado Springs will provide full utilization of CISF. From a survey of space available at Peterson AFB and Falcon AFB, we determined that the military facilities were at full capacity in that all available floorspace was occupied or reserved for future programs. With the military facilities at full capacity, the Air Force space programs were required to lease more costly contractor facilities. Because of the lack of military facilities, the Air Force Space Command occupies 156,000 square feet in off-base leased facilities in the Colorado Springs area. The requirements for military floorspace exceed the 104,000 square feet planned for phase II of CISF.

In addition to local requirements for floorspace, other space programs were evaluating the possibility of moving their operations to the Colorado Springs area. Three space programs, the Advanced Electro-Optical System, the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program, and Milstar were planning a presence in the Colorado Springs area after FY 1996 but no decisions were made as to the extent of the programs' operations. Also, the 1995 BRAC recommended realigning the 750th Space Group from Onizuka Air Station, Sunnyvale, California, and the 1001st Space Systems Squadron from Lowry AFB, Denver, Colorado, to Colorado Springs. If those program requirements were evaluated and included in phase II of CISF, CISF could be fully utilized.

Reevaluating and Redesigning Costs. The costs associated with reevaluating and redesigning CISF would have significantly offset the potential savings from reducing the size of CISF. From available data, we calculated that the

estimated cost savings from reducing the size of CISF by 35 percent would be $3.5 million. However, we further determined that to reevaluate program requirements, to redesign CISF, to lease floorspace for an additional 6 months, and to renovate leased facilities could cost about $4.8 million, which would more than offset the potential cost savings.

Conclusion. The allegation to the Hotline had merit at the time it was made. The Air Force did not fully and adequately rejustify phase II of CISF. However, based on the 1995 BRAC recommendations regarding base closures and realignments, the unavailability of alternate floorspace in the Colorado Springs area, and the costs associated with reevaluating program requirements and redesigning CISF, we concluded that for the Air Force to do further analyses would be unproductive and unwarranted. Therefore, there was no reason to delay the award of the contract to expand CISF.

Management Comments

We provided a draft of this report to you on October 12, 1995. Because the report contains no recommendations, comments were not required, and none were received. Therefore, we are publishing this report in final form.

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the audit staff. If you have questions on this report, please contact Mr. John A. Gannon, Audit Program Director, at (703) 604-9427 (DSN 664-9427) or Mr. Tilghman A. Schraden, Audit Project Manager, at (703) 604-9436 (DSN 664-9436). See Enclosure 5 for the report distribution. The audit team members are listed inside the back cover.

David K. Steensma

David K. Steensma
Deputy Assistant Inspector General
for Auditing

Enclosures

Background Information on CISF

Software Maintenance Responsibilities. Before 1986, software maintenance support to space and missile early warning systems was not a logistics function in the Air Force. The then Air Force Systems Command (the Systems Command) and the Air Force Space Command (the Space Command) provided contractor support for developmental and operational software because space and missile early warning systems were designed for reliability rather than maintainability and logistical support.

In 1986, the Air Force changed its traditional method for providing maintenance support to space and missile early warning systems. Responsibilities for software maintenance were divided among the Space Command network managers, the Systems Command system developers, and the then Air Force Logistics Command (the Logistics Command) system program managers. The Air Force Satellite Control Network became the first space system in 1986 to operate under the new expanded support methodology. In 1992, the Systems Command and the Logistics Command were consolidated to form the new Air Force Materiel Command.

Pacer Frontier Study. In 1986, at the request of the Space Command, the Logistics Command initiated the Pacer Frontier Study (previously entitled the Consolidated Support Alternative Study). The Pacer Frontier Study (the Study) evaluated the feasibility of establishing a software maintenance support facility at Colorado Springs to consolidate support to the Air Force Satellite Control Network and other space and missile early warning systems located in the area. The Study recommended that Air Force command responsibilities for software development, operation, and maintenance for space and missile early warning systems be the same as for other weapon systems by 1992. The Study also recommended that the space and missile early warning systems sustainment support, including software support, be centralized in a single facility in Colorado Springs. In September 1987, the Space Command, the Systems Command, and the Logistics Command signed a Memorandum of Understanding agreeing to assume defined command responsibilities for software support to space and missile early warning systems.

Software Support in Colorado Springs. To accomplish the logistics function for software maintenance support to space and missile early warning systems, the Sacramento ALC established Detachment 25 in 1988 to operate in Colorado Springs. As the logistics function assumed greater responsibilities, the Sacramento ALC established an operating location in Sacramento to support Detachment 25.

When the Air Force Materiel Command was established in 1992, software development and maintenance management functions were integrated. Then in February 1993, the Air Force Space Command and the Air Force Materiel Command signed another Memorandum of Understanding that defined responsibilities of the two commands for maintaining software during the life of a space system. The agreement separated software maintenance support into level 1 organizational maintenance accomplished by the Air Force Space Command and level 2 depot maintenance accomplished by the Air Force Materiel Command.

In December 1993, the Air Force Chief of Staff directed that detachments and operating locations be reduced Air Force-wide. The 19 detachments and operating locations in the Colorado Springs area were consolidated into the Space Systems Support Group, a field operating organization reporting directly to the Air Force Materiel Command effective October 14, 1994.

Recommendations from 1995 BRAC. On May 3, 1988, the Secretary of Defense chartered the BRAC to recommend military installations for realignment and closure. Public Law 101-510, "Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990," November 5, 1990, reestablished the BRAC. The law chartered the BRAC to meet during calendar years 1991, 1993, and 1995 to verify that the process for realigning and closing military installations was timely and independent. The 1995 BRAC required the Military Departments to submit certified data on the capacity and work loads of DoD maintenance organizations for its evaluation.

The 1995 BRAC recommended the closure of the Sacramento ALC and Lowry AFB, and the realignment of the San Antonio ALC and Onizuka Air Station. The President of the United States approved and forwarded the 1995 BRAC recommendations to Congress on July 24, 1995. The 1995 BRAC recommendations became law on September 27, 1995. As a result of those recommendations, the Air Force and the Office of the Secretary of Defense are evaluating the privatization of depot maintenance support and the realignment of maintenance work loads and Government personnel among Government contractors and organic maintenance organizations.

The 1995 BRAC recommended the realignment of Onizuka Air Station by deactivating the 750th Space Group and Detachment 2 of the Space and Missile Systems Center, Los Angeles, California, and relocating their functions to Falcon AFB, Colorado Springs, Colorado. The 1995 BRAC also deactivated the 1001st Space Systems Squadron (a detachment of the Space Systems Support Group, at Lowry AFB, Denver, Colorado) and recommended that some equipment and personnel be relocated to Peterson AFB, Colorado.

Definitions of Technical Terms

Missile early warning systems. Systems that provide early notification or warning of unknown missile weapons or weapon carriers to National Command Authorities for the defense of the United States.

Levels of software support. Levels of software support documented in a memorandum of understanding between the Air Force Space Command and the Air Force Materiel Command, dated February 16, 1993.

Level 1 software support. The Air Force Space Command operator-provided support that includes data base and system configuration changes within design limits.

Level 2 software support. The Air Force Materiel Command support that includes design, code, and test for all changes in mission (application) and support software and data bases.

Floorspace. In determining floorspace requirements for new construction, the Air Force delineates between administrative and technical space. Administrative space is determined through Air Force guidelines by using three different criteria for calculating gross floorspace, net floorspace, and net office space. Technical space is determined by the footprint of existing computer systems.

Space systems. All the devices and organizations forming the space network. The network includes spacecraft, ground control stations, and associated terminals. Those systems planned for Peterson AFB include the Air Force Satellite Control Network, the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program, the Global Positioning System, and Milstar.

Descriptions of Space and Missile Early Warning Systems

Air Force Satellite Control Network (the Network). The Network is a system of computers that support all aspects of satellite operations and test activities. The Network provides commanding, communications, dissemination, data processing, mission data telemetry, and tracking support to operational DoD space systems. The Network focuses principally on launch, early orbit, and anomaly resolution. It focuses secondarily on orbit management functions, vehicle state-of-health, and data requests by the vehicle system program offices and data users. The Network supports the Army Defense Satellite Communication System, the Defense Meteorological Satellite Program, the Defense Support Program, the Global Positioning System, and Milstar.

Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (the Satellite Program). The Satellite Program provides an enduring and survivable capability to collect and disseminate global cloud data and other specialized meteorological, oceanographic, space environmental and terrestrial data.

The Satellite Program is undergoing convergence with the Department of Commerce per the President's direction. The Government agency responsible for software support of the Satellite Program is undecided. The primary satellite center is expected to be in Suitland, Maryland, under the control of the Department of Commerce and the backup facility at Falcon AFB under the operational control of DoD.

Global Positioning System (the Positioning System). The Positioning System is a space-based radionavigation system that provides all-weather, continuous, precise, three-dimensional position, timing, and velocity information to users worldwide. The secondary mission of the system is to monitor nuclear detonation. The system is jointly managed by DoD and the Department of Transportation and has 24 operational satellites.

The Positioning System is maintained by contractors working on-site at the operational location, Falcon AFB. All testing is conducted on a segment of the operational computer. Phase II of the CISF will contain a hot mockup of the system for testing software.

Milstar Satellite System (Milstar). Milstar provides worldwide, survivable satellite telecommunications services to the strategic and tactical forces of the United States. Milstar is a DoD-wide operating system with an operational location for the mission control segment at Falcon AFB. Each satellite contains a communications payload to provide extremely high frequency, super high frequency and ultra high frequency communications capabilities. Each satellite also contains an onboard data processing subsystem, which, with the spacecraft software subsystem, supports autonomous control of the bus, payload, and spacecraft subsystems for extended periods.

Organizations Visited or Contacted

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Logistics, Washington, DC
- Assistant Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Maintenance Policy, Programs, and Resources), Washington, DC
  - Joint Depot Maintenance Analysis Group, Dayton OH

Ballistic Missile Defense Organization, Arlington, VA
- National Test Facility, Falcon AFB, Colorado Springs, CO

Department of the Army

U.S. Army Corp of Engineers, Omaha, NE

Department of the Air Force

Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Washington, DC

Air Force Materiel Command, Wright Patterson AFB, Dayton, OH
- Ogden Air Logistics Center, Hill AFB, Ogden UT
- Sacramento Air Logistics Center, McClellan AFB, Sacramento, CA
- Space and Missile Center, Los Angeles Air Force Station, Los Angeles, CA
- Space Systems Support Group, Peterson AFB, Colorado Springs, CO
  - Detachment 1, Lowry AFB, Denver, CO
  - Detachment 2, Falcon AFB, Colorado Springs, CO

Air Force Space Command, Peterson AFB, Colorado Springs, CO

Report Distribution

Office of the Secretary of Defense

Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Technology
  Director, Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange
Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Command, Control, Communications, and Intelligence)
Assistant Secretary of Defense (Economic Security)
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Logistics)
Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs)
Director, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization

Department of the Army

Auditor General, Department of the Army

Department of the Navy

Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Auditor General, Department of the Navy

Department of the Air Force

Secretary of the Air Force
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Manpower, Reserve Affairs, Installations, and Environment)
Auditor General, Department of the Air Force
Commander, Air Force Materiel Command
Commander, Air Force Space Command

Other Defense Organizations

Director, Defense Contract Audit Agency
Director, Defense Logistics Agency
Director, National Security Agency
  Inspector General, National Security Agency

Non-Defense Federal Organizations

Office of Management and Budget
National Security and International Affairs Division, General Accounting Office
Technical Information Center
Defense and National Aeronautics and Space Administration Management Issues
Military Operations and Capabilities Issues

Chairman and ranking minority member of each of the following congressional committees and subcommittees

Senate Committee on Appropriations
Senate Subcommittee on Defense, Committee on Appropriations
Senate Committee on Armed Services
Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs
House Committee on Appropriations
House Subcommittee on National Security, Committee on Appropriations
House Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
House Subcommittee on National Security, International Affairs, and Criminal Justice, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight
House Committee on National Security

Audit Team Members

This report was prepared by the Logistics Support Directorate, Office of the Assistant Inspector General for Auditing, DoD.

Mr. Shelton R. Young
Mr. John A. Gannon
Mr. Tilghman A. Schraden
Ms. Suzette Luecke
Mr. William Zeh
Mr. Keith M. Owens
Ms. Linh Truong
Ms. Jennifer Stephens