



093194

UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE
REGIONAL OFFICE
ROOM 226 870 NORTH MILITARY HIGHWAY
NORFOLK, VIRGINIA 23502

6A000355

January 7, 1975

093194

Lieutenant General Richard J Seitz, USA
Commander, Headquarters XVIII Airborne Corps
and Fort Bragg
Fort Bragg, North Carolina 28307

AGC 00128

Dear General Seitz.

We have completed a survey of the management of selected major equipment and commercial vehicles at Fort Bragg. The survey was concerned primarily with the adequacy of asset accountability and control. We also examined procedures and practices for distribution of excess equipment and made tests to determine whether certain vehicle requirements were justified based on use. Most of our work was confined to the U S Army Garrison, Fort Bragg Combat Support (hereafter referred to as Fort Bragg) and the 782nd Close Support Maintenance Battalion of the 82nd Airborne Division (hereafter referred to as Division)

The results of the survey were discussed with Colonel E. D. Pendleton, Jr, and other Fort Bragg and Division officials on October 10, 1974, and are summarized below for your information and action.

EXCESS EQUIPMENT

For 11 line items of equipment, there were excesses on hand valued at \$100,122 (see appendix I). These items were retained up to 26 months by some units although needed by other units. We believe this happened because units were not always requested to turn in excess items and did not always comply with requests that excesses be turned in. Further, appropriate action was not taken to enforce compliance. To avoid unnecessary procurement and obtain maximum use of available resources, it is important that only authorized equipment be acquired and retained. Excesses should be promptly turned in and made available to units needing them.

~~714093~~

093194

Surveillance over Fort Bragg equipment is the responsibility of the Director of Industrial Operations and a number of property book officers. In the past, this function was accomplished primarily through annual and semiannual inventories. We were advised, however, that future reviews of units' equipment status would be made quarterly.

The Division Property Book Officer (PBO) has surveillance responsibility for Division equipment. Each month the PBO reviews the equipment status of Division units and requires each unit to inventory and report on 10 percent of its equipment. Usually, when excesses are identified, the PBO requests they be turned in. In the past, these requests were generally by telephone and followup action, if any, was by the same method. Division officials told us that future requests for equipment turn-in would be in writing and that firm followup action would be taken to insure that excess items are promptly returned to the supply system.

These additional procedures, if properly implemented, should reduce equipment excesses and provide for more effective use of these assets.

UNREPORTED ASSETS

We identified Fort Bragg and Division equipment valued at \$185,000 that had not been included in the June 20, 1974, equipment status report. This consisted of six truck lifts and seven oscilloscopes worth \$177,000 and \$8,000, respectively. The Army asset reporting system is important in determining total equipment requirements because it provides inventory managers information on the locations and quantities of major items available in storage or in use.

We could not determine why the above items had not been reported. However, after discussing this matter with Fort Bragg personnel, action was taken to properly account for the unreported items.

EXCESS VEHICLES

As of August 6, 1974, Fort Bragg had 51 1/2-ton pickup trucks in excess of the 186 recommended by Headquarters, United States Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) in its report of November 9, 1973. Based on the cost of older models on hand, these excess vehicles were worth \$100,800.

We did not determine the reasons for acquiring these excesses. It appears, however, that a lack of timely action to cancel procurement of the pickups was a contributing factor, as the excesses were received

at Fort Bragg between February 27 and June 7, 1974, well after the FORSCOM report of November 1973. Likewise, we did not identify and evaluate the reasons for retaining these vehicles at Fort Bragg, but we made the following observations.

In April 1974, FORSCOM advised Fort Bragg that 1/2-ton pickups excess to those recommended in its November 1973 management survey be reported for disposition no later than May 20, 1974. In August 1974, shortly after we suggested that the excess pickups be turned in, FORSCOM stated that all excess vehicles would be transferred and again told Fort Bragg to immediately provide registration numbers for 30 pickups, as they were needed by other FORSCOM activities. In September 1974, we were told that action was underway to turn in 30 pickups and that an additional 21 would be reported for FORSCOM disposition instructions.

Low mileage indicates additional excesses

Fifty-four of Fort Bragg's 99 commercial sedans were driven less than the average annual standard of 14,000 miles as prescribed by the Army. The established standard of 14,000 miles is the minimum expected for sedans and is to be used to determine requirements and justify retention of these vehicles. Fifteen sedans were driven less than one-half the standard mileage as shown below.

<u>Miles driven (note a)</u>	<u>Number of sedans (note b)</u>
2,000 - 3,999	2
4,000 - 5,999	5
6,000 - 6,999	8
7,000 - 7,999	9
8,000 - 9,999	9
10,000 - 11,999	9
12,000 - 13,999	12
14,000 - and over	<u>39</u>
	<u>93</u>

^aIndicated mileage has been increased by 15 percent to recognize the impact of the 1973 fuel crisis.

^bOdometer readings not available for six of the 99 sedans.

We recognize that mileage is only one of the criteria used to determine vehicle requirements. However, we believe this is one of the most important factors. In view of this relatively low mileage, we suggest that Fort Bragg evaluate the need for its sedans.

- - - -

In most instances, corrective action was either started or promised during our survey. However, we would appreciate being advised within 30 days as to the final disposition of the matters discussed in this letter.

We appreciate the cooperation and courtesies extended our representatives during this survey.

Sincerely yours,

Walter H. Henson
Regional Manager

DS/pam

bc: Mr. Donald J. Horan (OP)
Mr. Fred J. Shafer (LCD)
Mr. Zebedee English (OAPS)

cc Commanding General
Headquarters, U S. Army Forces Command

EXCESS EQUIPMENT IDENTIFIED
AT FORT BRAGG AND DIVISION

	<u>Line item number</u>	<u>Nomenclature and Federal stock number</u>	<u>Quantity</u>	<u>Unit price</u>	<u>Total value</u>
Fort Bragg	J 43918	1 5 KW generator set FSN 6115-889-1446	8	\$ 708	\$ 5,664
		FSN 6115-774-9342	3	470	1,410
	Q 54174	Radio set AN/VRC-47 FSN 5820-223-7434	3	2,158	6,474
	N 30256	Oscilloscope AN/USM FSN 6625-984-6603	1	1,200	1,200
		FSN 6625-999-3592	1	1,151	<u>1,151</u>
					<u>\$15,899</u>
Division	W 62596	Tool set organizational maintenance Army air- craft FSN 4920-944-1004	1	11,160	^a 8,000
	N 30256	Oscilloscope AN/USM-140C FSN 6625-999-3592	7	1,151	8,057
		FSN 6625-228-2201	1	1,434	1,434
	J 43918	1 5 KW generator set FSN 6115-887-8644	14	473	6,622
		FSN 6115-889-1446	24	708	16,992

H 02165	Electronic shop transportable FSN 4940-999-1793	1		7,685
J 38301	60 KW generator set diesel engine FSN 6115-937-4388	1		10,524
A 33001	Alarm set anti-intrusion restricted area FSN 6350-179-1557	33	50	1,650
D 67057	Case parachutists individual weapons FSN 8465-261-4995	686	28	19,208
W 62185	Tool set organizational maintenance Army air- craft FSN 4920-944-0990	1		<u>4,051</u>
				<u>\$84,223</u>
			Total	<u><u>\$100,122</u></u>

^aTools valued at \$3,160 were not considered excess.