

MINUTES OF THE 2003 COMMAND CE VEHICLE MANAGERS' WORKSHOP

1-3 April 2003

Mr. Potts, HQ AFMC/CEOM, introduced Lt Col Sohan, same office, who welcomed the group to Wright-Patterson AFB OH and the 2003 Command CE Vehicle Managers' Workshop. Lt Col Sohan highlighted vehicles as one of CE's most important commodities and stressed the important role they played in assisting our professional craftspeople in meeting the mission. The group, chaired by HQ AFCESA/CEOK, worked the agenda through to completion establishing new action items to resolve problem areas in policy, vehicle/equipment definition, and acquisition of CE special purpose vehicles and equipment. The expertise in attendance ensured the workshop's success.

1. New Action Items:

a. ACTION ITEM #03-01. Vehicle Support for the AF-Directed Recycling Program.

(1) The recycling program is/will shortly be a directed program. This program at many locations is being performed by existing contracted services, Non-Appropriated Funds (NAF) activities or in-house. Where recycling programs are not profitable for NAF activities, BCEs are being directed to assume the responsibilities. For those in-house locations, additional vehicle and manpower are required to support the recycling program. BCEs were forced to take vehicle and personnel requirements out-of-hide, causing shortages in their normal base maintenance operational requirements.

(2) This initiative was established to determine the actual vehicles needed to support a normal recycling program and work to establish allowances in AS-019 to meet the need. As with most vehicle increases required to support additional responsibilities, Transportation's 1988 AF/ILGP Zero Growth policy (see AFI 24-301) is restricting BCEs in gaining vehicle assets to meet the new mission imposed by the Wing or Base Commander.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOK

OCRs: ALMAJCOMs

SUSPENSE: HQ AFCESA/CEOK - Query MAJCOMs to determine who is performing this function and where the vehicle support is coming from. ECD: Sep 03
- From that query, define a package of vehicles common to all recycling programs for inclusion into AS-019. ECD: Dec 03

b. ACTION ITEM #03-02. Request current procedures be improved to allow end customer participation/input to the vehicle buy ordering data process.

(1) Currently, some BCEs are not provided tentative vehicle allocation notices much less the opportunity to order optional items necessary to equip their vehicles for their intended use. Consequently, replacement assets show up at bases unannounced and ill equipped to meet base

needs. Bases must be notified of what is being procured, from which manufacturer, and provided with a listing of the optional accessories (ordering data) available for the vehicle being procured. For those already receiving this information, they requested adequate lead time to respond to the request properly.

(2) AFCESA was requested to work with Air Staff, MAJCOM/LGTVs, and WR-ALC in developing a procedure/timeline (min 60 days) to allow for full user participation.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOK

OCRs: Air Staff, MAJCOM/LGTVs, WR-ALC

SUSPENSE: Work with AF/ILEG, WR-ALC/LESVG, and MAJCOM/LGTVs to ensure a reliable, cross-command process that will ensure all bases receive tentative allocations in a timely manner, with a minimum time of 60 days to respond to a base transportation request for information. ECD: Dec 03

c. ACTION ITEM #03-03. Base Contract involvement in Management Equipment & Evaluation Program (MEEP) projects.

(1) At the completion of many MEEP projects; the evaluators, based on the positive performance of the tested item, want to purchase the item for continued use. In many cases, this happens without incident, but for all the successes there have been challenges. Some base legal or contracting offices do not allow the unit to purchase the tested item, but do allow for competitive bidding for it or a like item. This negates the intent of MEEP, buying an untested "or equal" item for actual use.

(2) It was recommended that the AF MEEP Management Office consult with the local base contracting (PK) and legal (JA) before assigning equipment or vehicles for evaluation. This would make PK and JA aware that an evaluation was being considered and place them in a position to purchase the item if requested.

(3) Recommend AFI 24-305 (Management and Equipment Evaluation Program), paragraph 1.3.9, be changed to read: Consult with contracting (PK) and legal (JA) authorities on projects where products need to be bought, leased or evaluated on loan.

OPR: AF MEEP Office

OCR: HQ AFCESA/CEOK

ECD: Sep 03

d. ACTION ITEM # 03-04. Allowance Standards, AS-464 BCOA - Heavy Repair Pavements/Equipment, ASA-464 BDOA - Heavy Repair/Grounds, and ASA-464 BFOA - Heavy Repair/Railroad Track Maintenance review.

(1) AS-464 BCOA contains the Pavements and Equipment section's base support equipment items. AS-464 BCOA contains items like pavement breakers, loose material spreaders, and bituminous heating kettles. It was recommended and agreed to by the attending MAJCOMs that a review of the AS was required to update the standards with needed equipment items.

(2) This review will be worked through the allowance section at WR-ALC/LETA. WR-ALC/LETA will initiate/coordinate the review through the MAJCOM/CE/LGS and AFCESA will host a workshop to update the AS based on the review.

OPRs: HQ AFCESA/CEOK and WR-ALC/LETA

OCRs: MAJCOM/CE/LGS/AFCESA

SCHEDULE: - HQ AFCESA notifies MAJCOMs of review date (NLT Aug 03)

- During the review, the AS will be annotated with the changes/additions/deletions generated. MAJCOM/CEs will be tasked to provide request for cataloging action of any new item added to AS 30 days from review date.
- After the review, the Allowance Manager at WR-ALC/LETA will update the AFEMS COO1 to incorporate all changes generated from the review. When completed, a copy of the AS reflecting the changes will be forwarded to AFCESA by e-mail for distribution to the MAJCOMs LGS and CE functionals.

e. ACTION ITEM# 03-05. Determining The Towing Capabilities of Vehicles.

(1) Determining the lbs/tons a vehicle can tow safely is sometimes difficult because all the information necessary to make the proper decision is not always available. An overload of a vehicle could easily result, creating an increased safety risk by not knowing the vehicle's limits.

(2) HQ AFCESA/CEOK was tasked to gather and provide the necessary information to determine a vehicle's towing capacity.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOK provide process for determining towing requirements.

SUSPENSE: Nov 03

f. ACTION ITEM# 03-06. WR-ALC No-Buy Listing.

(1) Each year WR-ALC publishes a no-buy list for vehicles not being procured for that given year. MAJCOM/CEs wanted to know how, when, where, and why some of their standard, everyday vehicles appear on the list while still remaining on a base's Vehicle Authorization Listings (VAL) and require urgent replacement.

(2) HQ AFCESA/CEOK was tasked to provide the (a one-time thing) rationale for what is/is not on the list.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOK

SUSPENSE: Dec 03

2. Briefing(s):

a. Management & Equipment Evaluation Program (MEEP).

BRIEFER: Mr. Charles F. Batchelor, Chief, AF MEEP

Mr. Batchelor presented a briefing on MEEP explaining what it is and how it operates. He explained MEEP's history, mission, and concept of operations. He also explained the benefits to the government and industry, and gave an overview on the status of past and current projects. Mr. Batchelor spoke briefly about the consolidation of MEEP, the role of MAJCOM representatives, and the need for more projects. Mr. Batchelor concluded his briefing by providing a review of past, present, and proposed projects.

b. Waste Recycling.

BRIEFER(s): Mr. Parker, 88 ABW/CE-2, and Mr. Clendenin, 88th ABW/EMY

(1) Mr. Parker, 88 ABW/CE-2, and Mr. Clendenin, 88 ABW/EMY (environmental), presented a briefing on the recycling program at Wright-Patterson. Their effort was to describe the benefits and cost avoidance savings gained by a successfully managed program. In addition, they requested assistance in vehicle support from the group which pointed more to a MAJCOM-specific problem than one that covers all MAJCOMs. For resolution of that specific program, the group left to AFMC.

(2) Ms. Brown, Ctr, AF/ILVEQ, and Ms. Carper, AFCEE/EQP, were in attendance during the discussion and stated that the recycling program will be mandatory for all AF installations regardless of cost effectiveness. AFI 32-7080 is currently under revision and will eliminate all references to recycle programs being "cost effective." In the past, bases were having difficulties getting vehicle authorizations established because some base recycling programs were and are still not cost effective. Vehicle support was rejected when the program was not cost effective.

(3) In 2002, an action item was initiated to update AS-019 with the recycling vehicle program requirements included. The AS-019 review concluded without final resolution to recycling needs. A new action item was created to resolve this issue (see AI #03-01) to include a survey of bases to determine who, what, where, and how the recycling program was being managed. From that survey, vehicle allowances would be requested to be placed in AS-019 to support base recycling programs.

3. Discussion Topics:

a. **Zero Growth:** Zero growth was initiated in 1988 to curb any new vehicle increases without a corresponding mission increase. Mission increases were those supported by a POM, OPLAN, or PPLAN. In 1988, the vehicle inventory was approximately 140K strong while today, through base closures, force downsizing, and the zero growth policy, it is down at a level of approximately 81/82K.

(1) Periodically, the appropriate MAJCOM/LGTV conducts base vehicle validations to ensure the correct vehicles are provided to meet mission requirements. In addition, low use vehicles are challenged to ensure the authorization is still required. If not fully utilized, it is deleted and the customer is left to lease to meet the short-term need if still required. In some instances, these reductions are used to offset increases for additional vehicles determined necessary to meet current mission requirements; however, in many instances valid vehicle requirements recognized by both the requester and the validation team are disapproved because they are not accompanied by a POM, OPLAN, or PPLAN as defined in AFI 24-301. It is automatically expected that if the customer can't justify the need adequately to Transportation, the authorization should be rejected.

(2) At the conclusion of the discussion, CE's position was that the Zero Growth Policy should be withdrawn, leaving vehicle management and the customer the ability to make valid decisions concerning vehicle needs based on today's requirements. Transportation representatives present recognized that CE gained additional workloads from sources other than POMs, OPLANs, or PPLANS, and the guidance in AFI 24-301 did not address or allow for these increases. AF/ILGP agreed to review the situation and provide further guidance if change was deemed necessary. Additionally, AF/ILGP stated that no MAJCOM/LGTV has requested Air Staff reduce their vehicle command ceilings based on continued reductions and MAJCOM/LGTVs could authorize these bank-rolled authorizations in these instances. Bottom line, bases are being denied vehicle authorizations based on the Zero Growth policy when both the customer and the validating official recognize the need.

RECOMMENDATION: MAJCOM/CEOs are requested to have bases document their efforts to gain the vehicles required to meet mission requirements, and once documented, provide them to HQ AFCESA/CEOK for consolidation. If deemed necessary based on the volume of rejections, HQ AFCESA/CEOK will address our shortfalls with AF/ILE for resolution.

b. **Contingency Support Vehicles.** Bases were tasked to provide vehicle support for ENDURING FREEDOM from the existing base maintenance support fleet. Although all agreed support for the contingency was required and supported, replacement vehicles are slow in coming. Some bases have been given lease-to-buy authority with lease monies provided while others have received nothing. At the conclusion, no recommendations were provided to improve the replacement process and bases would have to support Transportation's efforts to gain additional funding to replace the tasked assets.

c. **CE Vehicle Allocations and Budget Cuts Notifications.** BCEs are increasingly being required to be more involved in the sourcing of vehicles to support mission requirements. Deployed, salvaged, or open authorizations for special purpose vehicles are being filled by the BCE through lease and/or leasing to buy options. In determining whether lease or lease/purchase is appropriate, it is vital that the BCE be provided FY tentative vehicle allocation due-ins, as well as any cancellations to determine lease and lease/purchase requirements. Since all MAJCOMs/bases were not having this notification problem, it was recommended to those that are having this problem to contact their MAJCOM Transportation counterparts and work all avenues to make this information available to the BCEs. If their efforts were unsuccessful, they would

provide document actions taken thus far to resolve the problem. Based on the information provided, HQ AFCESA/CEOK would elevate the problem for resolution.

d. **Vehicles for Training.** HQ AETC/LGTV is the responsible agency for supplying/replacing vehicles to support 3E2X1 training at Fort Leonard Wood MO. With the vehicle budget replacing only approximately 6% of the vehicles, the training facility requested assistance in acquiring the vehicles required to support training. Several alternatives were addressed: Funding off the top of the vehicle buy program, lease and lease-to-buy, and MAJCOM/CE funding support based on numbers of students trained. After review, it was found the Transportation community replaced their training vehicles using the same priority process as the rest of the AF and the training division lacked the funds to lease or lease/purchase these assets. After discussion, the third alternative; i.e., MAJCOM O&M funding support was deferred to the Training Committee for consideration, and if found favorable would forward to the Program Review Committee.

e. **Sweeper Depot Overhaul Program.** Concern was expressed over the overhaul of our aged sweeper fleet without the benefit of including new technological improvements, not to mention the loss of the asset for as much as a year (overseas locations) to accomplish the overhaul. Currently, a 1988 model year sweeper being overhauled is returned to the user as a new 1988 model sweeper with the same technology as provided in 1988. Improvements such as additional water carrying capacity to improve dust suppression; hydraulically controlled gutter brooms for improved curb cleaning; high-speed heads for more efficient runway sweeping, etc., are not provided under this contract. Although performance was challenged after being overhauled, little documented evidence was provided to support the claims.

It is important for the end customer to understand how the depot overhaul program functions. Based on requirements generated by the base to their MAJCOMs, WR-ALC maintains a contract to support their overhaul requirements. The number of sweepers projected for overhaul are determined by Base Transportation Maintenance units through evaluations of their current sweepers determining if it is a candidate for overhaul or replacement. It is important to remember that every sweeper overhauled reduces the vehicle priority buy program requirement by approximately \$109K. Depot dollars are a different funding line. It has been reported that some MAJCOM/LGTVs are excluding sweepers from the vehicle priority buy program allowing only depot overhaul for maintaining the airfield sweeper fleet. Bases are encouraged to inspect and report any deficiencies encountered from a depot-repaired sweeper to their Transportation maintenance and to their MAJCOM/CE vehicle representative. Any significant documentation will be gathered by HQ AFCESA/CEOK and worked to a satisfactory resolution.

4. **Old Action Items: Completed and deleted**

a. **ACTION ITEM #01-01.** Develop guidance to assist MAJCOM vehicle managers to better define/identify vehicle requirements.

b. **ACTION ITEM #01-02.** Develop a method/avenue to integrate vehicle issues into the CE corporate structure.

c. **ACTION ITEM #01-03.** Determine impact on CE modernization efforts as HQ USAF/ILTV reduces MEEP manpower positions from 12 to 6/7 positions and consolidates the MEEP at Langley AFB VA. Ensure position description (PD) best demonstrates CE needs and CE makes selection.

5. Old Action Items: Open

a. **ACTION ITEM #01-05. Migrate the current IWIMS Vehicle Management Program to ACES.**

(1) Currently, IWIMS contains a vehicle program designed to assist the VCO/VCNCOs in managing the CE vehicle fleet. ACES will soon replace IWIMS and the question was raised, should this vehicle management program be updated and moved from IWIMS to ACES? A quick survey of the MAJCOMs indicated the majority was not currently using the program. This made it necessary to survey the bases to check the level of usage there. The first objective is to determine if the program is being used and is it needed?

(2) CE data in IWIMS is input manually, while the same data is maintained at Transportation's Vehicle Maintenance Branch under a program called On-Line Vehicle Interactive Management System (OLVIMS). Maintenance data is used to validate IWIMS data, so why is it necessary to keep two separate databases when one can be easily electronically accessed and data reports designed to meet CE needs? The group agreed OLVIMS would be used should the program be required in ACES.

Discussions led to several taskings. They were:

(a) Suspend MAJCOMs (30-day turnaround) to query their bases concerning their awareness of the current program and to validate its need.

(b) At the same time, suspend MAJCOMs to query their bases to identify program content. HQ AFCESA/CEOM will provide the current program's content containing an explanation of each data field and a program worksheet that allows bases to select/deselect the data fields necessary for the program. Blank data entries will be available for bases to identify new data fields.

(c) The results of this survey will generate the basic information plus any new data fields needed for the new ACES vehicle management program. Survey data indicating there is no further requirement for this program will be provided to the ACES working group for documentation.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOM

OCRs: ALMAJCOMs

ECD: Completed Sep 01

STATUS:

1. MAJCOMs/Bases were surveyed to determine the content of the vehicle program to be developed in ACES. Information was provided to the ACES IPT to use as evaluation criteria for selected commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) programs that may or may not be suitable for CE use instead of developing internal programs. Evaluation revealed that all of the COTS programs could interface with the AF vehicle maintenance program and develop screens to accommodate our requirements. Total review of COTS programs pending.

2. HQ USAF/ILTV (M) was provided our requirements for review and indicated interface with the local base vehicle maintenance programs was doable. A recent meeting with Gunter SSG confirmed interface and supported the necessary screens to provide CE data, plus the possible use of AD-HOC queries.

STATUS: Transportation SSG has placed a hold on our request for the interface with the base maintenance records database. This stop was placed on our request because the decision has not been made as to which direction they will take in upgrading their programs. They are presently in the process of reviewing COTS management programs for possible use instead of their current OLVIMS program. Until that decision is made and the conversions are made, our request will remain on hold. CE has made its decision that ACES will be managed through a COTS program from Caver-Morehead. This program contains a vehicle management portion believed to be a viable substitute until Transportation comes back on-line. A review of the data screens and what kind of database reports are available will be made. If the current Caver-Morwhead program is usable as a temporary measure, a meeting will be held to allow base-level VCO/VCNCOs the opportunity to review/modify the screens to better meet their needs.

3. It is estimated that the basic review on the screens and a determination as to the need for a meeting of the VCNCO should be complete by Oct 03. The actual meeting will be NLT 30 Jan 04. From this meeting, if held, we will ask Caver-Morehead to make the changes to enable the VCNCOs to temporarily use this program.

b. ACTION ITEM #01-07. Conduct an AS-019 Review.

(1) AS-019 contains all the vehicle allowances a BCE should need to perform the CE mission at a normal or average base. Please keep in mind that each allowance has to be justified before it becomes a valid authorization and any additional requirement over and above these common allowances is requested using the Command Unique Allowance designator; i.e., AS-021 belongs to AFSPC and AS-022 belongs to USAFE.

(2) Members of the group indicated there is a growing concern that some of the allowances may not meet the needs of the BCE. Since AS-019 has not been reviewed in over 10 years, MAJCOMs indicated a review was in order. After a short discussion, it was agreed a review would be conducted only if a survey of the bases indicated changes were required. HQ AFCESA will request MAJCOMs to query their bases to validate the need for a review. On 2 Apr 01, HQ AFCESA sent out copies of the ASRS to the MAJCOMs for distribution to the bases to assist in the determination. In addition, it was decided certain elements of the standard would not be considered for review (all readiness standards, Fire, EOD, the Operation's "single

BOI," and snow removal). Snow removal is in the middle of a significant upgrade and exact performance capabilities of the new units are not yet validated.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOM
OCRs: ALMAJCOMs
ECD: Aug 03

STATUS: A letter dated 23 May 01 requested MAJCOMs initiate the AS-019 review, asking each base within their command to review the allowance standards, making comments and recommendations as to which allowances required attention. This action was complete and a meeting was set for Nov 01. 9/11 cancelled the review and all agreed to hold the review in conjunction with the 2002 workshop.

The AS-019 review was conducted the week of 28 Mar 02 and revisions were made to numerous allowance standards. The minutes were approved and posted. HQ AFCESA/CEOK sent a letter of change request to HQ USAF/ILTV (now ILGP) requesting they coordinate the requests with all MAJCOM/LGTVs and approve as written. ECD was 30 Sep 02. Latest estimated completion date was 30 Apr 03. Awaiting ILGP action.

c. **ACTION ITEM #02-01.** Request HQ USAF/ILTV revise AFI 24-301, Chapter 5, paragraph 5.3, eliminating the "Zero Growth" policy.

(1) This change would allow MAJCOM/base LGTVs to approve/disapprove authorization requests based on actual requirements rather than disapprove a request based only on the downward-directed zero growth policy. The majority of the voting members felt the purpose and intent of the 1988 established zero growth policy has achieved its goal and should be rescinded. Its intent was to reduce the number of vehicle authorizations to a level matching the reduction in forces. We supported that effort and have reduced our level of general and special purpose vehicles and equipment to a level commensurate with our current training requirements and workload.

(2) Currently, civil engineers experience growths in manpower and mission without much to do or fanfare and require vehicles to support these increases. However, when requests are made to offset these mission increases, the increased workload is recognized by the vehicle Transportation-approving authorities, but often times disapproved based on the 1988 imposed zero growth policy. We would request each authorization be approved based on its own merit.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOK
SUSPENSE: Letter of request to HQ USAF/ILTV - Complete

STATUS: A letter was sent to HQ USAF/ILEX for signature and forwarded to HQ USAF/ILGP on 1 May 03. Awaiting ILGP response.

d. **ACTION ITEM #02-02. Identify a War Readiness Material (WRM) snow removal package(s) and once identified, gain Air Staff support for funding and placement.**

(1) Past, present, and future activities have identified the requirement for dedicated WRM snow removal equipment packages at PACAF, USAFE, and CENTAF that can be used to support Air Force forward locations. Past requirements have been met with snow removal equipment from the existing fleet, placing a strain on mission capabilities at those units having to provide snow equipment to a deployed location. The fleet, although now just starting a modernization initiative, is still inadequate and consists of antiquated, inferior equipment. Mandating the redistribution of current base snow removal equipment assets only detracts from their required mission and increases the opportunities for aircraft mishaps.

(2) MAJCOMs stated the need for WRM snow removal package(s) and requested HQ AFCESA/CEOK work the issue. First, MAJCOMs would be requested to provide a basic snow removal package based on their requirements. HQ AFCESA would review and consolidate input from the MAJCOMs for concurrence on the configuration of the final set(s) of WRM snow removal equipment. Once the set(s) were identified, HQ AFCESA would champion the requirement to Air Staff for action.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOK

OCRs: Air Staff and ALMAJCOMs

SUSPENSE: Request MAJCOMs provide tentative snow removal set configuration. Letter to MAJCOMs, Jul 02

Identify tentative set configuration to MAJCOMs for approval. Back to MAJCOMs, Oct 02

Request Air Staff support establishing WRM snow removal equipment package(s), Dec 02

Once the set is approved by the MAJCOMs, a UTC will be requested by HQ AFCESA/CEX to establish the sets at the predetermined locations.

ECD: Jul 04

STATUS: Letter was sent to all MAJCOMs 23 Jul 02 requesting MAJCOMs support for the WRM packages by providing a listing of vehicles/equipment by size, type, and quantity they perceived to be the required package configuration. The following commands provided responses. HQs USAFE, AETC, AMC, and AFMC would provide their consent to establishing the WRM package by providing their set configuration recommendations to AFCESA NLT 1 Sep 03. From that point, a consolidated set will be developed by AFCESA and provided to all MAJCOMs for approval.

e. ACTION ITEM #02-03. Allowance Standard AS-019 action - replace current RRR excavator with new vehicle identified and justified by the readiness community.

The readiness community is currently changing out the excavator for RRR and replacing it with a new vehicle configuration. As CE functional focal point for AS-019, HQ AFCESA/CEOK has agreed to request and coordinate the excavator change in the RRR set with HQ USAF/ILTV and MAJCOM/LGTVs.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOK

OCR: HQ AFCESA/CEXR

SUSPENSE: 30 days after receipt of request from HQ AFCESA/CEXR
ECD: Complete – 9 Jun 03

STATUS: HQ AFCESA/CEX was provided the specifications of the current excavator and sources for available commercial sources of new excavators. In Dec 02, a meeting was held at Nellis AFB to review and define today's performance requirements for the new replacement excavator. The new specifications were prepared for all MAJCOM/CEs/LGTVs for coordination. Currently, HQ USAFE/LGTV has non-concurred with the package based on the number of optional accessories and their recommendation to have the asset provided by AFCAP instead of providing the asset through the AF procurement system. Once a resolution has been reached with USAFE, AFCESA will forward the requirement to WR-ALC/LESV for all future ADR excavator acquisitions. ECD: Jul 03

f. ACTION ITEM #02-04. Provide tentative FY vehicle allocations to all MAJCOM CE vehicle program managers.

(1) Under current practices, base customers are supposed to be involved in identifying each vehicle's configuration required to meet job requirements during the acquisition process. Most customers are not notified of the allocations or are requested to provide their recommended configuration requirements. Since WR-ALC/LESVG now uses manufacturer's brochures instead of MIL-SPECS or Commercial Item Description (CIDS) to purchase our requirements, it is critical the customer be involved in the original vehicle configuration process.

(2) To ensure this happens and customers are notified of tentative vehicle allocations, MAJCOMs requested they receive a courtesy copy of any tentative allocations sent to their LGTVs by WR-ALC. WR-ALC/LESVG stated they were not authorized to do this but would, if HQ AFCESA requested, ask MAJCOM/LGTVs to approve allowing WR-ALC provide HQ AFCESA a courtesy copy of all CE allocations. If approved, HQ AFCESA/CEOK would then forward all MAJCOM allocations to the respective MAJCOM and provide any assistance requested. All agreed to this approach.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOK
SUSPENSE: Letter of request to WR/ALC - Sep 02
ECD: Dec 03

STATUS: Letter requesting above information was sent to WR-ALC/LESV 19 Aug 02. WR-ALC/LESV queried the MAJCOM/LGTVs and they disagreed with WR providing AFCESA with the yearly allocations for CE vehicles. After discussion, it was agreed that the affected MAJCOMs would go back to their LGTV counterpart and establish a procedure/avenue for getting the allocation notices. If this is not successful, we would re-engage this action item and request assistance from higher HQ. ECD: Jul 03

g. ACTION ITEM #02-05. Establish CE vehicle liaison position at WR-ALC/LE.

(1) Currently, the difficulties encountered during the vehicle acquisition process require close support from the engineers to ensure the correct items are being procured and the user has

the opportunity to provide the ordering data necessary for the asset to be properly equipped once delivered to the unit. To this end, a HQ AFCESA subordinate position serving as CE vehicle liaison at Robins would greatly enhance our abilities to meet the engineer's needs. It was agreed this request be made by HQ AFCESA/CEOK. This action was endorsed by the WR-ALC/LESVG members present.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOK
SUSPENSE: 31 Mar 03
ECD: Dec 04

STATUS: Unofficial contact was made with WR-ALC/LESV to ensure they still agreed to accept the position if approved. They concurred providing all work accomplished by this position with regards to vehicle authorizations and performance requirements, etc. was first coordinated and approved by the MAJCOM/LGTVs. No further action has been taken. Open for discussion.

(2) After discussion it was agreed that this position was critical to ensure the CE community was integrated with the acquisition agencies ensuring our minimum needs are being met. HQ AFCESA/CEOK will develop justification and duties of the position and elevate for approval and funding for a military 3E291 position.

h. ACTION ITEM #02-06. Crane Certification and Inspection.

(1) The group was concerned that current guidance for the inspection and certification process for cranes was difficult to locate and the guidance available was confusing. The group requested HQ AFCESA research crane certification requirements and practices and any related safety requirements currently imposed. In addition, the responsibility for carrying out the certifications was questioned.

(2) HQ AFCESA agreed to research the appropriate AFIs, OSHA, and AFOSH standards and make the findings known to the MAJCOMs by placing them on the AFCESA homepage. At the conclusion of the discussion, MSgt Tichota, HQ PACAF, volunteered to assist in the research.

OPR: HQ AFCESA/CEOK
OCR: HQ PACAF
SUSPENSE: Publish findings on the AFCESA homepage, Mar 03
ECD: Dec 03

STATUS: Information is still being gathered and AFIs are being reviewed/updated by HQ AFCESA/CEOF. ECD – Dec 03