



# *REPORT TO THE CONGRESS*

LAW BRANCH  
THE ARMY 112246

## Possible Savings Available By Sending Men To Nearest Armed Forces Examining And Entrance Station B-162111

**Selective Service System**

*BY THE COMPTROLLER **GENERAL**  
OF THE UNITED STATES*

26  
DEC. 22, 1967

02.41



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B- 162111

To the President of the Senate and the  
Speaker of the House of Representatives

The General Accounting Office has reviewed selected aspects of the administration of registrant travel by the Selective Service System, and the accompanying report presents our findings and recommendation.

We found that not all local boards sent men to the nearest Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Station. Our review of **42** selected local boards showed that, if certain of those boards had sent their men to the nearest examining station in fiscal year 1966, savings of about \$67,000 could have been realized. If the conditions at these boards were typical of those at other boards, we estimate that nationwide the Selective Service System could have saved about \$600,000 in fiscal year 1966 if it had not transported men further than necessary for pre-induction examination and/or induction into the military service.

We believe that the basic causes of the uneconomical travel practice were that (1) State offices were not following the procedures prescribed by the National Headquarters **for** the selection of examining stations and (2) National Headquarters officials were not reviewing travel practices in the field to determine whether prescribed procedures had been carried out.

Under the law, the Selective Service System is responsible for providing transportation, **meals**, and lodging **for** the trip from the local draft boards to the Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Stations. In selecting examining stations, State offices are to consider such factors as travel costs, welfare of the men, and workload of the examining station.

Our review showed that during fiscal year 1966 some draft boards sent men to examining stations located from 11 to 173 miles further away than the nearest examining station. In our opinion, most of their reasons **for** doing so--discussed in the accompanying report--were not sound.

B- 162111

The Director of the Selective Service System, in commenting on our findings and proposals, stated that he would have reviews made of the movement of men to examining stations and that changes would be made where appropriate. He expressed the belief, however, that the annual **savings** that would be realized would not be **as** substantial as our estimate. The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) informed us that the Department of the Army would cooperate with the Selective Service System in this matter.

In the interest of ensuring continued management attention to this matter, we are recommending to the Director of Selective Service that the scope of reviews made during supervisory field visits by National Headquarters officials, including internal auditors, be broadened to include adequate coverage of the administration of registrant travel. We are reporting this matter to the Congress to show the substantial savings available to the Selective Service System by making greater use of examining stations located nearest to the local boards.

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Bureau of the Budget; the Secretary of Defense; and the Director of Selective Service.

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "James B. Axtell". The signature is written in a cursive style with a prominent initial "J".

Comptroller General  
of the United States

## C o n t e n t s

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION	4
Savings available by sending men to nearest Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Station	4
Arkansas, Mississippi, and Missouri	5
Michigan and Ohio	6
Agency comments and our evaluation	7
Recommendation to the Director of Selective Service	8
	<u>Appendix</u>
<b>APPENDIXES</b>	
Principal officials of the Selective Service System responsible for admin- istration of the activities discussed in this report	I 11
Examples of savings available through use of nearest AFEEES	II 12
Letter dated May 16, 1967, to the General Accounting Office from the Director of Selective Service	III 13
Letter dated June 6, 1967, to the General Accounting <b>Office</b> from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower)	IV 15

REPORT ON  
POSSIBLE SAVINGS AVAILABLE BY SENDING MEN TO  
NEAREST ARMED FORCES EXAMINING AND ENTRANCE STATION  
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

The General Accounting Office has made a review of selected aspects of the administration of registrant travel by the Selective Service System (SSS). Our review was made pursuant to the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67).

Our attention was directed to this matter when we noted that some local draft boards might be incurring additional costs for transportation, meals, and lodging by sending their registrants to other than the nearest Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Station (AFEES) for preinduction examination and/or induction into the military service. Our review was directed to that specific aspect of registrant travel and not to an overall evaluation of SSS travel procedures.

We made our review at the National Headquarters in Washington, D.C., and at six State Headquarters offices. The review included an examination of data relating to registrant travel from 2,089 local boards in 24 States.

BACKGROUND

The SSS, an independent agency in the executive branch of Government, was established by the Universal Military Training and Service (UMTS) Act<sup>1</sup> (62 Stat. 604; 50 U.S.C. app. 451). The purpose of the SSS is to assure the Armed

---

<sup>1</sup>Public Law 90-40, dated June 30, 1967, changed the name of this act to "Military Selective Service Act of 1967."

Forces a supply of manpower'adequateto ensure the security of the United States.

The functions of the SSS are carried out by about 4,070 local draft boards under the direction of 56 State Headquarters for Selective Service--one in each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, New York City, the Canal Zone, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam--and a National Headquarters office in Washington, D.C. Each State headquarters is headed by a State director of selective service who is responsible for carrying out the functions of the SSS within his area of jurisdiction.

The Universal Military Training and Service Act requires male citizens of the United States and all other male persons in the United States who are between the ages of 18 and 26 to register with the SSS. Each registrant, who is not otherwise deferrable, is sent to an AFEES for a preinduction examination to determine his acceptability for military service. If the registrant is found acceptable for military service, he may later be sent to an AFEES for induction.

The AFEESs are operated by the Department of the Army under the direction of the United States Army Recruiting Command. The recruiting district commanders and the State directors of selective service are responsible for maintaining liaison to ensure an orderly flow of registrants to the AFEESs.

The SSS is generally responsible for providing transportation, meals, and lodging for registrants sent to the AFEESs. The State directors are responsible for the administration of registrant travel and for the selection of the AFEESs used, taking into consideration such factors as cost to the Government, welfare of the registrants, and capacity of the AFEES. During fiscal year 1966, SSS spent about \$7.5 million for registrant travel, most of which was used to send about 1.7 million registrants to AFEESs for preinduction examinations and about 400,000 registrants for induction.

The names of the principal officials of the SSS responsible for administration of the activities discussed in this report are listed in appendix I.

## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION

### SAVINGS AVAILABLE BY SENDING MEN TO NEAREST ARMED FORCES EXAMINING AND ENTRANCE STATION

Our review of SSS registrant travel showed that not all local boards sent registrants to the nearest **AFEES**. Our further review of registrant travel of 42 selected local boards showed that, if certain of those boards had sent their registrants to the nearest AFEES in fiscal year 1966, savings of about \$67,000 could have been realized. If the conditions at these boards were typical of those at other boards, we estimate that nationwide the SSS could have saved about \$600,000 in Fiscal year 1966 by sending registrants to the nearest AFEES.

We believe that the basic causes of this uneconomical practice were that (1) State directors were not following the procedures prescribed by the National Headquarters for the selection of AFEESs and (2) National Headquarters officials were not reviewing travel practices in the field to determine whether prescribed procedures had been carried out.

We made a review of data relating to registrant travel in 24 States, which showed that, of the 2,089 local boards in these States, 196 boards, or 9.4 percent, were sending registrants to AFEESs that were located from 11 to 173 highway miles farther away than the nearest AFEES. We selected 42 of the 196 local boards for detailed review of registrant travel.

Our review indicated that, on the basis of transportation schedules and related traveling costs, it was more advantageous for 16 of the 42 local boards to continue sending registrants to the more distant AFEESs. In the case of the other 26 local boards, however, our review indicated that savings of about \$67,000 in travel costs could have been realized in fiscal year 1966 if the boards had sent their registrants to the nearest AFEES (see app. II), as discussed in the following sections.

## Arkansas, Mississippi, and Missouri

During fiscal year 1966, 16 local boards in Arkansas, Mississippi, and Missouri sent their registrants to AFEESs that required traveling for distances ranging from about 93 miles to 202 miles although the AFEES located at Memphis, Tennessee, would have required traveling for distances ranging from only about 10 to 120 miles. Our review indicated that, if the 16 local boards had sent their registrants to the Memphis AFEES during fiscal year 1966, savings of about \$41,000 could have been realized.

The Arkansas and Missouri state directors said that local boards had not sent registrants to the Memphis AFEES because the applicable Army recruiting district commanders had not designated the Memphis AFEES to process registrants from Arkansas and Missouri. We were informed by Department of Defense officials, however, that there was no prohibition against sending registrants from one recruiting district to another for preinduction examination and/or induction into the military service. Also, we noted that local boards in five States were sending registrants to AFEESs located in recruiting districts other than the one in which the boards were located.

Mississippi State Headquarters officials said that a study made in the early 1950's to determine the feasibility of sending registrants from local boards in northern Mississippi to the Memphis AFEES had resulted in 20 local boards' sending registrants to the Memphis AFEES. At the time of our review, 19 local boards were continuing to send registrants to the Memphis AFEES. We were informed that no recent studies concerning the travel of registrants to AFEES had been made. Our review indicated, however, that some savings could be realized if two additional local boards in northern Mississippi sent registrants to the Memphis AFEES.

The Commanding Officer of the Memphis AFEES informed us that there was adequate space and equipment available at the Memphis AFEES to handle additional workload. He also stated that, although an increase in the workload at the Memphis AFEES could result in the need for a larger staff to process the additional administrative work, he believed that any increases in staffing at the Memphis AFEES would be offset by

decreases in staffing at the AFEESs to which registrants are now being sent.

### Michigan and Ohio

We noted that, during fiscal year 1966, 10 local boards in Michigan and Ohio were sending their registrants to AFEESs requiring travel for distances ranging from about 109 to 179 miles. Had the nine Ohio local boards sent their registrants to the Detroit AFEES and had the one Michigan local board sent its registrants to the Chicago AFEES, the required travel would have ranged from about 57 to 135 miles and would have resulted in savings of about \$26,000.

The Ohio State Director informed us that the Ohio local boards were not sending registrants to the Detroit AFEES because it had been determined in 1956 that the Detroit AFEES had neither the space nor the personnel to process additional registrants. We found no evidence that the matter had received further consideration after 1956. The Commanding Officer, Detroit AFEES, said that during fiscal year 1966 the Detroit AFEES would have been able to handle the increase in the workload that would have resulted if the Ohio local boards had sent their registrants to the Detroit AFEES.

The Michigan State Director said that no studies had been made to determine the feasibility of the local board's sending the registrants to the Chicago AFEES primarily because the Detroit AFEES was able to process the registrants.

- - - -

As pointed out on page 4, our review of registrant travel for 2,089 local boards in 24 States showed that 196, or 9.4 percent, of these boards were not sending registrants to the nearest AFEES for preinduction examination and/or induction into the military service. Our detailed review of registrant travel at 42 of these 196 local boards showed that savings in registrant travel costs of about \$67,000 could have been realized in fiscal year 1966 by sending registrants to the nearest AFEES. If the movement of these registrants is typical of the movement of men at all 196 boards, we estimate that these boards could have realized savings of over \$300,000 in registrant travel costs in fiscal

year 1966 and that servicewide the savings could have been about \$600,000 by sending registrants to the nearest AFEES.

We recognize that factors other than the distances that registrants have to travel could have an effect on our estimate of the savings that might have been realized in fiscal year 1966. Our estimate is presented merely as an indication of the potential savings in registrant travel costs which may be realizable by sending registrants to the nearest AFEES.

In discussing the matter with officials at SSS National Headquarters, we were informed that, during their periodic field reviews, neither National Headquarters officials nor internal auditors had made reviews of the State directors' selection of AFEESs to which registrants were sent.

We therefore proposed to the Director of SSS that (1) he or the State directors make a review of registrant travel to determine whether local boards are keeping travel costs to a minimum by sending registrants, wherever feasible, to the nearest AFEES, (2) instructions and directives be issued to ensure that local boards send registrants, to the maximum extent practicable, to the nearest AFEES, and (3) arrangements be made with the Department of Defense to resolve any problems related to the capacity of AFEESs to process registrants that might result from a change in the movement of registrants.

#### Agency comments and our evaluation

The Director of Selective Service, in a letter dated May 16, 1967 (see app. III), in commenting on our finding and proposals, stated that he is asking the State directors to review the movement of registrants to AFEESs. He stated **also** that necessary changes would be undertaken where it was determined that justifiable savings could be realized without undue inconvenience to the registrants. Also he expressed the belief that the annual savings that would be realized by adopting our proposals would not be as substantial as our estimate of the savings that could have been realized in fiscal year 1966.

As previously stated, our estimates of the savings that could have been realized in fiscal year 1966 were presented merely as an indication that annual savings in registrants' travel costs are realizable by sending registrants to the nearest AFEES. We recognize that the amount of such savings is dependent on various factors, particularly the number of registrants required to have preinduction examinations and/or to meet induction calls.

We also brought our findings to the attention of the Department of Defense. The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), in a letter dated June 6, 1967 (see app. IV), informed us that the Department of the Army would cooperate fully with the SSS in accepting registrants at AFEESs in accordance with any plan developed by the SSS but that the implementation of such plan might require considerable lead time to make any necessary changes in the facilities and personnel strength of particular AFEESs.

We believe that the contemplated actions by the Selective Service System and the Department of the Army, if effectively carried out, should result in savings in registrant travel costs. However, we also believe that the National Headquarters should strengthen its management controls by making periodic field reviews to determine whether prescribed procedures for registrant travel are being complied with.

#### Recommendation to the Director of Selective Service

We recommend that the scope of reviews made during supervisory field visits by National Headquarters officials, including internal auditors, be broadened to include adequate coverage of the administration of registrant travel.

LI PONI

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS OF THE  
 SELECTIVE SERVICE **SYSTEM** RESPONSIBLE  
 FOR ADMINISTRATION OF THE ACTIVITIES  
 DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

		Tenure of office	
		From	To
DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE:			
	Lt. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey	July 1941	Present
STATE DIRECTORS OF SELECTIVE SERVICE:			
State	State Director		
Arkansas	Col. Fred M. Croom	Feb. 1955	Jan. 1967
Do.	Col. Willard A. Hawkins	Jan. 1967	Present
Indiana	Col. Robert K. Custer	June 1961	Present
Michigan	Col. Arthur A. Holmes	June 1952	Present
Mississippi	Col. James L. Davis	Oct. 1964	Present
Missouri	<b>Maj.</b> Gen. Laurence B. Adams, Jr.	Feb. 1965	Present
Ohio	Col. Raymond E. Clouse	Dec. 1960	Oct. 1966
Do.	Col. Heber L. Minton	Nov. 1966	Present

APPENDIX II

EXAMPLES OF SAVINGS AVAILABLE

THROUGH USE OF NEAREST AFEES

<u>State</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Local board No. and city</u>	<u>AFEES used</u>	<u>Nearest AFEES</u>	<u>Difference in mileage (one-way)</u>	<u>Potential savings in travel costs, fiscal year 1966</u>
Arkansas	Clay	11-Piggot;	Little Rock	Memphis	67	\$ 2,270
Do.	Craighead	16-Jonesboro	do.	do.	67	4,490
Do.	Crittenden	18-West Memphis	do.	do.	119	3,070
Do.	Cross	19-Wynne	do.	do.	49	1,160
Do.	Greene	2E-Paragould	do.	do.	66	2,070
Do.	Lee	35-Marianna	do.	do.	58	2,610
Do.	Mississippi	47-Blytheville	do.	do.	128	5,410
Do.	Phillips	54-Helena	do.	do.	54	4,190
Do.	Poinsett	56-Harrisburg	do.	do.	69	2,400
Do.	St. Francis	64-Forrest City	do.	do.	47	1,060
Do.	Mississippi	106-Osceola	do.	do.	116	3,420
Michigan	Berrien	11-Benton Harbor	Detroit	Chicago	89	18,080
Mississippi	Bolivar	6-Cleveland	Jackson	Memphis	18	380
Do.	do.	7-Rosedale	do.	do.	34	100
Missouri	Dunklin	35-Kennett	St. Louis	do.	86	2,800
Do.	New Madrid	76-Mew Madrid	do.	do.	46	2,020
Do.	Pemiscot	82-Caruthersville	do.	do.	99	3,840
Ohio	Lucas	73-Toledo	Cleveland	Detroit	52)	
Do.	do.	74- do.	do.	do.	52)	
Do.	do.	75- do.	do.	do.	52)	6,750
Do.	do.	76- do.	do.	do.	52)	
Do.	Defiance	34-Defiance	do.	do.	40)	
Do.	Henry	59-Napoleon	do.	do.	40)	
Do.	Paulding	96-Paulding	do.	do.	40)	510
Do.	Williams	125-Bryan	do.	do.	45)	
Do.	Fulton	44-Wauseon	do.	do.	48	760
						<u>\$67,390</u>



OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS  
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM1724 F STREET NW.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20435ADDRESS REPLY TO  
THE DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

16 May 1967

Honorable Elmer B. Staats  
The Comptroller General  
of the United States  
Washington, D. C. 20548

Dear Mr. Staats:

We have reviewed with interest the draft report covering a study made of Selectee Travel from several of the Selective Service Local Boards to Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Stations forwarded by Mr. Drenman's letter of March 30th. We recognize the report itself points to the fallacy of drawing conclusions to the probable amount of the savings from such a selected sample.

The sample was applied to Fiscal Year 1966 examination and induction load and was premised upon the additional capacity of certain examining stations. It may be true that at some time some station was not operating to capacity. However, the fact is that because of the rapid build-up as a result; of the President's announcement in July of 1965, nationally the stations were unable to handle the required examination load and it was necessary for Selective Service to draw out of their examined and acceptable pool nearly 100,000 more than those who vent in by acceptance at examination and were available to fill induction calls. The very heavy enlistments out of those examined and accepted helped produce this result but of the nearly 400,000 forwarded for induction, one out of four had to be taken from the pool which became seriously depleted. If an isolated station commander acknowledged additional capacity was available, it certainly was the exception rather than the rule during most of Fiscal Year 1966.

Although there is no prohibition against crossing army area lines in the forwarding of registrants for examination, it does increase the administrative workload at State Headquarters. This is where the forwarding schedules are made and where contact is maintained with the station commanders. The scheduling is not a unilateral action, but must be done with due regard to the station's capacity and requirements.

The fewer AFES involved in each state movement, the more efficient can be the State Headquarter's operation. The cost of extra work may well offset the savings of a few miles by scheduling small groups to several different places.

INSURE FREEDOM'S FUTURE—AND YOUR OWN—BUY UNITED STATES SAVINGS BONDS

Honorable Elmer 3. Staats  
The-Comptroller General  
of the United States

Because of the greater number forwarded in 1966 than in several previous **years**, we were able to save substantially by use of charter bus. This of course involves near capacity **bus loads** and often involves the movement of men from **several** boards. **It has** been consistently advantageous to move larger parties rather than several smaller ones.

Over recent years the common carrier transportation facilities have been withdrawn in many areas, which has complicated the movement of registrants.

In line with your recommendation, I **am asking** State Directors to review **the** movement of registrants for both examination and induction to determine if justifiable savings **can be made**. Registrants are now sent to 74 examining stations which are located in or adjacent to cities and obviously registrants moving to these stations from the city areas (a sizable portion of the number forwarded) **would not be** changed **as** far as existing stations are concerned. **We** believe **any** savings realized would not be as substantial as suggested in the report. **However**, if savings can be **realized** without **unduly** adding to **the** inconvenience of those concerned, they **will** be undertaken.

Sincerely yours,

  
DIRECTOR



MANPOWER

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20301

6 JUN 1967

Mr. **J.L.** DiGuisseppi  
Assistant Director  
Defense Division  
General Accounting Office  
Washington, D. C. 20548

Dear Mr. DiGuisseppi:

We have reviewed the draft Report to the Congress, "Potential Savings if Local Draft Boards Made Greater Use of Nearest Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Stations" forwarded with your letter of March 31, 1967.

It is noted that the report recommends that the Director of Selective Service (1) review or cause each State Director to make a review to determine whether the local boards are keeping travel costs at a minimum by using the facilities of the closest AFEESs in all practical instances, (2) issue such instructions and directives as are found necessary to ensure that local boards make use of the closest AFEESs to the maximum extent practicable, and (3) make the necessary arrangements with the Department of Defense to resolve any problems relating to the capabilities of the AFEESs to absorb these changes.

The Department of the Army, which is the Executive Agent for the Department of Defense having responsibility for the operation of the Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Stations, will cooperate fully in accepting registrants at the AFEES in accordance with any plan developed by the Selective Service System, provided facilities and staffing at the individual AFEES are adequate to process the anticipated workload.

If a proposed Selective Service System plan would result in a workload exceeding the capacity of a particular AFEES, consideration would have to be given to moving the AFEES to a larger facility or increasing the authorized personnel strength, or both. In this event, the Army would require a substantial lead time. Specific determinations in this regard can be made only after a detailed evaluation of the results of the Selective Service System review recommended in your draft report.

Sincerely,



Thomas D. Morris