DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT CO
2521 SOUTH CLARK STREET, SUITE 600
ARLINGTON, VA 22202
TELEPHONE: 703-699-2950
FAX: 703-699-2735

DCN: 5962

July 25, 2005
JCS# 23

Chairman:
The Honorable Anthony J. Principi

Commissioners:
The Honorable James H. Bilbray
The Honorable Philip E. Coyle, III
Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.)
The Honorable James V. Hansen
General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.)
General Lloyd W. Newton, USAF (Ret.)
The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner
Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)

Executive Director:
Charles Battaglia

Mr. Bob Meyer
Director
BRAC Clearinghouse
1401 Oak St.
Rosslyn, VA 22209

Dear Mr. Meyer:

I respectfully request a written response from the Department of Defense concerning the following requests which were generated from BRAC recommendations generated by the Technical Joint- Cross Service Group(TJCSG).

<u>Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (TECH-6)</u>

In a TJCSG letter to Chairman Principi dated June 30, 2005, you attempted to state what elements would transfer from OSSG Maxwell/Gunter to Hanscom AFB. Please clarify what is meant by operational activities that should remain at OSSG and what elements should be transferred to Hanscom. In this letter, it was stated that Air Force Materiel Command would provide the exact authorizations that wil remain a t Maxwell and what will transfer to Hanscom. We have not received this information. Please provide it. Also, provide the same typ of information concerning DFSG personnel expected to relocate from Wright Patterson AFB to Hanscom.

Is the movement of OSSG in line with Air Force's future plans t consolidate network operations and how does that relate to the netw operations center at Maxwell-Gunter? Is this in line with DISA's pl create Mission Centers that will interact with service network oper centers? If you can't address the DISA question, who should we What provision has been made (square footage) by Hanscom to accommodate mission essential contractors from Maxwell-Gun and WPAFB (DFSG)? What is the cost included in COBRA an of space is involved (laboratory, office, etc.)?

Defense Research Service Led Laboratories (TECH-22)

Rome Research Site

Did the TJCSG take into account the requirements of specific lab customer programs that are classified or special access (and may require SCIFs) during its evaluation of laboratories to determine how realignments and consolidations would impact these programs?

What funding is estimated in COBRA for setting-up and moving the Sensor Radar System to Dayton? What funding is included in COBRA that moves this system as well as MILCON, moving and re-establishing radars, antennas, jammers and other specialized facilities and equipment currently located at Rome?

Did the TJCSG evaluate and determine the ability to secure the necessary FCC licenses and frequency clearances required to operate the radars, jammers and antennas that would relocate from Rome to Dayton? Were topography and local interference issues analyzed to see if these radars meet mission requirements?

Will WPAFB area have access to radar sites currently located in Newport and Stockbridge, NY which are used by the Rome Sensor Directorate for their respective programs?

What is the basis for realigning the WPAFB Information Directorate to Hanscom when all other proposed Air Force Research Laboratory realignments sought to enhance military value by consolidating labs to their focus areas (e.g., sensors to sensors); realign labs to highest military value locations; and reduce the number of lab locations to reduce cost? What is the rationale for this realignment when it is inconsistent with the underlying objectives of the TJCSG? Why move the WPAFB Information Directorate to Hanscom when all registered scenarios that it considered for the Air Force Research Lab Information Directorate had all of the Information Directorate either in Rome, or Hanscom and never considered a split location?

Was the move of the WPAFB Information Directorate to Hanscom and not Rome an error? When the Infrastructure Executive Council rejected the recommendation to move Rome Information Directorate to Hanscom on 5/4/05, did it forget to go back and change the realignment scenario for WPAFB base on the decision to maintain Rome Information Directorate at Rome?

Army Research Laboratory, Glenn, Ohio

What impact will moving this research to Aberdeen have on the synergy developed between Army and NASA? NASA scientists and engineers at NASA Glenn have collaborated for 40 years because it saves national resources. They are co-located because of common interests. Army does not own the equipment at NASA Glenn. Army uses NASA's facilities and equipment while Army provides administrative support. Does Aberdeen have sufficient facilities to accommodate research performed at Glenn, Ohio? What is the estimated cost to replicate equipment at Aberdeen and is it factored in COBRA?

Air Force Research Laboratory, Mesa, AZ

Did the TJCSG consider an alternative of linking the Warfighter Training Research Lab with Arizona State University to achieve greater synergies, achieve economic benefits, and increased military value? The University has estimated that over the next 10 years, the Air Force and DOD could save $60-80M by realigning Air Force Research Lab as an integral part of Arizona State University.

Do you believe that losing the Air Force's investment in the knowledge base of its researchers who choose not to move, losing significant training time due to moving equipment, personnel and having to secure new facilities would cause significant disruption and a major loss of potential military value? Please elaborate.

Army Research Laboratory, White Sands, NM

How does the relocation of laboratory activities from WSMR to Aberdeen increase military value? Specifically, what lab functions are moving? Is an encroachment free area such as that at WSMR needed for testing of products generated by the laboratory at WSMR?

Please provide details that justify this realignment as well as cost, savings, payback period and the number of military and civilians involved.

I would appreciate your response by August 2, 2005. Please provide a control number for this request and do not hesitate to contact me if I can provide further information concerning this request.

Yours sincerely,

Frank Cirillo
Director
Review & Analysis

Enclosures (5): Questions for the record to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force and the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology).

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 SOUTH CLARK STREET, SUITE 600
ARLINGTON, VA 22202
TELEPHONE: 703-699-2950
FAX: 703-699-2735

DCN: 5962

July 25, 2005
JCS#23

Chairman:
The Honorable Anthony J. Principi

Commissioners:
The Honorable James H. Bilbray
The Honorable Philip E. Coyle, III
Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.)
The Honorable James V. Hansen
General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.)
General Lloyd W. Newton, USAF (Ret.)
The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner
Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)

Executive Director:
Charles Battaglia

Mr. Bob Meyer
Director
BRAC Clearinghouse
1401 Oak St.
Rosslyn, VA 22209

Dear Mr. Meyer:

I respectfully request a written response from the Department of Defense concerning the following requests which were generated from BRAC recommendations generated by the Technical Joint- Cross Service Group(TJCSG).

Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test and Evaluation (TECH-6)

In a TJCSG letter to Chairman Principi dated June 30, 2005, you attempted to state what elements would transfer from OSSG Maxwell/Gunter to Hanscom AFB. Please clarify what is meant by operational activities that should remain at OSSG and what elements should be transferred to Hanscom. In this letter, it was stated that Air Force Materiel Command would provide the exact authorizations that will remain a t Maxwell and what will transfer to Hanscom. We have not received this information. Please provide it. Also, provide the same type of information concerning DFSG personnel expected to relocate from Wright Patterson AFB to Hanscom.

Is the movement of OSSG in line with Air Force's future plans to consolidate network operations and how does that relate to the network operations center at Maxwell-Gunter? Is this in line with DISA's plans to create Mission Centers that will interact with service network operations centers? If you can't address the DISA question, who should we contact? What provision has been made (square footage) by Hanscom to accommodate mission essential contractors from Maxwell-Gunter (OSSG) and WPAFB (DFSG)? What is the cost included in COBRA and what type of space is involved (laboratory, office, etc.)?

Defense Research Service Led Laboratories (TECH-22)

Rome Research Site

Did the TJCSG take into account the requirements of specific lab customer programs that are classified or special access (and may require SCIFs) during its evaluation of laboratories to determine how realignments and consolidations would impact these programs?

What funding is estimated in COBRA for setting-up and moving the Sensor Radar System to Dayton? What funding is included in COBRA that moves this system as well as MILCON, moving and re-establishing radars, antennas, jammers and other specialized facilities and equipment currently located at Rome?

Did the TJCSG evaluate and determine the ability to secure the necessary FCC licenses and frequency clearances required to operate the radars, jammers and antennas that would relocate from Rome to Dayton? Were topography and local interference issues analyzed to see if these radars meet mission requirements?

Will WPAFB area have access to radar sites currently located in Newport and Stockbridge, NY which are used by the Rome Sensor Directorate for their respective programs?

What is the basis for realigning the WPAFB Information Directorate to Hanscom when all other proposed Air Force Research Laboratory realignments sought to enhance military value by consolidating labs to their focus areas (e.g., sensors to sensors); realign labs to highest military value locations; and reduce the number of lab locations to reduce cost? What is the rationale for this realignment when it is inconsistent with the underlying objectives of the TJCSG? Why move the WPAFB Information Directorate to Hanscom when all registered scenarios that it considered for the Air Force Research Lab Information Directorate had all of the Information Directorate either in Rome, or Hanscom and never considered a split location?

Was the move of the WPAFB Information Directorate to Hanscom and not Rome an error? When the Infrastructure Executive Council rejected the recommendation to move Rome Information Directorate to Hanscom on 5/4/05, did it forget to go back and change the realignment scenario for WPAFB base on the decision to maintain Rome Information Directorate at Rome?

Army Research Laboratory, Glenn, Ohio

What impact will moving this research to Aberdeen have on the synergy developed between Army and NASA? NASA scientists and engineers at NASA Glenn have collaborated for 40 years because it saves national resources. They are co-located because of common interests. Army does not own the equipment at NASA Glenn. Army uses NASA's facilities and equipment while Army provides administrative support. Does Aberdeen have sufficient facilities to accommodate research performed at Glenn, Ohio? What is the estimated cost to replicate equipment at Aberdeen and is it factored in COBRA?

Air Force Research Laboratory, Mesa, AZ

Did the TJCSG consider an alternative of linking the Warfighter Training Research Lab with Arizona State University to achieve greater synergies, achieve economic benefits, and increased military value? The University has estimated that over the next 10 years, the Air Force and DOD could save $60-80M by realigning Air Force Research Lab as an integral part of Arizona State University.

Do you believe that losing the Air Force's investment in the knowledge base of its researchers who choose not to move, losing significant training time due to moving equipment, personnel and having to secure new facilities would cause significant disruption and a major loss of potential military value? Please elaborate.

Army Research Laboratory, White Sands, NM

How does the relocation of laboratory activities from WSMR to Aberdeen increase military value? Specifically, what lab functions are moving? Is an encroachment free area such as that at WSMR needed for testing of products generated by the laboratory at WSMR?

Please provide details that justify this realignment as well as cost, savings, payback period and the number of military and civilians involved.

I would appreciate your response by August 2, 2005. Please provide a control number for this request and do not hesitate to contact me if I can provide further information concerning this request.

Yours sincerely,

Frank Cirillo
Director
Review & Analysis

Enclosures (5): Questions for the record to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force and the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology).