DCN: 12086

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF
DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING
3040 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-3040

AUG 19 2005

Mr. Frank Cirillo
Director, Review & Analysis
Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Mr. Cirillo:

You requested a modified Cost of Base Realignment and Closure Actions (COBRA) report for the Technical Joint Cross Service Group (TJCSG) recommendation Consolidate Maritime C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation. The specific request follows.

> ...please run an excursion from that [Clearinghouse Tasker] C0700 baseline, leaving Dahlgren and Newport personnel in place in Dahlgren and Newport, rather than moving them to Point Loma or Charleston, as described in your original scenario and recommendation and my request.

This letter provides the requested COBRA report and outlines the differences between your report and the original submitted with the TJCSG recommendation. It also provides TJCSG comments concerning the scenario adjustments your request entails.

Adjustments made to the baseline data used in your COBRA report relative to the SECDEF recommendation:

1. Personnel movements from Charleston to Little Creek, Dahlgren to Point Loma and Newport to Point Loma eliminated.
2. One-time moving costs at Dahlgren ($21K in 2007) and Newport ($46K in 2007 and $9K in 2008) were eliminated as they were tied to the personnel movements.
3. Position reductions at Dahlgren (5 positions in 2006) and Newport (38 positions in 2008) were eliminated as the reductions were associated with the SECDEF proposed realignment/consolidation.

Significant differences between your COBRA alternative relative to the SECDEF recommendation:

1. One-time costs drop (fewer personnel to move, etc.).
2. Net present value shows less savings (due to fewer positions eliminated).

TASK 956

TJCSG comments on the alternative scenario your request entails:

1. The alternative leaves Maritime Information Systems Research, Development & Acquisition and Test & Evaluation fragmented which in turn has been shown to increase the response time to fleet needs and create interoperability problems between delivered systems.
2. The alternative forgoes almost $30M in net present value relative to the SECDEF recommendation.
3. The alternative locates SPAWAR Systems Command Atlantic away from the fleet it serves, away from NETWARCOM with which it must interact, and with Joint Forces Command whom it supports.

For these reasons, the TJCSG supports the SECDEF recommendation over the alternative.

Thank you for the opportunity to address your concerns.

Sincerely,

for Robert D. Rushstad 19 Aug
COL, CHF of STAFF

Alan R. Shaffer
Executive Director
Technical Joint Cross Service Group

Enclosure:
As Stated.