



DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
HEADQUARTERS UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON, DC

July 21, 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR OSD BRAC CLEARINGHOUSE

FROM: AF/SGE
1420 Air Force Pentagon
Washington, DC 20330-1420

SUBJECT: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker C0513 (Naval Surface Warfare Center,
Dahlgren Division)

Attached is the Medical Joint Cross Service Group response to the referenced query.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (703) 692-6990 or
mark.hamilton@pentagon.af.mil.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark A. Hamilton".

MARK A. HAMILTON, COL, USAF, BSC
Secretary
Medical Joint Cross Service Group

Attachments:

1. Response to Query

Query:

The original JCSG scenario stated “Navy activities relocated to Aberdeen Proving Grounds are consolidated to one detachment of the largest Navy donor activity.” Is that still the intent of MED 15? If MED 15 intended to develop a “joint” action, why isn’t the receiving site designated as a Joint or DOD Command? Consider rewriting the recommendation to read “Realign Naval Surface Warfare Center, Dahlgren Division, VA, by relocating Non-medical Chemical Biological Defense Research and Development & Acquisition to the Joint Chemical Biological Center, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. By not making it clear that problems of all of the Services are to be addressed and rotating command between the Services, it is not clear whether Navy interests will suffer at Army expense.

Response to Query:

The Chemical, Biological and Medical RDA Joint Centers of Excellence concept were focused on collocation of programs and capabilities, not organizational consolidations. This strategy has proven effective in previous BRAC rounds, particularly within the Medical RDA community. Examples are the co-location of the Naval Medical Research Center with the Walter Reed Army Research Institute of Research at Forest Glen Annex of Walter Reed Army Medical Center, and the Tri-Service Directed Energy Bioeffects co-location at Brooks City Base. In the ChemBio R&D area, the Air Force has had co-located assets at Aberdeen Proving Ground since the mid-90’s and was a model for expanded co-location. The various Service representatives to the MJCSG and TJCSG were cognizant of the status of these previous BRAC actions, and did not feel there was any evidence that one Service’s interests had been subordinated by such co-locations. BRAC scenario deliberations did not deal with the actual specifics of day-to-day program management and execution business processes, and we assumed that if it worked effectively for USAF and others in previous co-locations, it should work for Navy in the case of the Aberdeen PG co-location.

In the case of Chemical and Biological Defense, it should be noted that the program is already under joint management through the Joint Program Executive Office – Chemical and Biological Defense and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, under the oversight of the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense for Nuclear, Chemical and Biological Matters (ATSD(NCB)). Since the programs are already managed as joint programs, the potential for Navy interests to suffer at Army expense was considered remote.