

**Mandzia, Lesia, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

---

**From:** Hamilton Mark Col AF/SGE  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 23, 2005 5:10 PM  
**To:** Mandzia, Lesia, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Subject:** DE Labs

Lesia-

Naval Research Center Electro-Magnetic Energy Detachment,  
Part of the Human Effectiveness Directorate of AFRL at Brooks City Base,  
Army Medical Research Detachment

Mark

## Brooks City Base

	Original Cobra	Directed Energy + Non-Human Primitives to FSH
1-time cost	\$ 325 M	\$ 324 M
Net implementation cost	45 M	44 M
Annual Recurring Savings	(102 M)	(102 M)
Payback period	2 yrs	2 yrs
NPV	(940 M)	(943 M)

**Mandzia, Lesia, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

**From:** Hamilton Mark Col AF/SGE  
**Sent:** Monday, August 22, 2005 7:50 PM  
**To:** Mandzia, Lesia, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Mandzia, Lesia, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Cc:** Guerrero Michaelle Maj AF/SGMP  
**Subject:** FW: BRAC - Brooks - Ft Sam Directed Energy  
**Attachments:** COBRA\_Brooks\_Ft Sam energy\_22Aug05.pdf; Commission\_Brooks\_Ft Sam energy\_22Aug05.CBR

Lesia-  
Here's the COBRA run for the monkeys and DE guys.

Mark

Sir - Atch is the MJCSG COBRA analysis for moving the AF and Navy directed energy functions from Brooks City Base to Ft Sam instead of Wright-Patterson AFB. The COBRA analysis provides no substantial differences from the original proposed scenario (similar payback, NPV, 1x cost, etc). This is reasonable since the staff and MILCON projects associated with AF and Navy directed energy programs were moved to Ft Sam instead of Wright-Patt.

★ The fundamental issue is aligning the mission in the best location. While all three Services conduct directed energy research, the focus is in different areas. The Army research has shifted to the treatment of laser eye injuries and would be best suited at Ft Sam with the Center for Trauma and Battlefield Medicine where collaboration with similar patient treatment research and medical center access are available. The AF and Navy research remain focused on the health effects of directed energy and would benefit from co-location at Wright-Patterson to not only join AF and Navy medical research but also collaborate with the general AF research in this area.

DOUG HARPER, Maj, USAF, BSC  
Chief, Medical Facilities Modernization  
HQ AFMSA/SGSF  
5201 Leesburg Pike, STE 1501 (Skyline 3)  
Falls Church VA 22041  
COM: 703-681-6052, DSN 761- , FAX -6011  
doug.harper@pentagon.af.mil

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT - FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY - DO NOT RELEASE  
UNDER FOIA

<<COBRA\_Brooks\_Ft Sam energy\_22Aug05.pdf>> <<Commission\_Brooks\_Ft Sam  
energy\_22Aug05.CBR>>

**Mandzia, Lesia, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

---

**From:** Hamilton Mark Col AF/SGE  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 23, 2005 10:48 AM  
**To:** Mandzia, Lesia, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Subject:** Animal Holding

Lesia-

The answer is that we programmed animal holding at both Ft Sam and Wright Patterson.

The costs are included for the MILCON in the COBRA run. The AF identified 2048 ft2, Army just lumped it into their certified response. Both noted that they included necessary space for the animals/primates.

Mark

**Mandzia, Lesia, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

---

**From:** Hamilton Mark Col AF/SGE  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 25, 2005 1:49 PM  
**To:** Mandzia, Lesia, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Subject:** Fw: reclaima on BCB? Reconsider the movement of AFRL/HE to WPAFB

Lesia-

Reommend consideration of focus the amendment to target the DE guys in AFRL/HE. The laguage would just a tweak: "the directed energy aspects of the AFRL/HE."

Mark

Mark A. Hamilton, Col, USAF, BSC  
Exec  
AF Surgeon General  
\*\*\*\*\* SENT VIA BLACKBERRY \*\*\*\*\*

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence C. Schuette <schuette@enews.nrl.navy.mil>  
To: Ruck Hendrick W Civ AFRL/HE <Hendrick.Ruck@wpafb.af.mil>; Hamilton Mark Col AF/SGE <Mark.Hamilton@pentagon.af.mil>; Glenn John F Dr USAMRMC <john.glenn@us.army.mil>  
CC: Short, James, Dr, OSD-ATL <James.Short@osd.mil>  
Sent: Thu Aug 25 13:43:47 2005  
Subject: RE: reclaima on BCB? Reconsider the movement of AFRL/HE to WPAFB

That's great - and since they pulled their markup language it's still possible!

---

From: Ruck Hendrick W Civ AFRL/HE [mailto:Hendrick.Ruck@wpafb.af.mil]  
Sent: Thu 8/25/2005 1:25 PM  
To: Hamilton Mark Col AF/SGE; Lawrence C. Schuette; Glenn John F Dr USAMRMC  
Subject: Re: reclaima on BCB? Reconsider the movement of AFRL/HE to WPAFB

Mark,

The amendment as written seems to keep all of HE at BCB at Brooks. I watched the hearing, and agree with your interp--but not sure that it's the way the system will act.

Henk

Hendrick W. Ruck, PhD, SES  
Director, Human Effectiveness  
Air Force Research Laboratory

-----Original Message-----

From: Hamilton Mark Col AF/SGE <Mark.Hamilton@pentagon.af.mil>  
To: Lawrence C. Schuette <schuette@enews.nrl.navy.mil>; john.glenn@us.army.mil <john.glenn@us.army.mil>  
CC: Ruck Hendrick W Civ AFRL/HE <Hendrick.Ruck@wpafb.af.mil>  
Sent: Thu Aug 25 13:11:48 2005  
Subject: RE: reclaima on BCB? Reconsider the movement of AFRL/HE to WPAFB

Guys-

The intent of the Commission was only that the DE guys would realign to Ft Sam Houston with their animals.  
The rest of AFRL/HE is headed fro WPAFB.

Mark DCN: 12096

-----Original Message-----

From: Lawrence C. Schuette [mailto:schuette@enews.nrl.navy.mil]  
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 1:05 PM  
To: john.glenn@us.army.mil  
Cc: Ruck Hendrick W Civ AFRL/HE; Hamilton Mark Col AF/SGE  
Subject: Re: reclaima on BCB? Reconsider the movement of AFRL/HE to WPAFB

Hi Fraiser

I leave it to Henk to get it right. We may want to get the fte count and the milcon split correct (what we can allow to go stay in texas and what must go to wpafb).

Larry

-----  
-----  
Lawrence C. Schuette, Ph.D. schuette@nrl.navy.mil  
Code 5707.5 (202)767-6814  
Naval Research Laboratory (202)767-6767 (fax)

-----Original Message-----

From: Glenn, John F Dr USAMRMC <John.Glenn@us.army.mil>  
To: Lawrence C. Schuette <schuette@enews.nrl.navy.mil>  
CC: Hendrick.Ruck@wpafb.af.mil <Hendrick.Ruck@wpafb.af.mil>; Hamilton Mark Col AF/SGE  
<Mark.Hamilton@pentagon.af.mil>  
Sent: Thu Aug 25 12:43:36 2005  
Subject: RE: reclaima on BCB? Reconsider the movement of AFRL/HE to WPAFB

Larry,

I have been in meetings all morning so I have not heard or seen the specifics of the problem other than the DE groups were realigned to Ft. Sam. Did they realign all of HE?

COL Mark Hamilton is the go to guy for questions on reclamation and I have copied him. I can tell you the DE issue was raised repeatedly by the Commission staff and both Mark and I tried to explain the differences among the various Service components and how the Army's future program was evolving. I think there is a basis for a reclamation, I just don't know the mechanisms or feasibility of that effort.

From my vantage point, it appears the AF and Navy efforts are migrating more and more to non-medical applications and preventive measures/protective equipment, and even into NLW effects. The Army has gotten out of the microwave business and the laser work has shifted from describing the injury and setting safety standards into development of FDA regulated medical countermeasures. The three units are no longer as synergistic as they once were and will be less so in the future. The capabilities/programs that are most synergistic for the Army program are at Fort Sam, but the capabilities/programs most synergistic for the Navy and AFRL DE programs are going to be at Wright-Pat.

Frazier

---

From: Lawrence C. Schuette [mailto:schuette@enews.nrl.navy.mil]  
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 11:00 AM  
To: Glenn, John F Dr USAMRMC  
Cc: Hendrick.Ruck@wpafb.af.mil  
Subject: reclaima on BCB? Reconsider the movement of AFRL/HE to WPAFB

DCN:12096

Hi Fraiser,

We really need AFRL/HE at WPAFB. Moving it to San Antonio just keeps us a fragmented research community. Will MJCSG be writing reclaims?

thanks,  
larry

**TITLE:** DoD Directive 5101.11 "DoD Executive Agency for the Military Postal Service (MPS)",  
01/31/2005

**SUMMARY:** This Directive (a) Cancels DoD Directive 4525.6, "Single Manager for Military Postal Service," May 5, 1980 (hereby canceled) and clarifies the authorities and functional responsibilities of the DoD Executive Agent for the Military Postal Service (MPS) pursuant to DoD Directive 5101.1, "DoD Executive Agent," November 21, 2003 and implements DoD Instruction 4525.7, "Military Postal Service and Related Services," April 2, 1981 and DoD Instruction 4525.8, "DoD Official Mail Management," December 26, 2001; DoD 4525.8-M, "DoD Official Mail Manual," December 26, 2001; Sections 406, 3401, and 3406 of title 39, United States Code; and United States Postal Service – DoD Postal Agreement, as amended, August 20, 1982 to provide for the performance of MPSs for authorized personnel and organizations outside the United States and its outlying areas for the USPS extended to the U.S. Armed Forces. (b) Establishes the MPS responsibilities of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics (USD(AT&L)); updates the MPS responsibilities and relationships of the DoD Components; and assigns the Secretary of the Army as the DoD Executive Agent for the MPS in accordance with DoD Directive 5101.1, "DoD Executive Agent," November 21, 2003. (c) Prescribes the management authorities of the DoD Executive Agent for the MPS and authorizes the Military Postal Service Agency (MPSA) to functionally manage the MPS worldwide. (d) Authorizes the publication of DoD Instruction 4525.7, "Military Postal Service and Related Services," April 2, 1981, consistent with DoD 5025.1-M "DoD Directives Systems Procedures," March 5, 2003, and authorizes publication of an MPSA Operations and Procedures Manual to replace DoD 4525.6-M, "Department of Defense Postal Manual," August 15, 2002.

**FILES:** Select a Format

[PDF \(100 KB\)](#) [RTF \(89 KB\)](#)

**OPR:** USD(AT&L), 703-697-7261