



OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF  
DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING  
3040 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3040

 RECEIVED

06302005

JUN 17 2005

The Honorable Anthony Principi  
Chairman  
2005 BRAC Commission  
Washington, DC 20301

Dear Chairman Principi:

Thank you for your recent letter to Secretary Michael W. Wynne concerning Dr. Sega's testimony to the Commission. The enclosure provides the responses for the Technical Joint Cross-Service Group's (TJCSG) questions for the record.

Thank you for the opportunity to address your questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Alan R. Shaffer", written over a horizontal line.

Alan R. Shaffer  
Executive Director  
Technical Joint Cross-Service Group

Enclosure:  
As stated.



**Joint Cross-Service Group Questions for the Record**  
May18 - 19, 2005

**5. Why were no facility closures recommended by the Technical Joint Cross-Service Group to eliminate excess capacity?**

Volume XII of the Base Realignment and Closure Final Report, Technical Joint Cross Service Group Analysis and Recommendations lists facilities closed by the Technical Joint Cross Service Group: Air Force Research Laboratory, Mesa City, AZ; Office of Naval Research facility, Arlington, VA; Air Force Office of Scientific Research facility, Arlington, VA; Army Research Office facilities in Durham, NC and Arlington, VA; Defense Advanced Research Project Agency facility, Arlington, VA.

The TJCSG collaborated with a Military Department or another JCSG to enable closure recommendations at Brooks City Base, TX; Naval Support Activity Corona, CA; and Fort Monmouth, NJ. TJCSG opportunities for closure recommendations arose when functions on the installation were almost 100% technical. Only a few installations were almost 100% technical, so the TJCSG had few opportunities for closure recommendations.

**6. Test and evaluation facilities, including the formal development test and evaluation and operational test evaluation functions appear to have been blurred and not specifically addressed by the Technical Joint Cross-Service Groups.**

**a. Why were no specific recommendations made that address elimination of excess capacity among test and evaluation facilities?**

The TJCSG had a Memorandum of Agreement with the Education & Training JCSG (Volume XII of the Base Realignment and Closure Final Report, Technical Joint Cross Service Group Analysis and Recommendations, page B12) that E&T JCSG recommendations for open air ranges (OARs) with technical functions would be coordinated with, and reviewed by, the TJCSG. Based on the requirement to maintain the diversity of physical and climatic properties required in T&E, no OARs were identified by the E&T JCSG for closure.

One TJCSG recommendation closed a test facility. The Army's Aviation Technical Test Center at Ft. Rucker, AL was closed and relocated to Redstone Arsenal, AL (Volume XII of the Base Realignment and Closure Final Report, Technical Joint Cross Service Group Analysis and Recommendations, page 35).

Closure of other test facilities did not cost effectively enable the TJCSG principles and strategy (Volume XII of the Base Realignment and Closure Final Report, Technical Joint Cross Service Group Analysis and Recommendations, page 11).

**b. What was the rationale behind the Technical Joint Cross-Service Group decision to retain duplicate capabilities at unspecified separated sites, each of which would have a similar combination of technologies and functions?**

**i. Is this duplication in capabilities intended to provide "surge" capability? If so, what is the nature of such needed surge capability?**

The TJCSG established two principles and an overarching strategic framework (Volume XII of the Base Realignment and Closure Final Report, Technical Joint Cross Service Group Analysis and Recommendations, page 11). The two principles were:

1. Provide efficiency of operations by consolidating technical facilities to enhance synergy and reduce excess capacity;

2. Maintain competition of ideas by retaining at least two geographically separated sites, each of which would have a similar combination of technologies and

functions. This will also provide continuity of operations in the event of unexpected disruptions.

The strategy was to establish Centers of Excellence. A benefit of more than one Center of Excellence is to enable excellence through intellectual competition between the Centers.

Provision of surge capability was not primary to the strategy to have at least two sites

**c. Specifically how much excess capacity among laboratories and test facilities was identified and eliminated by the Joint Cross Service Group?**

Based on responses to the TJCSG Capacity Data Call the Department has excess current capacity (Volume XII of the Base Realignment and Closure Final Report, Technical Joint Cross Service Group Analysis and Recommendations, page 20). Measured in full-time equivalent man-years the excess is 13,169. The excess research capacity is 2,756 man-years. The excess test and evaluation capacity is 4,674 man-years. TJCSG recommendations eliminate about 25% of the excess capacity.

**7. The BRAC report states that the Technical Joint Cross Service Group recommended nine closures and transferred those recommendations to the respective military services or other Joint Cross Service Groups for inclusion in their recommendations? What was the outcome of those transferred recommendations?**

Part 2, Volume I, page Tech-3 of the Department of Defense Base Closure and Resignment Report states: *In the recommendation coordination process, nine candidate recommendations associated with closures or other proposed actions were transferred to the Military Departments of other JCSGs for inclusion in their recommendations.*”

We assume these are the “nine closures” cited in the question.

The nine recommendations transferred to others, and their resolutions were:

	<u>Related Technical Candidate Recommendation or Potential Action</u>	<u>Recommendation/Resolution</u>
1	Relocate Naval Surface Warfare Center Corona to March Air Reserve Base	This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the Navy recommendation titled “Recommendation for Closure Naval Support Activity Corona, CA.”
2	Combattant Commander C4ISR DAT&E Consolidation	This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the H&SA JCSG recommendation titled “Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR D&A Capability.”
3	Integrated Weapons & Armaments RDAT&E Center at Redstone Arsenal	This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the H&SA JCSG recommendation titled “Co-locate Missile and Space Defense Agencies.”
4	Defense Research Service Led Laboratories	Part of this TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the Medical JCSG recommendation “Brooks City Base, TX.” The rest of the recommendation was enacted by the TJCSG recommendation with the same name.
5	Consolidate Air Force Human Systems and Air Platform D&A	This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the Medical JCSG recommendation “Brooks City Base, TX.”
6	Chemical-Biological Defense RD&A Consolidation	This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the Medical JCSG recommendations titled “Walter Reed National Military

		Medical Center, Bethesda, MD” and “Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biological, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisition.”
7	Army Land C4ISR Center	This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the U.S. Army recommendation “Fort Monmouth, NJ.”
8	Army Soldier and Biological Chemical Center	This TJCSG Candidate Recommendation was deliberated and inactivated.
9	Realign Space System RD&A (proposed recommendation only)	This TJCSG Candidate Recommendation was deliberated and inactivated.

**8. One of the Technical Joint Cross Service Group recommendations calls for realignment of Patrick Air Force Base functions and relocating nuclear test and evaluation to the Strategic Weapons Facility Atlantic, Kings Bay, GA. What missions will remain at Patrick after this realignment and what consideration was given to closing Patrick?**

The TJCSG recommended realigning the Navy's nuclear test and evaluation function at the Navy Ordnance Test Unit (NOTU) at Cape Canaveral Air Force Station, a separate installation assigned under Patrick Air Force Base. The NOTU is a tenant mission on Cape Canaveral AFS.

Following this TCJSG recommendation, remaining missions at Cape Canaveral would include the primary Air Force mission--all 45th Space Wing and Eastern Range operational space launch and range activities--as well as various tenant missions. Patrick AFB houses the 45th Space Wing headquarters and base operating support activities for both Patrick and Cape Canaveral. Patrick's major tenant missions include the Air Force Reserve's 920th Rescue Wing, which also supports NASA manned spaceflight activities and provides safety/surveillance for the Eastern Range during launches at Cape Canaveral or the Kennedy Space Center; the Department of State Air Wing; and the Air Force Technical Applications Center (AFTAC). Patrick also has numerous other smaller tenant units and activities.

The Air Force did not consider Patrick AFB for closure because of its support to space launch operations at Cape Canaveral, to include NASA and commercial launch activities. This was consistent with the Air Force basing imperative to ensure unimpeded access to polar and equatorial earth orbits. Cape Canaveral is the only launch location capable of placing payloads into equatorial orbit. The Air Force did consider Patrick AFB as a potential receiver location, but made no recommendations that affected the installation.

**9. Several laboratory realignments are included within the Technical Joint Cross-Service Group recommendations. To achieve greater jointness among the military departments and to eliminate excess capacity, why weren't "super labs" created that could accommodate the needs of all the military and other agency services within specific technical areas?**

In its deliberations, the TJCSG considered the benefits of greater jointness among the Military Departments through the creation of super labs within specific technical areas. The TJCSG also considered the benefits of multi-disciplinary laboratories. Each approach offers benefits to the Department.

The TJCSG developed a preference for multi-disciplinary labs over labs that could accommodate the needs of all the military within specific technical areas. Our strategic framework strategy (Volume XII of the Base Realignment and Closure Final Report, Technical Joint Cross Service Group Analysis and Recommendations, page 11) centered on establishing multi-functional and multi-disciplinary centers of excellence. The TJCSG feels that science, already multidisciplinary, will continue to become more so in the future. Therefore, realignment leading to multidisciplinary labs will enable the Department to integrate multiple technologies even more rapidly in the future than in the past.

**10. Two of the Technical Joint Cross Service Group recommendations call for creation of separate Navy and Air Force Integrated Weapons and Armaments Research, Development and Acquisition, Test and Evaluation Centers, at Naval Air Weapons Station, China Lake, CA and Eglin Air Force Base, FL, respectively. Why wasn't a single joint Center created for use by both Navy and Air Force?**

The TJCSG recommends two Weapons and Armaments Centers of Excellence based on its two principles and overarching strategic framework (Volume XII of the Base Realignment and Closure Final Report, Technical Joint Cross Service Group Analysis and Recommendations, page 11).

The two principles were:

1. Provide efficiency of operations by consolidating technical facilities to enhance synergy and reduce excess capacity;
2. Maintain competition of ideas by retaining at least two geographically separated sites, each of which would have a similar combination of technologies and functions. This will also provide continuity of operations in the event of unexpected disruptions.

The strategy was to establish multifunctional and multidisciplinary Centers of Excellence.

**11. There appear to many opportunities for jointness that did not make it to the recommendations. What are the technical functions/labs that were considered for jointness but didn't make the final list of realignments?**

The TJCSG agrees there are many opportunities for jointness in the DoD. To guide its analysis and recommendations, the TJCSG established two principles and an overarching strategy (Volume XII of the Base Realignment and Closure Final Report, Technical Joint Cross Service Group Analysis and Recommendations, page 11).

The TJCSG considered the benefits of greater jointness among the Military Departments through Centers of Excellence within specific technical areas. The TJCSG considered the benefits of greater jointness among the Military Departments through Centers of Excellence within specific functional areas. The TJCSG considered the benefits of greater jointness among the Military Departments through multifunctional or multidisciplinary of Centers of Excellence.

The TJCSG developed a preference for multidisciplinary and multifunction Centers of Excellence. The TJCSG feels that science, already multidisciplinary, will continue to become more so in the future. Therefore, realignment leading to multidisciplinary labs will enable the Department to integrate multiple technologies even more rapidly in the future than in the past.

Based on these deliberative decisions, the TJCSG generated over 100 ideas (DoD Base Closure and Realignment Report, Volume 1, page Tech-3). Our recommendations are the full set of the cost effective ideas from the set of 100 ideas. The other ideas include opportunities for jointness. The TJCSG found many of those ideas appealing. However, the COBRA analysis indicated the rest not to be cost effective.

**12. What consideration was given to the “cost” of human capital in the recommended realignments? Many senior technology professionals may not be inclined to move to remote or high cost areas and create a “brain drain.”**

Using a combination of certified and open source data regarding Intellectual Capital, the TJCSG used professional judgment to confirm that the technical workforce could be reconstituted at the receiving location. We were conscious of locales where technological “Centers of Gravity” or critical mass of a technical capability currently exists.

Additionally, the quantitative Military Value contains a Synergy component that measures in part a Technical Facilities Partnership with its supporting community. Both the quantitative and qualitative analysis provided insights into the extent of tradeoffs that would be required to achieve a balance between cost of implementation and the potential loss of technical skill.