

08 July 2005

BRAC Commission

Admiral (Ret.) Harold Gehman
Commissioner
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

JUL 28 2005

Received

Dear Admiral Gehman,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your attention to the delegation from Indiana during the recent BRAC Hearing in St. Louis. I hope that the testimony helped you realize the importance of Indiana Military installations, in particular NSWC Crane and CAAA, to our Nation's Defense and the Global War On Terrorism. As a concerned taxpayer I support the work you are doing to ensure that our Military operations remain as effective and affordable as possible. I also realize that you have a very difficult job in deciding which activities to re-align or close as part of the BRAC process.

I have been following the BRAC process closely since the proposed closure/re-alignment list was published and I am growing increasingly concerned that DOD has not followed sound judgement in making some of it's recommendations. Data available on the DOD website (www.defenselink.mil/brac) indicates that it is going to cost \$150M to move the 152 people working on the ALQ-99 depot from NSWC Crane to NAS Whidbey Island. That equals a cost of nearly \$1M per person for the move. In addition, information available at the Federation of American Scientists website (www.fas.org) seems to indicate that the platform for the ALQ-99, the EA-6B Prowler, will begin to be retired from service in the year 2010. I find it hard to believe that it is in the best interest of the DOD and the taxpayers to spend \$150M to move 152 people doing work on a system that is about to be removed from service.

I urge you to reconsider the recommendation to re-align the ALQ-99 work from NSWC Crane by properly taking into account the costs involved in this re-alignment and the relatively short remaining service life of the equipment.

Very Respectfully,



08 July 2005

Admiral (Ret.) Harold Gehman
Commissioner
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

BRAC Commission

JUL 28 2005

Received

Dear Admiral Gehman,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your attention to the delegation from Indiana during the recent BRAC Hearing in St. Louis. As a concerned taxpayer I support the work you are doing to ensure that our Military operations remain as effective and affordable as possible. I hope that the testimony helped you realize how important Indiana Military installations like Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) Crane and Crane Army Ammunition Activity (CAAA) are to our Nation's Defense and the Global War On Terrorism.


I am growing increasingly concerned that the DOD has not properly followed the selection criteria in making its re-alignment recommendations. One of the main criteria of the BRAC process seems to be the creation of joint centers of excellence in order to improve our efficiency while maintaining the quality of service provided to our war fighters. NSWC Crane is a joint activity providing products and services to all branches of the military. Another key criteria of the BRAC process centers on Military Value. The Military Value scores for NSWC Crane in the area of Sensors, Electronics and Electronic Warfare (S, E and EW) are higher than almost every other DOD activity.

One example of a recommendation that does not make sense is the re-alignment of Army S, E and EW work from Fort Monmouth to Aberdeen Proving Grounds. According to the Technical Joint Cross Service Group Analysis and Recommendations document dated 19 May 2005, which is available on the DOD BRAC website (www.defenselink.mil/brac), NSWC Crane has much higher Military Value scores than both Fort Monmouth and Aberdeen Proving Grounds. In addition, NSWC Crane already has a close working relationship with the Army since it is co-located with CAAA. If the BRAC criteria are followed properly, this workload should be re-located to NSWC Crane instead of Aberdeen Proving Grounds. Additionally, this same logic applies to the Army S, E and EW work being relocated from Fort Belvoir to Aberdeen Proving Grounds. The Fort Belvoir workload should be re-aligned to NSWC Crane since NSWC Crane has existing joint S, E and EW capability as well as higher Military Value scores.

Another example of a recommendation that does not make sense is the re-alignment of S, E and EW workload from Space and Naval Warfare sites at Charleston and San Diego to NSWC Dahlgren. NSWC Crane has higher Military Value scores than Charleston, San Diego and Dahlgren and should have been designated as the receiving site for this workload.

I urge you to reconsider the recommendation to re-align S, E and EW workload to sites other than NSWC Crane by properly taking into account the joint capability of NSWC Crane and CAAA as well as the DODs own Military Value scoring analysis.

Very Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping, fluid strokes that form a cursive, somewhat abstract shape.

08 July 2005

BRAC Commission

Admiral (Ret.) Harold Gehman
Commissioner
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

JUL 8 2005
Received

Dear Admiral Gehman,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your attention to the delegation from Indiana during the recent BRAC Hearing in St. Louis. I hope that the testimony helped you realize the importance of Indiana Military installations, in particular NSWC Crane and CAAA, to our Nation's Defense and the Global War On Terrorism. As a concerned taxpayer I support the work you are doing to ensure that our Military operations remain as effective and affordable as possible. I also realize that you have a very difficult job in deciding which activities to re-align or close as part of the BRAC process.

I have been following the BRAC process closely since the proposed closure/re-alignment list was published and I am growing increasingly concerned that DOD has not followed sound judgement in making some of it's recommendations. Data available on the DOD website (www.defenselink.mil/brac) indicates that it is going to cost \$150M to move the 152 people working on the ALQ-99 depot from NSWC Crane to NAS Whidbey Island. That equals a cost of nearly \$1M per person for the move. In addition, information available at the Federation of American Scientists website (www.fas.org) seems to indicate that the platform for the ALQ-99, the EA-6B Prowler, will begin to be retired from service in the year 2010. I find it hard to believe that it is in the best interest of the DOD and the taxpayers to spend \$150M to move 152 people doing work on a system that is about to be removed from service.

I urge you to reconsider the recommendation to re-align the ALQ-99 work from NSWC Crane by properly taking into account the costs involved in this re-alignment and the relatively short remaining service life of the equipment.

Very Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of several overlapping loops and a long horizontal stroke at the bottom.

08 July 2005

The Honorable Samuel Knox Skinner
BRAC Commissioner
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

BRAC Commission

JUL 28 2005

Received

Dear Commissioner Skinner,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your recent visit to NSWC Crane, CAAA and Southern Indiana. As a concerned taxpayer I support the work you are doing to ensure that our Military operations remain as effective and affordable as possible. I realize that you have a very difficult job in deciding which activities to re-align or close as part of the BRAC process. I hope that your visit helped you to realize what important assets NSWC Crane and CAAA are to our Nation's Defense and the Global War On Terrorism.

I have been following the BRAC process closely since the proposed closure/re-alignment list was published and I am growing increasingly concerned that DOD has not properly followed the law in developing recommendations. The DOD is required to take into account the return on investment resulting from its closure/re-alignment recommendations. In reviewing the cost data that is available on the E-library at the BRAC Commission website (www.brac.gov) I have come to the conclusion that moving Chemical and Biological workload from NSWC Crane to Edgewood in Maryland does not result in any costs savings. It appears that, of the four sites being re-aligned to Edgewood (NSWC Crane, NSWC Dahlgren, Falls Church and Fort Belvoir), only the Falls Church and Fort Belvoir generate any return on investment. The NSWC Crane and NSWC Dahlgren re-alignments cost more than they save. In fact it appears that, when added together, the four re-alignments to Edgewood result in a net loss rather than net savings. In other words the only way this scenario will save money is if the NSWC Crane and NSWC Dahlgren portions of the re-alignments are eliminated!

I urge you to reconsider the recommendation to re-align work from NSWC Crane by properly taking into account the Return On Investment requirements of BRAC law.

Very Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized 'S' followed by a long, horizontal, wavy line that tapers at both ends.

08 July 2005

BRAC Commission

The Honorable Samuel Knox Skinner
BRAC Commissioner
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

JUL 28 2005

Received

Dear Commissioner Skinner,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your recent visit to NSWC Crane, CAAA and Southern Indiana. As a concerned taxpayer I support the work you are doing to ensure that our Military operations remain as effective and affordable as possible. I realize that you have a very difficult job in deciding which activities to re-align or close as part of the BRAC process. I hope that your visit helped you to realize what important assets NSWC Crane and CAAA are to our Nation's Defense and the Global War On Terrorism.

I have been following the BRAC process closely since the proposed closure/re-alignment list was published and I am growing increasingly concerned that DOD has not properly followed the law in developing recommendations. DOD is required to give priority consideration to installations that have a high military value ranking. Data available on the DOD website (www.defenselink.mil/brac) leads me to conclude that NSWC Crane's military value rating was not taken into account properly, which is violation of BRAC law. Specifically, NSWC Crane has one of the highest military value ratings of all activities performing Electronic Warfare work, including a higher rating than NAS Whidbey Island and yet it is recommended that Electronic Warfare workload related to repair of the ALQ-99 system be re-aligned from NSWC Crane to NAS Whidbey Island.

The DOD is also required to take into account the return on investment resulting from its closure/re-alignment recommendations. In reviewing the cost data that is available on the E-Library at the BRAC Commission website (www.brac.gov) I have come to the conclusion that the moving the ALQ-99 Electronic Warfare workload to NAS Whidbey Island does not result in any cost savings. It appears that all of the savings in this scenario are generated by re-aligning work within Whidbey Island and moving work from North Island, CA to Whidbey Island. In other words this scenario will save DOD even more money if the NSWC Crane portion is eliminated!

I urge you to reconsider the recommendation to re-align work from NSWC Crane by properly taking into account the Military Value and Return On Investment requirements of BRAC law.

Very Respectfully,



BRAC Commission

JUL 28 2005

Received

The Honorable Samuel Knox Skinner
BRAC Commissioner
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Commissioner Skinner,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your recent visit to **NSWC Crane**, Crane Army Ammunition Activity, and Southern Indiana. As a concerned taxpayer I support the work you are doing to ensure that our Military operations remain as effective and affordable as possible. I realize that you have a very difficult job in deciding which activities to re-align or close as part of the BRAC process. I hope that your visit helped you to realize what important assets **NSWC Crane** and CAAA are to our Nation's Defense and the Global War On Terrorism.

I have been following the BRAC process closely since the proposed closure/re-alignment list was published and I am growing increasingly concerned that DOD has not properly followed the law in developing recommendations. The DOD is required to take into account the return on investment resulting from its closure/re-alignment recommendations. Crane has become a one-stop shop for specialized weapons for our Special Forces Warfighters. Crane did this by being responsive, innovative, technically superior and affordable for these outstanding soldiers. As our reputation for delivering what the customer needed, when it was needed, at a cost that was affordable, more work was brought to us. The proposal to the commission to realign work to China Lake and Picatinny will now split the support to special forces to different locations. This will add cost, reduce efficiency and cause a loss in intellectual capital that could take years to replace.

I urge you to reconsider the recommendation to re-align work from NSWC Crane by properly taking into account the Return On Investment requirements of BRAC law.

Very Respectfully,



JUL 28 2005

Received

Admiral (Ret.) Harold Gehman
Commissioner
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Admiral Gehman,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your attention to the delegation from Indiana during the recent BRAC Hearing in St. Louis. I hope that the testimony helped you realize the importance of Indiana Military installations, in particular **NSWC Crane** and Crane Army Ammunition Activity, to our Nation's Defense and the Global War On Terrorism. As a concerned taxpayer I support the work you are doing to ensure that our Military operations remain as effective and affordable as possible. I also realize that you have a very difficult job in deciding which activities to re-align or close as part of the BRAC process.

I have been following the BRAC process closely since the proposed closure/re-alignment list was published and I am growing increasingly concerned that DOD has not followed sound judgment in making some of its recommendations. The DOD is required to take into account the return on investment resulting from its closure/re-alignment recommendations. Crane has become a one-stop shop for specialized weapons for our Special Forces Warfighters. Crane did this by being responsive, innovative, technically superior and affordable for these outstanding soldiers. As our reputation for delivering what the customer needed, when it was needed, at a cost that was affordable, more work was brought to us. The proposal to the commission to realign work to China Lake and Picatinny will now split the support to Special Forces to different locations. This will add cost, reduce efficiency and cause a loss in intellectual capital that could take years to replace.

I urge you to reconsider the recommendation to re-align work from NSWC Crane by properly taking into account the Return On Investment requirements of BRAC law.

Very Respectfully,



08 July 2005

BRAC Commission

The Honorable Samuel Knox Skinner
BRAC Commissioner
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

JUL 28 2005

Received


Dear Commissioner Skinner,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your recent visit to NSWC Crane, CAAA and Southern Indiana. As a concerned taxpayer I support the work you are doing to ensure that our Military operations remain as effective and affordable as possible. I realize that you have a very difficult job in deciding which activities to re-align or close as part of the BRAC process. I hope that your visit helped you to realize what important assets NSWC Crane and CAAA are to our Nation's Defense and the Global War On Terrorism.

I have been following the BRAC process closely since the proposed closure/re-alignment list was published and I am growing increasingly concerned that DOD has not properly followed the law in developing recommendations. The DOD is required to take into account the return on investment resulting from its closure/re-alignment recommendations. In reviewing the cost data that is available on the E-library at the BRAC Commission website (www.brac.gov) I have come to the conclusion that moving Chemical and Biological workload from NSWC Crane to Edgewood in Maryland does not result in any costs savings. It appears that, of the four sites being re-aligned to Edgewood (NSWC Crane, NSWC Dahlgren, Falls Church and Fort Belvoir), only the Falls Church and Fort Belvoir generate any return on investment. The NSWC Crane and NSWC Dahlgren re-alignments cost more than they save. In fact it appears that, when added together, the four re-alignments to Edgewood result in a net loss rather than net savings. In other words the only way this scenario will save money is if the NSWC Crane and NSWC Dahlgren portions of the re-alignments are eliminated!

I urge you to reconsider the recommendation to re-align work from NSWC Crane by properly taking into account the Return On Investment requirements of BRAC law.

Very Respectfully,



08 July 2005

Admiral (Ret.) Harold Gehman
Commissioner
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

BRAC Commission

JUL 28 2005

Received

Dear Admiral Gehman,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your attention to the delegation from Indiana during the recent BRAC Hearing in St. Louis. As a concerned taxpayer I support the work you are doing to ensure that our Military operations remain as effective and affordable as possible. I hope that the testimony helped you realize how important Indiana Military installations like Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) Crane and Crane Army Ammunition Activity (CAAA) are to our Nation's Defense and the Global War On Terrorism.

I am growing increasingly concerned that the DOD has not properly followed the selection criteria in making its re-alignment recommendations. One of the main criteria of the BRAC process seems to be the creation of joint centers of excellence in order to improve our efficiency while maintaining the quality of service provided to our war fighters. NSWC Crane is a joint activity providing products and services to all branches of the military. Another key criteria of the BRAC process centers on Military Value. The Military Value scores for NSWC Crane in the area of Sensors, Electronics and Electronic Warfare (S, E and EW) are higher than almost every other DOD activity.

One example of a recommendation that does not make sense is the re-alignment of Army S, E and EW work from Fort Monmouth to Aberdeen Proving Grounds. According to the Technical Joint Cross Service Group Analysis and Recommendations document dated 19 May 2005, which is available on the DOD BRAC website (www.defenselink.mil/brac), NSWC Crane has much higher Military Value scores than both Fort Monmouth and Aberdeen Proving Grounds. In addition, NSWC Crane already has a close working relationship with the Army since it is co-located with CAAA. If the BRAC criteria are followed properly, this workload should be re-located to NSWC Crane instead of Aberdeen Proving Grounds. Additionally, this same logic applies to the Army S, E and EW work being relocated from Fort Belvoir to Aberdeen Proving Grounds. The Fort Belvoir workload should be re-aligned to NSWC Crane since NSWC Crane has existing joint S, E and EW capability as well as higher Military Value scores.

Another example of a recommendation that does not make sense is the re-alignment of S, E and EW workload from Space and Naval Warfare sites at Charleston and San Diego to NSWC Dahlgren. NSWC Crane has higher Military Value scores than Charleston, San Diego and Dahlgren and should have been designated as the receiving site for this workload.

I urge you to reconsider the recommendation to re-align S, E and EW workload to sites other than NSWC Crane by properly taking into account the joint capability of NSWC Crane and CAAA as well as the DODs own Military Value scoring analysis.

Very Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patricia Q. Kennedy". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, prominent "P" and "K".

08 July 2005

BRAC Commission

JUL 28 2005

Received

The Honorable Samuel Knox Skinner
BRAC Commissioner
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Commissioner Skinner,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your recent visit to NSWC Crane, CAAA and Southern Indiana. As a concerned taxpayer I support the work you are doing to ensure that our Military operations remain as effective and affordable as possible. I realize that you have a very difficult job in deciding which activities to re-align or close as part of the BRAC process. I hope that your visit helped you to realize what important assets NSWC Crane and CAAA are to our Nation's Defense and the Global War On Terrorism.

I have been following the BRAC process closely since the proposed closure/re-alignment list was published and I am growing increasingly concerned that DOD has not properly followed the law in developing recommendations. DOD is required to give priority consideration to installations that have a high military value ranking. Data available on the DOD website (www.defenselink.mil/brac) leads me to conclude that NSWC Crane's military value rating was not taken into account properly, which is violation of BRAC law. Specifically, NSWC Crane has one of the highest military value ratings of all activities performing Electronic Warfare work, including a higher rating than NAS Whidbey Island and yet it is recommended that Electronic Warfare workload related to repair of the ALQ-99 system be re-aligned from NSWC Crane to NAS Whidbey Island.

The DOD is also required to take into account the return on investment resulting from its closure/re-alignment recommendations. In reviewing the cost data that is available on the E-Library at the BRAC Commission website (www.brac.gov) I have come to the conclusion that the moving the ALQ-99 Electronic Warfare workload to NAS Whidbey Island does not result in any cost savings. It appears that all of the savings in this scenario are generated by re-aligning work within Whidbey Island and moving work from North Island, CA to Whidbey Island. In other words this scenario will save DOD even more money if the NSWC Crane portion is eliminated!

I urge you to reconsider the recommendation to re-align work from NSWC Crane by properly taking into account the Military Value and Return On Investment requirements of BRAC law.

Very Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be a stylized 'S' or similar character, located at the bottom of the page.