

Ralph J. Dean  
425 High head Road  
Harpwell, ME 04076

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

BRAC Commission

**AUG 15 2005**

**Received**

Dear Secretary Skinner:

During your visit with the NAS Brunswick Task Force on July 26, 2005, you asked for information, on an annualized basis, about the operating costs of NAS Brunswick relative to the cost of trying to meet Maritime Patrol and Reconnaissance Aircraft (MPRA) mission basing requirements from another site in the region, via aircraft and aircrew detachments.

The premise that the mission requirements could be met with periodic detachment or surge operations is invalid. As stated in the nation's DoD Homeland Defense and Civil Support Strategy, "...Homeland defense and civil support missions require a rapid response, *often measured in hours, not days.*" That fact, especially true of maritime interdiction missions, mandates *full-time availability* and response in the region. The risk of mission failure would be too great without that capability in the northeast.

That said, aviation analyst Ed Anderson (whom you also met in Brunswick) and I have tried to answer your query. BRAC data is not structured to directly provide total costs on an annualized basis. However, the Navy's DON-138 COBRA analysis indicates that \$843.2 million (net present value) would be saved over 20 years by complete closure of NAS Brunswick. This would be an annual savings of \$42.2 million. However, as shown during the deliberative discussions and the July 6<sup>th</sup> BRAC hearing on the proposed realignment of NASB, the Navy failed to consider the substantial savings that will be realized at the base when the P-3 is replaced with the follow-on multi-mission maritime aircraft. This factor alone should reduce costs at NAS Brunswick by 30 to 40%, due to the reduced number of aircraft, greatly reduced military personnel requirements (including elimination of AIMD), and the proportional reduction in base overhead. Using the smaller (30%) savings figure reduces the net cost of operating NASB to \$29.5 million annually.

The estimated cost of a nominal ten-day detachment of five P-3s, five aircrews, with the necessary Mobile Operational Command Center and maintenance support, would be \$786,000, for an average of \$78,600 per day. Given the requirement for full-time availability, the annual cost of such detachments could approach \$28.7 million per year. Furthermore, aircraft operating out of NAS Jacksonville will incur additional costs due to the greater distances the aircraft must fly on deployments (average round trip increases 1700 nautical miles) and many operational missions. These non-productive transit hours will add over \$41K per sortie, for a total of at least

\$1.25 million annually. In other words, total additional mission costs could easily reach \$30 million annually, depending on the nature and tempo of operations.

It is important to note that the detachment option at this level would only provide support for approximately one-half of a patrol squadron, with all of the reduced effectiveness inherent in detached operations. At virtually the same cost, NAS Brunswick, operating advanced multi-mission maritime aircraft, can provide support for an entire Patrol and Reconnaissance Wing, as well as all its other value for Department of Defense aviation.

Most important, the periodic or intermittent detachment/surge option is *invalid*. The mission, with its still-evolving but certain requirements, dictates full-time capability.

We hope this information helps answer your question, and assists with your decision regarding the future of NAS Brunswick. As always, you have our admiration for your service to our nation.

Very respectfully,

R. J. Deane  
CAPT  
US NAVY, (ret)