

**Library Routing Slip**  
**2005 BRAC Commission Materials**

Title of Item: LETTER FROM SAJ - ANTI-VIOL MILITARY MISSIONS

Installation or Community: CYBEROLOGIC SYSTEMS GROUP, LACKLAND AFB

Source: COMMUNITY  
(Commission Generated; Department of Defense; Base (visited); Congress; Community; Other)

Certified Material?  yes  no

Analyst / Provider TOM. PAUTELIDES Date Received: \_\_\_\_\_

Copy to: \_\_\_\_\_

# SAN ANTONIO MILITARY MISSIONS TASK FORCE

602 E. Commerce San Antonio, TX 78205 (210) 229-2180 (210) 225-1600 Fax

August 18, 2005

**CO-CHAIRS:**

Charlie Amato  
Chairman, SWBC

Lyle Larson  
County Commissioner

Carroll Schubert  
Councilman, District 9

The Honorable Anthony J. Principi, Chairman  
Base Realignment and Closure Commission  
2521 S. Clark Street, Suite 600  
Arlington, VA 22202

*BRAC Commission*

**AUG 22 2005**

*Received*

Dear Chairman Principi:

As Chairman of the San Antonio Military Missions Task Force, I feel compelled to respond to statements made by the Northeast Pennsylvania Alliance (NEPA) in regards to the DoD proposed realignment of maintenance workload from the Cypologic Systems Group (CPSG) in San Antonio to Tobyhanna Army Depot in Pennsylvania. The NEPA document (dated 10 Aug 05) was sent to you as attachments to letters from Senator Rick Santorum and Congressman Paul E. Kanjorski (both dated 11 Aug 05) and is available in the BRAC e-Library.

Clearly the NEPA and Pennsylvania public officials from Pennsylvania were misinformed about the message conveyed during the San Antonio BRAC Commission Town Hall on 11 Jul 05. I offer the following as a response to statements made by the NEPA in their document of 10 Aug 05 to clarify any ambiguity that might result from the NEPA statements:

1. Concerning the national Signals Intelligence (SIGINT) workload. The National Security Agency (NSA) held a tri-service competition to consolidate this workload in 1995. CPSG and Tobyhanna competed head-to-head for this workload. CPSG won this competition and NSA's national SIGINT workload was consolidated at CPSG in 1996. NSA Director, William Black, Jr., confirms and details this competition in his letter (dated 30 Jun 05) and attachments. In this letter he expressed his concern to the Chairmen of four Joint Cross Service Groups – which is available in the BRAC e-Library.
2. Regarding capacity at Tobyhanna. The San Antonio delegation has made no assertion as to the capacity of Tobyhanna Army Depot. To my knowledge neither the CPSG nor Tobyhanna have conducted site surveys of the other's facilities. It is reasonable to assume that when Tobyhanna lost the NSA SIGINT workload to

City of San Antonio



The Greater San Antonio Chamber of Commerce



County of Bexar



CPSG in 1996 and transferred the mission to CPSG that Tobyhanna picked up some amount of excess capacity by virtue of that loss. However, we do believe there is reasonable doubt as to whether or not Tobyhanna has adequate space at the proper security level required to perform the CPSG mission without upgrading the classification of at least some facilities and no MILCON was identified in COBRA for expansion or conversion of this space.

3. In terms of capability, NEPA alludes to Tobyhanna's Communications Security (COMSEC) capability and points to an Army tactical SIGINT system and its associated subsystems as evidence of their capability. COMSEC maintenance is performed by all tri-service elements (Army, Navy, and Air Force). This capability should not be confused with the CPSG's support to NSA's national SIGINT mission. Again, this workload was competed and awarded to the CPSG.
4. Regarding capability to perform the CPSG maintenance mission with civilians. Again, the NEPA has it wrong. San Antonio has never said the work cannot be performed with civilians. In fact, the CPSG performs maintenance today with a mixture of military, civilians, and contractors. What we have said is there is a major disconnect between the DoD BRAC recommendation for civilian transfers and actual CPSG civilian authorizations in maintenance. You cannot transfer civilian billets you do not have.
5. The NEPA's description of the ease to which they can transfer the Space Environmental Test Facility is questionable. Again, no site survey has been performed and no MILCON was identified for this move.
6. The CPSG has multiple missions that require a government controlled runway, one of which requires an 11,000-foot runway and hanger for a WC-135 aircraft with a 72-hour maintenance response time. NEPA offers a variety of runways ranging from 103 to 300 miles from Tobyhanna as "within commuting distance."
7. Regarding Military Value, it is my understanding that Lackland has submitted certified data not included in the original COBRA run that is likely to raise Lackland's Military Value. Mission impact is addressed below.
8. Concerning the NEPA's allegations that Lackland's challenge contradicts BRAC law for jointness, enhancing warfighter

requirements, etc., let me state that the CPSG has Air Force, Army, and Navy military, Air Force civilians, and contractor personnel working on site. The CPSG also has collocated functions (i.e., maintenance, inventory control point, warehousing, etc.) – a distinct advantage to the customer. Today, CPSG is the *only* designated DoD organization supporting the following missions:

- a. NSA’s national SIGINT mission
- b. Space COMSEC
- c. Selected classified Special Projects
- d. United States Atomic Energy Detection System (USAEDS) mission

This consolidation of missions and collocation of functions is in concert with DoD BRAC criteria.

Finally, let me state that you must consider the entire DoD BRAC recommendation, as it applies to CPSG, to gain a full understanding and appreciation for the negative impact it will have on our national intelligence and security missions. The San Antonio delegation still maintains that the primary reasons to reverse the recommendations applying to CPSG are:

1. Mission Impact – taking a single, highly effective and efficient organization with collocated functions (providing a single bellybutton to the warfighting customer) and dispersing it to six separate organizations in five separate locations with different priorities, different capabilities, and different operating procedures *will hurt the mission*. Reference Director Black’s letter – this is not just San Antonio’s position – it’s also the position of the operational customer. We urge you to directly contact Mr. Black, the Director of NRO, or other CPSG customers if there are any doubts. Mr. Black “courtesy copied” the Director, National Intelligence (DNI), Mr. John Negroponte, on his letter. Concerns over realignment of the CPSG have reached the highest levels of our national intelligence community and any attempt to discount these concerns should be viewed as suspect.
2. Never Pays Back! COBRA’s own data shows the recommendations applicable to CPSG financially never pay back. Once disconnects identified are added to the equation the results are an even greater negative return on investment for the American taxpayer.

I appreciate your time and effort in sorting through the clutter. On behalf of our entire San Antonio delegation we join all Americans in thanking you for your service to our great country.

Very Respectfully,



JOHN G. JERNIGAN, BGen, USAF (Ret)  
Executive Director