

15 July 2005

Inquiry Response

**Re:** BI-0070, CT-0348

**Requester:** BRAC Commission

**Question #1:** (Sensors Directorate Question) How many people support the sensors directorate effort at WPAFB? Rome? Hanscom?

**Answer:** Air Force Materiel Command provided the following data (Off/Enl/Civ/Tot authorizations) for: Wright-Patterson-94/1/431/526; Rome-11/0/69/80; Hanscom-33/0/79/112.

**Question #2:** (C4ISR Consolidation Question) Clarify what elements move from WPAFB (DFSG, OSSG, EIS), Gunter (OSSG) and Lackland (CPSG) to Hanscom. Additionally, please provide the precise unit names and numbers of authorizations for this effort.

**Answer:** Technical Joint Cross Service Group Scenario #0042 moved the following elements and authorizations (taken from the 28 Feb 05 UMD which does not include overhires or contractors):

- a. From WPAFB: The Development & Fielding Systems Group (DFSG) realign 34/5/359/398 to Hanscom. 16/2/162/180 are eliminated.
- b. From Gunter Annex: The Operations and Sustainment Systems Group (OSSG) realign 94/374/370/838 to Hanscom (not including any operational activities). 41/160/158/359 are eliminated.
- c. From Lackland AFB: The Research, Development & Acquisition and Test & Evaluation (RDAT&E) portion of the Cryptologic Systems Group (CPSG) realign 8/2/34/44 to Hanscom. 1/0/6/7 are eliminated.

**Question #3:** (Rotary Wing move) Clarify ambiguity with respect to the V-22 and PRV move from WPAFB to PAX River.

**Answer:** This recommendation relocates Wright-Patterson Air Force Base Aeronautical Systems Center activities related to Rotary Wing Air Platform Development & Acquisition, including V-22 and Personnel Recovery Vehicle, to Naval Air Warfare Center Aircraft Division Patuxent River.

**Question #4:** (Live Fire Testing) Provide precise terms and recommendations for 46 TW move to China Lake. What will move? Will the 20 overhires and 101 contractors be identified for the move?

**Answer:** The TJCSG recommended the movement of work and functions or workload to Naval Air Weapons Division China Lake but did not make specific recommendations concerning overhires or contractors. Air Force manpower moves are based on UMD positions, so overhires and contractors were not considered by AF/DPM. The live fire survivability functions to be received by Naval Air Weapons Division, China Lake, are accommodated by new construction. Adequate space is available at Naval Air Weapons Division, China Lake, to support the required construction. Test site improvements will be done in an area already dedicated to functions similar to those being moved from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

**Question #5:** (CPO Consolidation) The proposed consolidation of all CPO functions at Randolph was viewed as a potential error (i.e. not what was intended). Staffers felt it was something the HQ & Spt JCSG should re-examine.

**Answer:** The HSA JCSG discussed this issue with its BRAC Commission Staff Liaison and provided a response to the OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker C027t: *Realign Civilian Personnel Offices at Hill AFB, Warner-Robins AFB and Tinker AFB* on 13 Jun 05. Reference the BRAC website, <http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/>, for details. Personnel relocations and eliminations used for COBRA analysis are in the left-hand column under Scenario Data Calls/Joint Cross Service Groups/Headquarters and Support Activities/0031-0041 zip file. Input data for COBRA Screen 3 (relocation) and Screen 6 (eliminations) is in HSA-0031 (0031 IG Review 13 May 05/COBRA Output Reports/COBRA CPO\_1 Reports/COBRA Report, pages 77-78 and 88-89).

The Air Force provided certified data on the personnel count reflected in the HSA JCSG COBRA analysis performed. The HSA JCSG reviewed the issues described and, in coordination with OSD General Counsel, believes the Air Force can fulfill the intent of the recommendations if it becomes BRAC law. The Air Force will determine implementation as appropriate.

**Question #6:** (AFMC Details) The staffers requested we release our latest SWAT team analysis of AFMC manpower and other detailed numbers to staffers.

**Answer:** The SWAT team analysis is used internally by AF leaders to evaluate resource implications of various decision actions.

**Question #7:** (BRAC Data Issues) The staffers indicated they found numerous disconnects in the various BRAC documents. As a result of this statement they asked: "In the AFMC review of the BRAC recommendations, have you identified any disconnects, inconsistencies or need for clarification? If so, can you provide them to us?"

**Answer:** In the 7 July 2005 XPM VTC, SAF/IEB established a 31 July 05 suspense for all MAJCOMs to identify disconnects, inconsistencies or need for clarification. Once SAF/IEB has compiled this information it will be made available to the Commission.

Approved



DAVID L. JOHANSEN, Lt Col, USAF  
Chief, Base Realignment and Closure Division