

TO: BRAC COMMISSION

Enclosed is further justification and further information to support the Department of Defense report to the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission on recommendations to create an integrated weapons and armaments specialty site for guns and ammunition at Picatinny Arsenal, NJ.

We appreciate and thank you for your sincere efforts to provide our country the most effective operating structure of our defense bases.

We sincerely hope that the enclosed information is of assistance to support the DoD report and your critical deliberations.

Sincerely,

CRISP GROUP (Concerned Responsible Individuals To Support Picatinny)

Encl.

BRAC Commission

AUG 24 2005

Received

TO: BRAC COMMISSION

The Army is clearly the biggest user and procurer of most of the munitions and munition components used in guns for DoD. This includes the energetic materials, the fuzes, the metal parts, and the loading, assembling and packing of these munitions. In addition, the Army's PEO Ammunition, located at Picatinny Arsenal, already has the role of being the Single Manager for Conventional Ammunition for the Army, Air Force, Navy and Marines.

The Army has also been the lead service for guns and their associated munitions under the Tri-service Reliance Agreement since its inception in the 1980s. This includes all guns from small caliber to the largest caliber guns. The Army R&D Budget for conventional guns and associated ammunition greatly exceeded the other services. The Air Force spent no money on guns in FY 02 and FY 03 while the Navy Budget was about 1% of that of the Army.

PEO Ammunition, and the associated armament's engineering organization, ARDEC, are collocated at Picatinny to maximize synergy. Picatinny provides fully integrated life cycle systems armaments engineering (from R&D to demilitarization) for weapons and munitions for indirect and direct fire to include: smart munitions, fire control, soldier weapons, area denial munitions and demolitions, energetic materials & gun propulsion, fuzing & lethal mechanisms and explosives ordnance disposal. Products developed and managed by Picatinny provide over 90% of the Army's conventional lethality and a substantial portion of other services lethality, thus having a considerable impact on joint war fighting, training and readiness.

DoD's recommendation to create a specialty site for guns and ammunition at Picatinny Arsenal makes eminent sense. The integration of the small and fragmented Navy organizations with the existing large and comprehensive Picatinny organization will yield a robust, joint center of excellence for guns and ammunition. This recommendation will enhance technical synergy, reduce duplication, and increase efficiency. By driving jointness, this recommendation will increase commonality among the Services' guns and ammunition programs, ultimately resulting in improved lethality and a reduced logistics burden for the warfighter. Objections to this recommendation have little basis in fact.

Losing sites have raised the specter of a "brain drain" if their gun and ammunition organizations were moved to Picatinny. This "brain drain", while a risk to be managed, is something that DoD has successfully handled in previous BRACs. The fact that Picatinny is a large organization absorbing small organizations with similar missions substantially mitigates this risk. Picatinny is also in a high technology metropolitan area near a multitude of industry and academic partners. It is easy to attract and retain strong science and engineering talent, as evidenced by the fact that Picatinny has hired over 500 scientists and engineers in the past few years.

Claims have been made that the recommendation does not preserve at Dahlgren synergies between large highly integrated control systems developments and weapons system developments. However, the recommendation would preserve weapon system integration at Dahlgren, thereby maintaining this important synergy. Only development of the gun itself, and its associated ammunition, would shift to Picatinny Arsenal. Picatinny has amply demonstrated its ability to develop gun systems and then work with system integrators elsewhere to incorporate

the gun system into a weapon platform (such as the Abrams tank). This successful model would now be followed for naval gun systems and their integration with the highly integrated control systems on ships.

Claims have been made that Picatinny doesn't have the facilities or equipment to perform Indian Head's specialized naval energetics (gun propulsion) mission. Picatinny has the facilities and equipment to develop energetics, including explosives, propellants, and pyrotechnics, and a long record of accomplishment in this technical area, primarily meeting Army requirements. The laws of physics and chemistry are not one thing for the Army and another for the Navy. So Picatinny's present capability is suitable to support Navy gun propulsion needs. The recommendation, in addition to moving Indian Head gun propulsion personnel, includes the movement or purchase of specialized equipment to support their mission. So the end state will be a complete capability at Picatinny that can meet all Navy gun propulsion needs.

A claim is made that Aberdeen and Picatinny routinely use Indian Head for gun propellant R&D work. Picatinny partners with many organizations, including defense, other government agencies (such as the National Laboratories), industry and academia in the pursuit of its mission. In this case, the routine interaction of Picatinny and Indian Head gun propellant groups argues in favor of their integration at Picatinny.

The DoD recommendation to create a guns and ammunition specialty site at Picatinny Arsenal is sound from both a technical and fiscal standpoint. Claims to the contrary are not supported by the facts.

FROM: CRISP GROUP