OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF
DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING
3040 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-3040

AUG 16 2005

Mr. Frank Cirillo
Director, Review & Analysis
Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Mr. Cirillo:

This letter responds to your request for information concerning the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure recommendations. The specific request was:

> The Navy clearly has stated that Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) Indian Head,is the Navy's center of excellence for energetics. We have received documentation that both Naval Air Warfare Center China Lake and Picatinny Arsenal each have more than 40 employees doing energetics work. Was it intended for these two groups to be moved to Indian Head? If not, why? If so, was the cost included in the page Tech-19 recommendation (Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition). If the cost was not included, we will update our chart to show the revised financial data if you provide a Cost of Base Realignment and Closure Actions update.

The intent of the recommendations was to include only one realignment to Indian Head, which is the realignment of NSWC Yorktown. There were no other intentions, thus no need for a modified COBRA run.

Consistent with the Technical Joint Cross Service Group's (TJCSG) strategy, recommendations concerning weapons and armaments consolidate capabilities into three large, integrated Research, Development, & Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation (RDAT&E) centers and two large specialty centers. Consideration was given to consolidate Indian Head's energetic materials capability into one of the integrated RDAT&E centers. However, it was determined that this action was too costly and would jeopardize the fragile intellectual capital that exists in the energetics area. Therefore Indian Head was retained as an energetics site.

Movement of energetics capability from China Lake and Picatinny Arsenal to Indian Head would shift capability from higher military value sites to a lower military value site. It is inconsistent with the TJCSG's strategy, poses similar issues with cost, and jeopardizes intellectual capital.

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to your request.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Shaffer
Executive Director
Technical Joint Cross Service Group