



DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 SOUTH CLARK STREET, SUITE 600
ARLINGTON, VA 22202
TELEPHONE: 703-699-2950
FAX: 703-699-2735

DCN 8565

July 28, 2005
DSE # 31

Chairman:
The Honorable Anthony J. Principi

Commissioners:
The Honorable James H. Bilbray
The Honorable Philip E. Coyle, III
Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.)
The Honorable James V. Hansen
General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.)
General Lloyd W. Newton, USAF (Ret.)
The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner
Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)

Executive Director:
Charles Battaglia

Mr. Bob Meyer
Director
BRAC Clearinghouse
1401 Oak St.
Rosslyn VA 22209

Dear Mr. Meyer:

I respectfully request a written response from the Department of Defense concerning the enclosed document:

What type of work does the part of the sub-recommendation in Tech-15 “Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except underwater weapons and energetic materials, to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA.” refer to? Based on our questions, it appear that this work 1) is done by NSWC Indian Head, Seal Beach detachment not NWS Seal Beach; and 2) is related to calibration and other types of work much of which is performed by NSA Corona and that it might be less costly to do so. Furthermore, if NSA Corona is not moved, this would also avoid the need to relocate equipment and personnel to China Lake. Is this correct? If so, please provide a COBRA that shows 1) the costs if this work is performed at China Lake, the intended destination; and 2) NSA Corona if NSA Corona is not moved to Point Mugu. If you believe that the personnel counts for this function would differ please explain.

I would appreciate your response by July 29, 2005. Please provide a control number for this request and do not hesitate to contact me if I can provide further information concerning this request.

Yours sincerely,

Frank Cirillo
Director
Review & Analysis

Enclosures (5): Questions for the record to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Air Force and the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Technology).



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

AUG 04 2005

Mr. Frank Cirillo
Director, Review and 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 follows.

What type of work does the part of the sub-recommendation in Tech-15 "Realign Naval Weapons Station Seal Beach, CA, by relocating all Weapons and Armaments Research, Development & Acquisition, and Test & Evaluation, except underwater weapons and energetic materials, to Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake, CA." refer to? Based on our questions, it appears that this work 1) is done by Naval Surface Warfare Center (NSWC) Indian Head, Seal Beach detachment not Naval Weapons Station (NWS) Seal Beach; and 2) is related to calibration and other types of work much of which is performed by Naval Support Activity (NSA) Corona and that it might be less costly to do so. Furthermore, if NSA Corona were not moved, this would also avoid the need to relocate equipment and personnel to China Lake. Is this correct? If so, please provide the Cost of Base Realignment and Closure Actions (COBRA) that shows 1) the costs if this work is performed at China Lake, the intended destination and 2) NSA Corona if NSA Corona is not moved to Point Mugu. If you believe that the personnel counts for this function would differ please explain.

The referenced scenario relocates Weapons and Armaments reported work from the NSWC Indian Head, Seal Beach detachment located at NWS Seal Beach to China Lake as part of the strategy to form integrated RDAT&E centers. The work done at Seal Beach appears to be non-site specific and primarily includes efforts such as in-service engineering/surveillance for Tomahawk re-entry vehicles, procurement of general purpose engineering test equipment, and depot maintenance of Automated Test Equipment. A small portion appears to be related to calibration of test equipment. Relocation includes an efficiency factor that assumes work could be combined with existing/similar work at the receiver site. The small amount of calibration work done at Seal Beach does not appear to make it a reasonable candidate for movement to Corona.

Due to the small numbers of personnel involved, a new COBRA run that would isolate a small piece of the scenario is not recommended and is not in concert with the integrated strategy of the scenario.



Thank you for the opportunity to address your questions and concerns.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Shaffer', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Alan R. Shaffer
Executive Director
Technical Joint Cross-Service Group