



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

BRAC Commission

JUL 28 2005

Received

JUL 22 2005

Mr. Lester Farrington
Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Mr. Farrington:

During Dr. Segal's Commission testimony on May 19, 2005, he was asked some questions that required additional time and information to answer. The enclosure provides the additional information to answer those questions.

Thank you for the opportunity to address your questions.

Sincerely,

Alan R. Shaffer
Executive Director
Technical Joint Cross Service Group

Enclosure
As stated.

les- These answers have been
approved by Dr. Segal-- if
Chairman Principi requires a
signed letter by Dr. Segal, please let us know. Best
AL (22)

BRAC Commission Hearing May 19, 2005
Additional Answers to Certain Questions

Question 1:

Admiral Gehman:

Some portion of the RDATE -- R&D, T&E -- budget, might be called -- and these are my own terms. They're probably not technically correct -- essentially just pass-through money where you take money and give it to universities or give it to contractors or something like that. A lot of it's done in house at these 650 facilities you talked about.

Could you give me a ballpark figure for what percentage of your budget is essentially supervised and managed by the Department of Defense, but the work is actually tasked through to universities or to contractors, and how much of it is done in house? Is it 50-50, or is it 90-10?

ANSWER:

We did not collect the data to answer this question during our BRAC work and have been unsuccessful in our attempts to find the necessary data. The Technical Joint Cross-Service Group requested the Military Departments and Defense Agencies report their mission funding in terms of intramural and extramural expenditure. Intramural expenditures are funds used organically to the reporting activity, detachment or command. Extramural expenditures are funds transferred to another DoD activity, or an organization outside DoD to perform the reporting organization's mission (pass-through dollars). Some funds may have been counted twice because of the intra-DoD fund transfers. The percentage distribution between intramural and extramural funds for all the activities that responded to the Technical Joint Cross Service Data Call is:

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Percent Distribution</u>	
	<u>Intramural</u>	<u>Extramural</u>
Development & Acquisition	22	78
Research	28	72
Test & Evaluation	<u>64</u>	<u>36</u>
Total	25	75

Question 2:

General Hill

OK. In the BRAC report from the Technical Joint Cross-Service Group, you recommended nine closures and transferred those recommendations to the respective military services or other joint service groups for inclusion in their recommendations. What was the outcome of those transferred recommendations?

ANSWER:

Before addressing the question, it is important to clarify the question we are answering. Volume II, page Tech-3, the third full paragraph, states: In the recommendation coordination process, nine candidate recommendations associated with closures or other proposed actions were transferred to the Military Departments of other JCSGs for inclusion in their recommendations." We believe this is the "9 closures" cited by General Hill.

The operative phrase in Volume II is "or other proposed actions"; some of the candidate recommendations transferred to other JCSGs were realignment recommendations. Further, it is important to note the Department and Services close bases, the JCSGs simply recommend realignment.

The nine recommendations/scenarios transferred to others, and the aggregated outcomes were:

Related Technical Candidate

Recommendation or Potential Action

1. Relocate Naval Surface Warfare Center Corona to March Air Reserve Base
2. Combatant Commander C4ISR DAT&E Consolidation
3. Integrated Weapons & Armaments R DAT&E Center at Redstone Arsenal
4. Defense Research Service Led Laboratories

Recommendation/Resolution

- This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the Navy recommendation titled "Recommendation for Closure Naval Support Activity Corona, CA."
- This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the H&SA JCSG recommendation titled "Consolidate Defense Information Systems Agency and Establish Joint C4ISR D&A Capability."
- This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the H&SA JCSG recommendation titled "Co-locate Missile and Space Defense Agencies."
- Part of this TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the Medical JCSG recommendation "Brooks

**Related Technical Candidate
Recommendation or Potential Action**

5. Consolidate Air Force Human Systems and
Air Platform D&A

6. Chemical-Biological Defense RD&A
Consolidation

7. Army Land C4ISR Center

8. Army Soldier and Biological Chemical Center

9. Realign Space System RD&A

Recommendation/Resolution

City Base, TX.” The rest of the recommendation was enacted by the TJCSG recommendation with the same name.

This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the Medical JCSG recommendation “Brooks City Base, TX.”

This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the Medical JCSG recommendations titled “Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD” and “Joint Centers of Excellence for Chemical, Biological, and Medical Research and Development and Acquisition.”

This TJCSG recommendation was enacted by the U.S. Army recommendation “Fort Monmouth, NJ.”

This potential action was deliberated and inactivated.

This potential action was deliberated and inactivated.

Note: We also provided this information in the answer to question 7 in our 17 June 2005, letter containing our responses to the Joint Cross-Service Group Questions for the Record, May 18 – 19, 2005.

Question 3

Mr. Coyle:

For example, there could be a tradeoff between the cost to go to a particular location and the retention of scientific and technical skills. It might be that a proposed location could be a little bit more costly than some other location, but much better from the point of view of retaining the people that we need. Did you do those kinds of tradeoffs, and can you provide them for the record?

ANSWER:

Using a combination of certified and open source data regarding Intellectual Capital, the TJCSG used professional judgment to confirm that the technical workforce could be reconstituted at the receiving location. In developing the strategic framework to include analyzing potential locations for the centers of excellence, we were conscious of locales where technological "Centers of Gravity" or critical mass of a technical capability currently exists. Additionally, the quantitative Military Value contains a Synergy component that measures the potential for technical facilities partnerships. Both the quantitative and qualitative analysis provided insights into the extent of tradeoffs that would be required to achieve a balance between cost of implementation and the potential loss of technical skills.

Question 4:

Admiral Gehman:

Thank you.

Gentlemen, I agree, you know, as I said in my opening statement, that previous BRACs have not attempted this cross-functional kind of integration before, and it is very difficult, and I applaud you for the work you've done.

I just have a couple of questions, and may not be able to answer them. I'll ask you to take them for the record.

Secretary Segal, in your opening remarks, you said that the domain of the RDATE universe that you looked at included 650 technical facilities located at 146 separate installations. Do you have any idea of what the result of all of this is, if approved, what those numbers would like if we did all this? In other words, that's the beginning number. What's the end state look like?

ANSWER:

Installations that reported greater than 30 FTEs performing RDAT&E work numbered 146. These installations contain 650 technical facilities identified by the four Military Departments and four Defense Agencies. The Joint Cross Service Group recommendations relocate or close 21 technical facilities at 13 installations. The Technical Joint Cross Service Group forwarded analysis and recommendations to other Joint Cross Service Groups and Military Departments that result in relocating or closing an additional 30 technical facilities at 8 installations. If the BRAC commission accepts all recommendations affecting Technical Facilities, the Department of Defense Research, Development and Acquisition, and Test and Evaluation infrastructure would be comprised of 599 technical facilities at 122 installations.

Question 5:

Admiral Gehman:

I have a similar question under what I think we used to call energetics, that's guns and ammunition, and, again, going by this report, created an integrated weapons and armaments site for guns and ammunition. I see all the sites here. It looks like the Navy and the Army are consolidating, but, here, it looks like the Air Force decided not to play. Am I misreading this?

ANSWER:

Based on the certified data calls, the TJCSG did not identify any Air Force technical facilities that performed work in the technical area of guns and ammunition.