

REPLY TO:

1630 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3061
FAX: (202) 225-3094

THE ATRIUM

 375 WEST PADONIA ROAD, SUITE 200
TIMONIUM, MD 21093
(410) 628-2701
FAX: (410) 628-2708

www.house.gov/ruppersberger
1 (877) 727-6802

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2002

C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

2ND DISTRICT, MARYLAND

ASSISTANT DEMOCRATIC WHIP

PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE

SUBCOMMITTEES:

HUMAN INTELLIGENCE, ANALYSIS, AND
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

TECHNICAL AND TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE

INTELLIGENCE POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:

CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND
HUMAN RESOURCES

NATIONAL SECURITY, EMERGING THREATS,
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BRAC Commission

July 25, 2005

Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner
Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 S. Clark St.
Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Brigadier General Turner:

JUL 29 2005

Received

I am writing today to express support for the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure recommendations, particularly the recommendation to move the C4ISR organizations from Ft. Monmouth, New Jersey to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG). The intention of BRAC 2005 is to reconfigure the current infrastructure [bases] into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency. The development of "Centers of Excellence" across the nation will create enhanced programs and synergies that will benefit the war fighter immensely.

In this process, both Maryland and New Jersey appeared before the BRAC Commission to express their position on this matter. During those meetings and since, arguments have been presented which suggest that Department of Defense had errors in their decision making process and calculations. I use this opportunity, and will be following up with a phone call, to outline the concerns raised by the New Jersey delegation and reiterate the Department of Defense's rationale for making this recommendation (the closing of Ft. Monmouth and relocation of C4ISR to APG to establish a Land C4ISR (Center of Excellence).)

Monmouth claim 1- Radical changes to the military should not be made during a time of war. -

Response - Such a claim would negate any BRAC action anywhere during this BRAC round and few of the past rounds. The overarching need is for efficiency, adaptability to current and potential threats and modernization demanded by proper utilization of finite defense resources. If there is a supportable promise of achieving continuity of service to the warfighter, then timing is irrelevant.

Monmouth claim 2- Closing Ft. Monmouth would have a negative impact on the war fighter.

Response - The prime example cited was the Warlock IED jamming system. This system was developed by the Army Research Laboratory (ARL), headquarters at APG with components at White Sands as well as Fort Monmouth. Fort Monmouth's role was

largely acquisition management not engineering. Continuity of this system is assured under the DOD recommendation.

Monmouth claim 3- A "Brain Drain" would be created by this movement

Response - Early estimates of numbers of employees willing to move is always greatly inaccurate. Maryland's previous experience with movement of other military installations showed up to 80% of the workforce ultimately relocating to maintain employment. 45% of Ft. Monmouth's workforce is at age 50+ with a significant portion likely to retire in the near future. Maryland has many citizens who have moved from across the nation and have chosen Maryland for their retirement home. Maryland is first among states in the nation with the highest percentage of professional and technical workers and is second among the states in its number of people holding advanced degrees. Maryland has a larger labor market than New Jersey for recruiting which can help mitigate these risks. Additionally, the move would create an increased synergy and enhanced program efficiency resulting in the need for fewer individuals to complete mission. Finally, it has been suggested that Ft. Monmouth has suffered from the lack of newly trained, highly motivated individuals bringing the latest in skills and technology to the project. This movement of C4ISR to APG would result in a refreshed, creative, "brain enhanced" workforce.

Monmouth claim 4- DOD cost data on relocating C4ISR is flawed.

Response - The wild assumption of construction costs suggested by Ft. Monmouth are inconsistent with GEO certified estimates. By locating this capability to APG, DOD will realize over \$143 million in cost savings each year - quickly recapturing any short term costs associated with the moving of C4ISR. The moving costs that Ft. Monmouth suggest do not include the relocation of the Ordnance school and the ability to utilize then vacant space. Additionally, an Enhanced Use Lease Program already established at APG will further provide additional financial benefits to the military.

Monmouth claim 5- Monmouth should be part of a mega-base including Dix, McGuire, Lakehurst and Monmouth.

Response- This configuration would not improve the efficiency of developing and fielding C4ISR technologies. This mega-base would consist of a fuel tanker airforce base, a carrier support naval base and coupling those facilities with C4ISR functions. Absent from this configuration are the synergies intended by this BRAC.

The movement of the C4ISR organizations to Aberdeen makes sense. It supports the original intention of the DOD BRAC recommendations and will enhance greatly the ability of our nation to protect our war fighter and grow DOD technology.

Signed



CA Dutch Ruppertsberger
Member of Congress

REPLY TO:
1630 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3061
FAX: (202) 225-3094

 **THE ATRIUM**
375 WEST PADONIA ROAD, SUITE 200
TIMONIUM, MD 21093
(410) 628-2701
FAX: (410) 628-2708
www.house.gov/ruppersberger
1 (877) 727-6802

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2002

July 25, 2005

The Honorable James Hansen
Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 S. Clark St.
Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Congressman Hansen:

I am writing today to express support for the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure recommendations, particularly the recommendation to move the C4ISR organizations from Ft. Monmouth, New Jersey to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG). The intention of BRAC 2005 is to reconfigure the current infrastructure [bases] into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency. The development of "Centers of Excellence" across the nation will create enhanced programs and synergies that will benefit the war fighter immensely.

In this process, both Maryland and New Jersey appeared before the BRAC Commission to express their position on this matter. During those meetings and since, arguments have been presented which suggest that Department of Defense had errors in their decision making process and calculations. I use this opportunity, and will be following up with a phone call, to outline the concerns raised by the New Jersey delegation and reiterate the Department of Defense's rationale for making this recommendation (the closing of Ft. Monmouth and relocation of C4ISR to APG to establish a Land C4ISR (Center of Excellence).)

Monmouth claim 1- Radical changes to the military should not be made during a time of war. –

Response - Such a claim would negate any BRAC action anywhere during this BRAC round and few of the past rounds. The overarching need is for efficiency, adaptability to current and potential threats and modernization demanded by proper utilization of finite defense resources. If there is a supportable promise of achieving continuity of service to the warfighter, then timing is irrelevant.

Monmouth claim 2- Closing Ft. Monmouth would have a negative impact on the war fighter.

Response - The prime example cited was the Warlock IED jamming system. This system was developed by the Army Research Laboratory (ARL), headquarters at APG with components at White Sands as well as Fort Monmouth. Fort Monmouth's role was

C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

2ND DISTRICT, MARYLAND

ASSISTANT DEMOCRATIC WHIP

**PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE**

SUBCOMMITTEES:

HUMAN INTELLIGENCE, ANALYSIS, AND
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

TECHNICAL AND TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE

INTELLIGENCE POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:

CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND
HUMAN RESOURCES

NATIONAL SECURITY, EMERGING THREATS,
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BRAC Commission

JUL 29 2005

Received

largely acquisition management not engineering. Continuity of this system is assured under the DOD recommendation.

Monmouth claim 3- A "Brain Drain" would be created by this movement

Response - Early estimates of numbers of employees willing to move is always greatly inaccurate. Maryland's previous experience with movement of other military installations showed up to 80% of the workforce ultimately relocating to maintain employment. 45% of Ft. Monmouth's workforce is at age 50+ with a significant portion likely to retire in the near future. Maryland has many citizens who have moved from across the nation and have chosen Maryland for their retirement home. Maryland is first among states in the nation with the highest percentage of professional and technical workers and is second among the states in its number of people holding advanced degrees. Maryland has a larger labor market than New Jersey for recruiting which can help mitigate these risks. Additionally, the move would create an increased synergy and enhanced program efficiency resulting in the need for fewer individuals to complete mission. Finally, it has been suggested that Ft. Monmouth has suffered from the lack of newly trained, highly motivated individuals bringing the latest in skills and technology to the project. This movement of C4ISR to APG would result in a refreshed, creative, "brain enhanced" workforce.

Monmouth claim 4- DOD cost data on relocating C4ISR is flawed.

Response - The wild assumption of construction costs suggested by Ft. Monmouth are inconsistent with GEO certified estimates. By locating this capability to APG, DOD will realize over \$143 million in cost savings each year - quickly recapturing any short term costs associated with the moving of C4ISR. The moving costs that Ft. Monmouth suggest do not include the relocation of the Ordnance school and the ability to utilize then vacant space. Additionally, an Enhanced Use Lease Program already established at APG will further provide additional financial benefits to the military.

Monmouth claim 5- Monmouth should be part of a mega-base including Dix, McGuire, Lakehurst and Monmouth.

Response- This configuration would not improve the efficiency of developing and fielding C4ISR technologies. This mega-base would consist of a fuel tanker airforce base, a carrier support naval base and coupling those facilities with C4ISR functions. Absent from this configuration are the synergies intended by this BRAC.

The movement of the C4ISR organizations to Aberdeen makes sense. It supports the original intention of the DOD BRAC recommendations and will enhance greatly the ability of our nation to protect our war fighter and grow DOD technology.

Signed



CA Dutch Ruppensberger
Member of Congress

REPLY TO:
1630 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3061
FAX: (202) 225-3094

 **THE ATRIUM**
375 WEST PADONIA ROAD, SUITE 200
TIMONIUM, MD 21093
(410) 628-2701
FAX: (410) 628-2708
www.house.gov/ruppersberger
1 (877) 727-6802

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2002

C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER
2ND DISTRICT, MARYLAND

ASSISTANT DEMOCRATIC WHIP

**PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE**

SUBCOMMITTEES:
HUMAN INTELLIGENCE, ANALYSIS, AND
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

TECHNICAL AND TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE
INTELLIGENCE POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:
CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND
HUMAN RESOURCES

NATIONAL SECURITY, EMERGING THREATS,
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BRAC Commission

July 25, 2005

The Honorable Samuel Skinner, Commissioner
Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 S. Clark St.
Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

JUL 29 2005

Dear Commissioner Skinner:

Received

I am writing today to express support for the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure recommendations, particularly the recommendation to move the C4ISR organizations from Ft. Monmouth, New Jersey to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG). The intention of BRAC 2005 is to reconfigure the current infrastructure [bases] into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency. The development of "Centers of Excellence" across the nation will create enhanced programs and synergies that will benefit the war fighter immensely.

In this process, both Maryland and New Jersey appeared before the BRAC Commission to express their position on this matter. During those meetings and since, arguments have been presented which suggest that Department of Defense had errors in their decision making process and calculations. I use this opportunity, and will be following up with a phone call, to outline the concerns raised by the New Jersey delegation and reiterate the Department of Defense's rationale for making this recommendation (the closing of Ft. Monmouth and relocation of C4ISR to APG to establish a Land C4ISR (Center of Excellence).)

Monmouth claim 1- Radical changes to the military should not be made during a time of war. -

Response - Such a claim would negate any BRAC action anywhere during this BRAC round and few of the past rounds. The overarching need is for efficiency, adaptability to current and potential threats and modernization demanded by proper utilization of finite defense resources. If there is a supportable promise of achieving continuity of service to the warfighter, then timing is irrelevant.

Monmouth claim 2- Closing Ft. Monmouth would have a negative impact on the war fighter.

Response - The prime example cited was the Warlock IED jamming system. This system was developed by the Army Research Laboratory (ARL), headquarters at APG with components at White Sands as well as Fort Monmouth. Fort Monmouth's role was

largely acquisition management not engineering. Continuity of this system is assured under the DOD recommendation.

Monmouth claim 3- A "Brain Drain" would be created by this movement
Response - Early estimates of numbers of employees willing to move is always greatly inaccurate. Maryland's previous experience with movement of other military installations showed up to 80% of the workforce ultimately relocating to maintain employment. 45% of Ft. Monmouth's workforce is at age 50+ with a significant portion likely to retire in the near future. Maryland has many citizens who have moved from across the nation and have chosen Maryland for their retirement home. Maryland is first among states in the nation with the highest percentage of professional and technical workers and is second among the states in its number of people holding advanced degrees. Maryland has a larger labor market than New Jersey for recruiting which can help mitigate these risks. Additionally, the move would create an increased synergy and enhanced program efficiency resulting in the need for fewer individuals to complete mission. Finally, it has been suggested that Ft. Monmouth has suffered from the lack of newly trained, highly motivated individuals bringing the latest in skills and technology to the project. This movement of C4ISR to APG would result in a refreshed, creative, "brain enhanced" workforce.

Monmouth claim 4- DOD cost data on relocating C4ISR is flawed.
Response - The wild assumption of construction costs suggested by Ft. Monmouth are inconsistent with GEO certified estimates. By locating this capability to APG, DOD will realize over \$143 million in cost savings each year - quickly recapturing any short term costs associated with the moving of C4ISR. The moving costs that Ft. Monmouth suggest do not include the relocation of the Ordnance school and the ability to utilize then vacant space. Additionally, an Enhanced Use Lease Program already established at APG will further provide additional financial benefits to the military.

Monmouth claim 5- Monmouth should be part of a mega-base including Dix, McGuire, Lakehurst and Monmouth.

Response- This configuration would not improve the efficiency of developing and fielding C4ISR technologies. This mega-base would consist of a fuel tanker airforce base, a carrier support naval base and coupling those facilities with C4ISR functions. Absent from this configuration are the synergies intended by this BRAC.

The movement of the C4ISR organizations to Aberdeen makes sense. It supports the original intention of the DOD BRAC recommendations and will enhance greatly the ability of our nation to protect our war fighter and grow DOD technology.

Signed



CA Dutch Ruppensberger
Member of Congress

REPLY TO:

1630 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3061
FAX: (202) 225-3094

THE ATRIUM

375 WEST PADONIA ROAD, SUITE 200
TIMONIUM, MD 21093
(410) 628-2701
FAX: (410) 628-2708

www.house.gov/ruppersberger
1 (877) 727-6802

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2002

C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

2ND DISTRICT, MARYLAND

ASSISTANT DEMOCRATIC WHIP

**PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE**

SUBCOMMITTEES:

HUMAN INTELLIGENCE, ANALYSIS, AND
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

TECHNICAL AND TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE

INTELLIGENCE POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:

CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND
HUMAN RESOURCES

NATIONAL SECURITY, EMERGING THREATS,
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BRAC Commission

July 25, 2005

The Honorable James Bilbray
Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 S. Clark St.
Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Congressman Bilbray:

JUL 29 2005

I am writing today to express support for the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure recommendations, particularly the recommendation to move the C4ISR organizations from Ft. Monmouth, New Jersey to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG). The intention of BRAC 2005 is to reconfigure the current infrastructure [bases] into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency. The development of "Centers of Excellence" across the nation will create enhanced programs and synergies that will benefit the war fighter immensely.

Received

In this process, both Maryland and New Jersey appeared before the BRAC Commission to express their position on this matter. During those meetings and since, arguments have been presented which suggest that Department of Defense had errors in their decision making process and calculations. I use this opportunity, and will be following up with a phone call, to outline the concerns raised by the New Jersey delegation and reiterate the Department of Defense's rationale for making this recommendation (the closing of Ft. Monmouth and relocation of C4ISR to APG to establish a Land C4ISR (Center of Excellence.)

Monmouth claim 1- Radical changes to the military should not be made during a time of war. -

Response - Such a claim would negate any BRAC action anywhere during this BRAC round and few of the past rounds. The overarching need is for efficiency, adaptability to current and potential threats and modernization demanded by proper utilization of finite defense resources. If there is a supportable promise of achieving continuity of service to the warfighter, then timing is irrelevant.

Monmouth claim 2- Closing Ft. Monmouth would have a negative impact on the war fighter.

Response - The prime example cited was the Warlock IED jamming system. This system was developed by the Army Research Laboratory (ARL), headquarters at APG with components at White Sands as well as Fort Monmouth. Fort Monmouth's role was

largely acquisition management not engineering. Continuity of this system is assured under the DOD recommendation.

Monmouth claim 3- A "Brain Drain" would be created by this movement

Response - Early estimates of numbers of employees willing to move is always greatly inaccurate. Maryland's previous experience with movement of other military installations showed up to 80% of the workforce ultimately relocating to maintain employment. 45% of Ft. Monmouth's workforce is at age 50+ with a significant portion likely to retire in the near future. Maryland has many citizens who have moved from across the nation and have chosen Maryland for their retirement home. Maryland is first among states in the nation with the highest percentage of professional and technical workers and is second among the states in its number of people holding advanced degrees. Maryland has a larger labor market than New Jersey for recruiting which can help mitigate these risks. Additionally, the move would create an increased synergy and enhanced program efficiency resulting in the need for fewer individuals to complete mission. Finally, it has been suggested that Ft. Monmouth has suffered from the lack of newly trained, highly motivated individuals bringing the latest in skills and technology to the project. This movement of C4ISR to APG would result in a refreshed, creative, "brain enhanced" workforce.

Monmouth claim 4- DOD cost data on relocating C4ISR is flawed.

Response – The wild assumption of construction costs suggested by Ft. Monmouth are inconsistent with GEO certified estimates. By locating this capability to APG, DOD will realize over \$143 million in cost savings each year – quickly recapturing any short term costs associated with the moving of C4ISR. The moving costs that Ft. Monmouth suggest do not include the relocation of the Ordnance school and the ability to utilize then vacant space. Additionally, an Enhanced Use Lease Program already established at APG will further provide additional financial benefits to the military.

Monmouth claim 5– Monmouth should be part of a mega-base including Dix, McGuire, Lakehurst and Monmouth.

Response– This configuration would not improve the efficiency of developing and fielding C4ISR technologies. This mega-base would consist of a fuel tanker airforce base, a carrier support naval base and coupling those facilities with C4ISR functions. Absent from this configuration are the synergies intended by this BRAC.

The movement of the C4ISR organizations to Aberdeen makes sense. It supports the original intention of the DOD BRAC recommendations and will enhance greatly the ability of our nation to protect our war fighter and grow DOD technology.

Signed



CA Dutch Ruppertsberger
Member of Congress

REPLY TO:

1630 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3061
FAX: (202) 225-3094

THE ATRIUM

375 WEST PADONIA ROAD, SUITE 200
TIMONIUM, MD 21093
(410) 628-2701
FAX: (410) 628-2708

www.house.gov/ruppersberger

1 (877) 727-6802

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2002

July 25, 2005

General James Hill, Commissioner
Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 S. Clark St.
Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear General Hill:

I am writing today to express support for the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure recommendations, particularly the recommendation to move the C4ISR organizations from Ft. Monmouth, New Jersey to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG). The intention of BRAC 2005 is to reconfigure the current infrastructure [bases] into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency. The development of "Centers of Excellence" across the nation will create enhanced programs and synergies that will benefit the war fighter immensely.

In this process, both Maryland and New Jersey appeared before the BRAC Commission to express their position on this matter. During those meetings and since, arguments have been presented which suggest that Department of Defense had errors in their decision making process and calculations. I use this opportunity, and will be following up with a phone call, to outline the concerns raised by the New Jersey delegation and reiterate the Department of Defense's rationale for making this recommendation (the closing of Ft. Monmouth and relocation of C4ISR to APG to establish a Land C4ISR (Center of Excellence).)

Monmouth claim 1- Radical changes to the military should not be made during a time of war. -

Response - Such a claim would negate any BRAC action anywhere during this BRAC round and few of the past rounds. The overarching need is for efficiency, adaptability to current and potential threats and modernization demanded by proper utilization of finite defense resources. If there is a supportable promise of achieving continuity of service to the warfighter, then timing is irrelevant.

Monmouth claim 2- Closing Ft. Monmouth would have a negative impact on the war fighter.

Response - The prime example cited was the Warlock IED jamming system. This system was developed by the Army Research Laboratory (ARL), headquarters at APG with components at White Sands as well as Fort Monmouth. Fort Monmouth's role was

C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

2ND DISTRICT, MARYLAND

ASSISTANT DEMOCRATIC WHIP

PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE

SUBCOMMITTEES:

HUMAN INTELLIGENCE, ANALYSIS, AND
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

TECHNICAL AND TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE

INTELLIGENCE POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:

CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND
HUMAN RESOURCES

NATIONAL SECURITY, EMERGING THREATS,
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BRAC Commission

JUL 29 2005

Received

largely acquisition management not engineering. Continuity of this system is assured under the DOD recommendation.

Monmouth claim 3- A "Brain Drain" would be created by this movement

Response - Early estimates of numbers of employees willing to move is always greatly inaccurate. Maryland's previous experience with movement of other military installations showed up to 80% of the workforce ultimately relocating to maintain employment. 45% of Ft. Monmouth's workforce is at age 50+ with a significant portion likely to retire in the near future. Maryland has many citizens who have moved from across the nation and have chosen Maryland for their retirement home. Maryland is first among states in the nation with the highest percentage of professional and technical workers and is second among the states in its number of people holding advanced degrees. Maryland has a larger labor market than New Jersey for recruiting which can help mitigate these risks. Additionally, the move would create an increased synergy and enhanced program efficiency resulting in the need for fewer individuals to complete mission. Finally, it has been suggested that Ft. Monmouth has suffered from the lack of newly trained, highly motivated individuals bringing the latest in skills and technology to the project. This movement of C4ISR to APG would result in a refreshed, creative, "brain enhanced" workforce.

Monmouth claim 4- DOD cost data on relocating C4ISR is flawed.

Response - The wild assumption of construction costs suggested by Ft. Monmouth are inconsistent with GEO certified estimates. By locating this capability to APG, DOD will realize over \$143 million in cost savings each year - quickly recapturing any short term costs associated with the moving of C4ISR. The moving costs that Ft. Monmouth suggest do not include the relocation of the Ordnance school and the ability to utilize then vacant space. Additionally, an Enhanced Use Lease Program already established at APG will further provide additional financial benefits to the military.

Monmouth claim 5- Monmouth should be part of a mega-base including Dix, McGuire, Lakehurst and Monmouth.

Response- This configuration would not improve the efficiency of developing and fielding C4ISR technologies. This mega-base would consist of a fuel tanker airforce base, a carrier support naval base and coupling those facilities with C4ISR functions. Absent from this configuration are the synergies intended by this BRAC.

The movement of the C4ISR organizations to Aberdeen makes sense. It supports the original intention of the DOD BRAC recommendations and will enhance greatly the ability of our nation to protect our war fighter and grow DOD technology.

Signed



CA Dutch Ruppensberger
Member of Congress

C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER
2ND DISTRICT, MARYLAND

REPLY TO:

1630 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3061
FAX: (202) 225-3094

THE ATRIUM

375 WEST PADONIA ROAD, SUITE 200
TIMONIUM, MD 21093
(410) 628-2701
FAX: (410) 628-2708

www.house.gov/ruppersberger

1 (877) 727-6802

The Honorable Anthony Principi, Chairman
Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 S. Clark St.
Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2002

July 25, 2005

ASSISTANT DEMOCRATIC WHIP

PORT SECURITY CAUCUS
Co-CHAIRMAN

PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE

SUBCOMMITTEES:
TERRORISM, HUMAN INTELLIGENCE, ANALYSIS,
AND COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

TECHNICAL AND TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE
OVERSIGHT

GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:
CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND
HUMAN RESOURCES

NATIONAL SECURITY, EMERGING THREATS,
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BRAC Commission

JUL 29 2005

Received

Dear Chairman Principi:

I am writing today to express support for the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure recommendations, particularly the recommendation to move the C4ISR organizations from Ft. Monmouth, New Jersey to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG). The intention of BRAC 2005 is to reconfigure the current infrastructure [bases] into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency. The development of "Centers of Excellence" across the nation will create enhanced programs and synergies that will benefit the war fighter immensely.

In this process, both Maryland and New Jersey appeared before the BRAC Commission to express their position on this matter. During those meetings and since, arguments have been presented which suggest that Department of Defense had errors in their decision making process and calculations. I use this opportunity, and will be following up with a phone call, to outline the concerns raised by the New Jersey delegation and reiterate the Department of Defense's rationale for making this recommendation (the closing of Ft. Monmouth and relocation of C4ISR to APG to establish a Land C4ISR (Center of Excellence.)

Monmouth claim 1- Radical changes to the military should not be made during a time of war. -

Response - Such a claim would negate any BRAC action anywhere during this BRAC round and few of the past rounds. The overarching need is for efficiency, adaptability to current and potential threats and modernization demanded by proper utilization of finite defense resources. If there is a supportable promise of achieving continuity of service to the warfighter, then timing is irrelevant.

Monmouth claim 2- Closing Ft. Monmouth would have a negative impact on the war fighter.

Response - The prime example cited was the Warlock IED jamming system. This system was developed by the Army Research Laboratory (ARL), headquarters at APG with components at White Sands as well as Fort Monmouth. Fort Monmouth's role was

largely acquisition management not engineering. Continuity of this system is assured under the DOD recommendation.

Monmouth claim 3- A "Brain Drain" would be created by this movement

Response - Early estimates of numbers of employees willing to move is always greatly inaccurate. Maryland's previous experience with movement of other military installations showed up to 80% of the workforce ultimately relocating to maintain employment. 45% of Ft. Monmouth's workforce is at age 50+ with a significant portion likely to retire in the near future. Maryland has many citizens who have moved from across the nation and have chosen Maryland for their retirement home. Maryland is first among states in the nation with the highest percentage of professional and technical workers and is second among the states in its number of people holding advanced degrees. Maryland has a larger labor market than New Jersey for recruiting which can help mitigate these risks. Additionally, the move would create an increased synergy and enhanced program efficiency resulting in the need for fewer individuals to complete mission. Finally, it has been suggested that Ft. Monmouth has suffered from the lack of newly trained, highly motivated individuals bringing the latest in skills and technology to the project. This movement of C4ISR to APG would result in a refreshed, creative, "brain enhanced" workforce.

Monmouth claim 4- DOD cost data on relocating C4ISR is flawed.

Response - The wild assumption of construction costs suggested by Ft. Monmouth are inconsistent with GEO certified estimates. By locating this capability to APG, DOD will realize over \$143 million in cost savings each year - quickly recapturing any short term costs associated with the moving of C4ISR. The moving costs that Ft. Monmouth suggest do not include the relocation of the Ordnance school and the ability to utilize then vacant space. Additionally, an Enhanced Use Lease Program already established at APG will further provide additional financial benefits to the military.

Monmouth claim 5- Monmouth should be part of a mega-base including Dix, McGuire, Lakehurst and Monmouth.

Response- This configuration would not improve the efficiency of developing and fielding C4ISR technologies. This mega-base would consist of a fuel tanker airforce base, a carrier support naval base and coupling those facilities with C4ISR functions. Absent from this configuration are the synergies intended by this BRAC.

The movement of the C4ISR organizations to Aberdeen makes sense. It supports the original intention of the DOD BRAC recommendations and will enhance greatly the ability of our nation to protect our war fighter and grow DOD technology.

Signed



CA Dutch Ruppensberger
Member of Congress

REPLY TO:
1630 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3061
FAX: (202) 225-3094

THE ATRIUM
375 WEST PADONIA ROAD, SUITE 200
TIMONIUM, MD 21093
(410) 628-2701
FAX: (410) 628-2708
www.house.gov/ruppersberger
1 (877) 727-6802

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2002

July 25, 2005

General Lloyd Newton, Commissioner
Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 S. Clark St.
Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear General Newton:

I am writing today to express support for the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure recommendations, particularly the recommendation to move the C4ISR organizations from Ft. Monmouth, New Jersey to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG). The intention of BRAC 2005 is to reconfigure the current infrastructure [bases] into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency. The development of "Centers of Excellence" across the nation will create enhanced programs and synergies that will benefit the war fighter immensely.

In this process, both Maryland and New Jersey appeared before the BRAC Commission to express their position on this matter. During those meetings and since, arguments have been presented which suggest that Department of Defense had errors in their decision making process and calculations. I use this opportunity, and will be following up with a phone call, to outline the concerns raised by the New Jersey delegation and reiterate the Department of Defense's rationale for making this recommendation (the closing of Ft. Monmouth and relocation of C4ISR to APG to establish a Land C4ISR (Center of Excellence.)

Monmouth claim 1- Radical changes to the military should not be made during a time of war. --

Response - Such a claim would negate any BRAC action anywhere during this BRAC round and few of the past rounds. The overarching need is for efficiency, adaptability to current and potential threats and modernization demanded by proper utilization of finite defense resources. If there is a supportable promise of achieving continuity of service to the warfighter, then timing is irrelevant.

Monmouth claim 2- Closing Ft. Monmouth would have a negative impact on the war fighter.

Response - The prime example cited was the Warlock IED jamming system. This system was developed by the Army Research Laboratory (ARL), headquarters at APG with components at White Sands as well as Fort Monmouth. Fort Monmouth's role was

C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER
2ND DISTRICT, MARYLAND

ASSISTANT DEMOCRATIC WHIP

**PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE**

SUBCOMMITTEES:
HUMAN INTELLIGENCE, ANALYSIS, AND
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

TECHNICAL AND TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE
INTELLIGENCE POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:
CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND
HUMAN RESOURCES

NATIONAL SECURITY, EMERGING THREATS,
AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

BRAC Commission

JUL 29 2005

Received

largely acquisition management not engineering. Continuity of this system is assured under the DOD recommendation.

Monmouth claim 3- A "Brain Drain" would be created by this movement

Response - Early estimates of numbers of employees willing to move is always greatly inaccurate. Maryland's previous experience with movement of other military installations showed up to 80% of the workforce ultimately relocating to maintain employment. 45% of Ft. Monmouth's workforce is at age 50+ with a significant portion likely to retire in the near future. Maryland has many citizens who have moved from across the nation and have chosen Maryland for their retirement home. Maryland is first among states in the nation with the highest percentage of professional and technical workers and is second among the states in its number of people holding advanced degrees. Maryland has a larger labor market than New Jersey for recruiting which can help mitigate these risks. Additionally, the move would create an increased synergy and enhanced program efficiency resulting in the need for fewer individuals to complete mission. Finally, it has been suggested that Ft. Monmouth has suffered from the lack of newly trained, highly motivated individuals bringing the latest in skills and technology to the project. This movement of C4ISR to APG would result in a refreshed, creative, "brain enhanced" workforce.

Monmouth claim 4- DOD cost data on relocating C4ISR is flawed.

Response - The wild assumption of construction costs suggested by Ft. Monmouth are inconsistent with GEO certified estimates. By locating this capability to APG, DOD will realize over \$143 million in cost savings each year - quickly recapturing any short term costs associated with the moving of C4ISR. The moving costs that Ft. Monmouth suggest do not include the relocation of the Ordnance school and the ability to utilize then vacant space. Additionally, an Enhanced Use Lease Program already established at APG will further provide additional financial benefits to the military.

Monmouth claim 5- Monmouth should be part of a mega-base including Dix, McGuire, Lakehurst and Monmouth.

Response- This configuration would not improve the efficiency of developing and fielding C4ISR technologies. This mega-base would consist of a fuel tanker airforce base, a carrier support naval base and coupling those facilities with C4ISR functions. Absent from this configuration are the synergies intended by this BRAC.

The movement of the C4ISR organizations to Aberdeen makes sense. It supports the original intention of the DOD BRAC recommendations and will enhance greatly the ability of our nation to protect our war fighter and grow DOD technology.

Signed



CA Dutch Ruppensberger
Member of Congress

REPLY TO:

1630 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3061
FAX: (202) 225-3094

THE ATRIUM

375 WEST PADONIA ROAD, SUITE 200
TIMONIUM, MD 21093
(410) 628-2701
FAX: (410) 628-2708

www.house.gov/ruppersberger
1 (877) 727-6802

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2002

C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

2ND DISTRICT, MARYLAND

ASSISTANT DEMOCRATIC WHIP

PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE
ON INTELLIGENCE

SUBCOMMITTEES:
HUMAN INTELLIGENCE, ANALYSIS, AND
COUNTERINTELLIGENCE

TECHNICAL AND TACTICAL INTELLIGENCE
INTELLIGENCE POLICY AND NATIONAL SECURITY

GOVERNMENT REFORM COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:
CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DRUG POLICY, AND
HUMAN RESOURCES

NATIONAL SECURITY, EMERGING THREATS,
BRAC Commission INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

July 25, 2005

Admiral Harold Gehman
Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 S. Clark St.
Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

JUL 29 2005

Received

Dear Admiral Gehman:

I am writing today to express support for the Department of Defense's Base Realignment and Closure recommendations, particularly the recommendation to move the C4ISR organizations from Ft. Monmouth, New Jersey to Aberdeen Proving Ground (APG). The intention of BRAC 2005 is to reconfigure the current infrastructure [bases] into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency. The development of "Centers of Excellence" across the nation will create enhanced programs and synergies that will benefit the war fighter immensely.

In this process, both Maryland and New Jersey appeared before the BRAC Commission to express their position on this matter. During those meetings and since, arguments have been presented which suggest that Department of Defense had errors in their decision making process and calculations. I use this opportunity, and will be following up with a phone call, to outline the concerns raised by the New Jersey delegation and reiterate the Department of Defense's rationale for making this recommendation (the closing of Ft. Monmouth and relocation of C4ISR to APG to establish a Land C4ISR (Center of Excellence.)

Monmouth claim 1- Radical changes to the military should not be made during a time of war. -

Response - Such a claim would negate any BRAC action anywhere during this BRAC round and few of the past rounds. The overarching need is for efficiency, adaptability to current and potential threats and modernization demanded by proper utilization of finite defense resources. If there is a supportable promise of achieving continuity of service to the warfighter, then timing is irrelevant.

Monmouth claim 2- Closing Ft. Monmouth would have a negative impact on the war fighter.

Response - The prime example cited was the Warlock IED jamming system. This system was developed by the Army Research Laboratory (ARL), headquarters at APG with components at White Sands as well as Fort Monmouth. Fort Monmouth's role was

largely acquisition management not engineering. Continuity of this system is assured under the DOD recommendation.

Monmouth claim 3- A "Brain Drain" would be created by this movement

Response - Early estimates of numbers of employees willing to move is always greatly inaccurate. Maryland's previous experience with movement of other military installations showed up to 80% of the workforce ultimately relocating to maintain employment. 45% of Ft. Monmouth's workforce is at age 50+ with a significant portion likely to retire in the near future. Maryland has many citizens who have moved from across the nation and have chosen Maryland for their retirement home. Maryland is first among states in the nation with the highest percentage of professional and technical workers and is second among the states in its number of people holding advanced degrees. Maryland has a larger labor market than New Jersey for recruiting which can help mitigate these risks. Additionally, the move would create an increased synergy and enhanced program efficiency resulting in the need for fewer individuals to complete mission. Finally, it has been suggested that Ft. Monmouth has suffered from the lack of newly trained, highly motivated individuals bringing the latest in skills and technology to the project. This movement of C4ISR to APG would result in a refreshed, creative, "brain enhanced" workforce.

Monmouth claim 4- DOD cost data on relocating C4ISR is flawed.

Response – The wild assumption of construction costs suggested by Ft. Monmouth are inconsistent with GEO certified estimates. By locating this capability to APG, DOD will realize over \$143 million in cost savings each year – quickly recapturing any short term costs associated with the moving of C4ISR. The moving costs that Ft. Monmouth suggest do not include the relocation of the Ordnance school and the ability to utilize then vacant space. Additionally, an Enhanced Use Lease Program already established at APG will further provide additional financial benefits to the military.

Monmouth claim 5– Monmouth should be part of a mega-base including Dix, McGuire, Lakehurst and Monmouth.

Response– This configuration would not improve the efficiency of developing and fielding C4ISR technologies. This mega-base would consist of a fuel tanker airforce base, a carrier support naval base and coupling those facilities with C4ISR functions. Absent from this configuration are the synergies intended by this BRAC.

The movement of the C4ISR organizations to Aberdeen makes sense. It supports the original intention of the DOD BRAC recommendations and will enhance greatly the ability of our nation to protect our war fighter and grow DOD technology.

Signed



CA Dutch Ruppensberger
Member of Congress