BRAC Commission

DCN: 4866

JUL 17 2005

Received

May 18, 2005

BRAC Chairman Anthony Principi
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
C/o Office of the Secretary of Defense
5000 Defense Pentagon
Washington, D.C. 20301-5000

Dear Chairman Principi,

The Base Realignment and Closure Commission has an unenviable task of sorting through tons of paperwork plus hearing oral testimony to arrive at highly advantageous decisions that affect the future combat capabilities of the U.S. Armed Forces.

Unfortunately, neither the contents on the BRAC list released by the Secretary of Defense on May 13, 2005, nor the criteria to select which bases to close or align that was released earlier last year are conducive to that objective for optimum decision-making. Rather the BRAC list is viewed as a very highly parochial listing by each service protecting its own turf. That list clearly avoids harder choices because the paradigm utilized reflects Twentieth Century Cold War thinking with large cumbersome in-house bureaucracies that would remain in place **versus** Twenty-First Century National Security thinking with streamlined smaller in-house bureaucracies teamed with the industrial capacity of America.

Basically, the 2005 BRAC list is an anachronism and an exaggeration. The major bases listed are sacrificial lambs while the proposed closure of Reserve facilities is fratricide.

A more realistic paradigm for purposes of the BRAC process would be to examine and possibly adopt the British model. After World War II the British were broke and adopted the concept of a single all-service laboratory (Royal Ordnance Laboratory) coupled with the all-service officer's staff/technical training school (Royal Military College of Science) near Swindon, England just west of London. That concept accords the flexibility for rapid adaptation to evolving warfare needs and maintains the jointness among the services.

In the United States, each service has its own in-house laboratory structure (less the Marine Corps) and other commercial contract centers involved in RDT&E. In addition, the Air Force Systems, and Naval Air Systems Commands functions duplicate that of aerospace contractors. Those system behemoths represent modern dinosaurs which account for enormous sums of funding. At the other end of the spectrum are the various service colleges which should be combined under one roof and officer technical degrees earned in the U.S. university system.

Streamlining the aforementioned could possibly release two to three times the funding over the next twenty (20) years as expected by the current 2005 BRAC list and criteria.

Respectfully yours

Will-Matthis Dunn, Jr.

Will-Matthis Dunn, Jr.