

JUL 13 2005

10 July 2005 Received

General Lloyd Newton  
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission  
2521 S. Clark Ste. 600  
Arlington, Va. 22202

Dear General Newton:

I am writing to you concerning the proposed move of the laboratory at which I work, Warfighter Readiness Research Division of the Air Force Research Laboratory from Mesa, Arizona, to Wright Patterson AFB in Dayton, Ohio. I wish to express my belief about the move, and to propose some alternatives to the DoD recommendation to the BRAC Commission. While I speak for myself, I know that the majority of my colleague scientists, engineers and other personnel at our laboratory share my opinion. I remember when you visited our laboratory a few years ago and so I believe you are well suited to understand and appreciate the points I will make in this letter. Because I am in the Civil Service, I wish to remain, regretfully, anonymous. I hope you will understand my need for anonymity.

The structure of this letter is as follows:

- Reasons why a move to WPAFB is not in the best interest of our Division, the AF and the DoD
- Reasons for keeping our laboratory at Mesa. This will include a discussion about why the Arizona State University proposal to convert the lab to a "Government Owned - Company Operated" facility is not sound.
- I realize there may be reasons why staying at Mesa is less than desirable (e.g., Force Protection). Therefore, I will finish the letter with a rationale for moving our laboratory to one of three alternative sites (Luke AFB, Kirtland AFB, Nellis AFB), that make much more sense than a move to WPAFB.

I do not believe that a move to Wright Patterson will serve the mission of our laboratory well. The following are my reasons:

- The stated rationale by the DoD for the move to Wright Patt is very vague. The only reason given for the move is to "increase synergy" between our laboratory and other AFRL units at WPAFB. The DoD never provides any specific information as to what type of synergy it expects to result from the co-location. It doesn't mention anything about the thematic or topical areas and functions in which it wishes to see synergy produced. I submit that it is incumbent upon the DoD to state a better rationale than the vague call for synergy, especially when millions of dollars will be spent for the move, our mission will be disrupted for many months, and we will lose a high percentage of our qualified personnel who opt not to make such a long move.
- As you know, our prime R&D area is in Distributed Mission Operations (DMO). To accomplish DMO we work with a large variety of distributed technologies (e.g., wide area networks, video teleconference, and collaborative web sites). We have been using these technologies through the last few years to better collaborate with our sister

JUL 13 2005

groups of AFRL, including those groups at WPAFB. That collaboration will ~~increase~~ <sup>Received</sup> in the years to come as all parties become more facile and comfortable with those technologies and mode of work. There really is no reason to move us to WPAFB for that purpose. The synergy rationale is being accomplished now.

- It is vital to our R&D mission that we have ready access to aircrew members. They act as research subjects. There is not a large population of pilots either at WPAFB or near by. This situation contrasts with our present situation at Mesa, where a large supply of aircrew are in the Southwest region of the U.S. Increased cost will result if we have to pay to bring aircrew to WPAFB from distances greater than we currently pay to bring them to Mesa.

- We have been told that there is no existing facility at WPAFB that will meet our mission needs. We have a perfectly suitable facility at Mesa right now. The expense to build a new facility at WPAFB is very difficult to justify.

The Air Force and the 1995 BRAC Commission opted to leave our laboratory at Mesa after Williams AFB closed. The Commission cited two main reasons to leave us in place. First, the expense of moving us to a different site (roughly \$15 Million in 1995) was difficult to justify. Second, the local community entities (cities, Arizona State University and Maricopa Community College, the Williams Airport Gateway Authority) made a case for the future of Williams AFB after its closure that showed great potential for synergy with our laboratory's mission. That vision has come to fruition. Williams is the only place in the world where one can find a federal research laboratory devoted to aviation training research, a Division I research university (Arizona State University) with significant R&D in aviation and technological efforts, a commercial airport, and a community college with a large aviation maintenance training mission. Our laboratory has a large number of ongoing collaborations with the local entities and we expect that collaboration to grow in the coming years.

- We have functioned very effectively as a stand-alone AFRL laboratory since Williams AFB's closure in 1993. There is no reason to expect our performance to change for the worse if we are left in place.

- We have what, for our mission, is recognized as a "world class" facility uniquely suited to our needs. It contains high bay space for our aircraft simulators, has a tempest area for our work in certain technical areas, and now has a security wall on our perimeter. It would cost many millions of dollars to duplicate our facility elsewhere.

- As mentioned above, our R&D requires ready access to aircrew and other warfighters. Part of the reason for our success over the years has been our location in the Southwest U.S. We are able to draw warfighters from a variety of Southwest U.S. bases to our laboratory. In addition, we can easily visit many bases on a one day trip basis. These bases include: Davis Monthan AFB in Tucson; the Air National Guard and Reserve ~~Test Facility~~ in Tucson; Luke AFB across the Valley of the Sun from our location; Kirtland AFB, Cannon AFB, and Holloman AFB in N.M.; Nellis AFB in Las Vegas; Hill AFB in Utah; Yuma Naval Air Station and Test Center; Ft. Irwin's National Training Center in California; Twenty Nine Palms Marine Corps base in California; and the Naval and USMC air facilities in the San Diego area. We have long standing agreements with a large variety of units at these bases in our region. Relocating us out of the Southwest region would truly harm our ability to perform our mission.

JUL 13 2005

- I understand that one reason why the DoD wishes to locate our laboratory base is because of Force Protection concerns. We generally do not have the desired 82-foot setbacks of buildings from surrounding roads. However, in our discussions with the local entities (Williams Gateway Airport Authority and Arizona State University) that surround our six-acre site they have emphatically stated that are willing to do whatever it takes to get the required setbacks even if it means closing surrounding roads. They and the city of Mesa are anxious to keep us in Mesa and they will do whatever it takes to make that happen.

I understand that Arizona State University is making a proposal to your Commission that the laboratory remain in Mesa, but it be converted to a "Government Owned, Company Operated" facility. Arizona State University would like to be the contractor that then runs the facility. They have talked to us on a number of occasions about their idea. We have consistently told them that we do not think it is a desirable or feasible option for a number of reasons. Here is a list of those reasons:

- They do not understand or appreciate our mission. While they have said that they would simply hire all personnel on site and then let the lab run itself as it always has, they have also said that they see new non-DoD business opportunities in which the lab could become involved. That desire reveals a shocking lack of understanding of our military mission. I believe it would be very difficult to maintain our recognized focus on our DoD customers and mission if ASU were running the lab.

- ASU is not used to being responsible for classified projects. We have a large number of these programs now, and that number will likely grow. I am certain that we have customers who would not be comfortable having their programs performed at a GOCO facility. They would likely pull out of current agreements if we were a GOCO.

- Because our mission is so focused on training R&D, we are unique in all of AFRL in that a constant and credible relationship with our warfighter customers is crucial. A large measure of our credibility with our customers comes from the number of uniformed personnel that are part of our team. Our Division Chief is an AF Colonel and we have about 40 military personnel in total. I realize that there are uniformed personnel at other GOCOs (e.g., the National Energy Laboratories), however I worry that due to personnel shortages the AF may opt to remove our uniformed personnel if we were converted to a GOCO. Our credibility and effectiveness would be severely harmed if we lost our military personnel.

- ASU, or any GOCO vendor, would have to "buy out" retirements of the civil servants who vested in the Government retirement system. We have over 60 civil servants and the buy out amount would be quite expensive. In our talks with ASU, they concede a "buy out" would have to be made, but they do not know how much it would cost or where they would get the money

- I would imagine the Federal Acquisition Regulations would require a competition to be held if the DOD decided to make our lab a GOCO. However, ASU believes they could get a sole source contract to run the GOCO just because it was their idea. We have three on site contractors (L3COM, Boeing, and Lockheed). I would imagine they and other companies would be interested in bidding to run the GOCO. I assume other companies would also be interested. In addition, other universities would

JUL 13 2005

likely be interested in bidding. Yet, ASU arrogantly believes that they would ~~have~~ <sup>Received</sup> exclusive rights to run the contract on a sole source basis. .

- It is clear that ASU would benefit from taking control of a world-class R&D organization. Yet, when we have asked them how the AF or DoD would benefit from such an arrangement, they do not have a good answer. They make vague statements about synergy with the rest of the university, but we already have that synergy due to extensive efforts to form collaborative agreements. We can't see any reason for ASU's arguments. I strongly recommend that the BRAC Commission **not accept ASU's proposal**. I feel it would be better for our mission to move rather than to go into a GOCO arrangement.

If, in its wisdom, your BRAC Commission decides that our laboratory simply can't stay at our current location under our current arrangement, I suggest you strongly consider three alternative locations that would enhance our mission, and entice, I believe, a majority of our qualified personnel to make the move.

- Luke AFB, Az. - As a former AETC Commander you know the number of aircrew assets and units at Luke. Our lab has had a quality long-term relationship with the warfighters at Luke over the years. It is less than fifty miles from our Mesa location. In fact, at certain times our lab has had an Operating Location at Luke along with lab personnel. Luke is the largest fighter training base in the world and its mission and our lab's mission of warfighter training research are highly compatible. Our scientists and engineers have performed, and are performing, a variety of training research at Luke. We use many of the Luke aircrew in our experiments in our lab at Mesa. That relationship would only be made stronger if we were located at Luke. A significant added bonus of a move to Luke AFB is that I am sure a great majority of our government and contractor personnel would move to Luke. They would not move to WPAFB. The Luke Commander has stated that he would be happy to have us move to Luke.

- Kirtland AFB, N.M. - Kirtland is already an Air Force Materiel Command base. AFMC is our parent Command. In addition, Kirtland has the advantage of already having a large AFRL presence with two complete AFRL Divisions there. Kirtland has the Distributed Mission Operations Center. DMO is a key part of R&D and a move in a co-located spot would be ideal for advancing the DMO concept. In addition, we could get Subject Matter Experts and research subjects from an F-16 Guard unit at Kirtland. Also, the 58th Special Operations Wing is at Kirtland. The lab has a long relationship with the 58th, and we could provide more help to the Air Force Special Operations Command if we were there. The Air Force Operational T&E Command and the AF Safety Center are there. We have worked with both groups before. Training is a key issue for both entities. There are a variety of other entities at Kirtland with which we could work if we were co-located there (e.g., Sandia National Laboratory, Defense Threat Reduction Agency). Many of our personnel said they would strongly consider a move to Kirtland.

- Nellis AFB, Nv. As you know, Nellis is the home of the fighter pilot. In addition, there is now a Coalition Air Operations Center there, and the lab is moving strongly into Command and Control training research. Again, we have a long history of cooperation with units at Nellis - Red Flag, Air Warrior, Fighter Weapons School, Air-

JUL 13 2005

Ground Operations School.. Nellis is near the National Training Center, at Ft. Irwin and our work with the Army is increasing. The Air Warfare Center is headquartered at Nellis and our relationship with a variety of AWC Commanders has prompted them to ask why we can't be located at Nellis. Our four ship F-16 DMO testbed could serve double duty in providing a research testbed for our lab, and a training venue for Nellis pilots. Again, I am sure more people would move to Nellis than would move to WPAFB.

I strongly believe that any of the three options I have described above would be far preferable for our mission than Wright-Patterson. They have the added benefit of keeping our lab located in the Southwest U.S. where we have so many customers and partners. I hope that the logic of my arguments for these three alternatives will convince the BRAC Commission that there are better locations for us than WPAFB. A facility will have to be built for us at any of these locations, but of course, one would have to be built for us if we moved to WPAFB.

Even if the Commission decides to move the bulk of our Division to WPAFB, I would hope that you would at least allow the AF the option of opening an Operating Location from our laboratory at one or more of these three alternative locations. The success of our mission will be greatly enhanced by such an option.

I very much appreciate the time you have taken to read this letter. I know the Commission has a very difficult task and I commend you for dedication to this work. To summarize, I strongly believe a move of our laboratory to WPAFB is not in the best interest of our lab at Mesa, the AF, or the DoD. I believe we can continue to function effectively if left in Mesa under AFRL direction. Vast amounts of money will be saved and our world class team will not be broken up. I do not believe the Arizona State University plan to take over the lab as a GOCO has merit. The BRAC Commission should not pursue it. If the BRAC decides that, we must relocate from Mesa I believe Luke AFB, Kirtland AFB, or Nellis AFB would be far superior alternatives to a WPAFB move. If the Commission still decides that we should move to WPAFB, I hope you will allow us to establish Operating Locations at at least one of these alternative sites.

Thank you very much, A concerned AFRL employee.

JUL 13 2005

**COMMENTS/COMPARISONS ON THE NEW AFMC REORGANIZATION AND  
THE NEW ASC "LANDSCAPE"**

Received

**PRELUDE**

Since 1992, Air Force Systems Command (AFSC) and Air Force Logistics Command (AFLC) merged to form Air Force Material Command (AFMC). AFMC consists of 24 separate organizations, including HQ AFMC at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (WPAFB), Ohio. This paper will only address those product and logistic center organizations germane to the major fiscal funding appropriations provided to AFMC and approved by the congress.

The product centers are:

- Aeronautical Systems Center, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio
- Electronic Systems Center, Hanscom AFB, Mass.

The logistic centers are:

- Ogden Air Logistics Center, Hill AFB, Utah
- Oklahoma Air Logistics Center, Tinker AFB, Okla.
- Warner Robins AFB, Robins AFB, Ga.

It is worthy to note that fiscal funding varies by funding codes and categories. Under existing AFMC appropriations the funding provided is specific and to be spent by appropriation and obligation which differs for the product and logistic centers. For example, 3600 funds are for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation and largely used by the product centers to develop new state-of-the-art weapon system platforms. Examples today include the F/A-22 Raptor Fighter (replaces the F-15 Fighter); the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (replaces the F-16 Fighter); the C-17 Globemaster III (replaces the C-141 Starlifter Cargo Plane); the E-10A, a new multisensor command and control aircraft (will replace E-3 AWACS, E-8 Joint STARS, and RC-135 Rivet Joint).

3600 funds are provided to the logistics centers for projects that require funding for new technologies to support aircraft and depot new technology insertions. Obligated 3600 funds must be spent within a two year obligation.

In addition to 3600 funds, the product centers receive 3010 Aircraft Production Procurement, 3020 Missile Production Procurement, and 3080 Other Aircraft/Missile Support Procurement, to build and support the new weapon system platform procurements until the new systems are turned over to the logistics centers after development and testing is complete. Obligated 3010, 3020 and 3080 funds must be spent within a three year obligation.

JUL 13 2005

The logistics centers receive 3400 Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funding. The 3400 funding is one year obligated funds supporting the three depot logistics operation with Depot Maintenance Industrial Funding (DMIF) in 14 separate Element of Expense/Investment Codes. 3400 funds are the operational financial heart of each depot to do its Air Force wide logistics support. The depots provide their Program Objective Memorandum (POM) requirements years ahead of time through the Air Force chain of command to be approved by the Congress. **The intent of 3400 funds is for depot use only and not to be applied for non DMIF use.**

**CURRENT AFMC AND ASC/ESC ACTIONS ON DEPOT OPERATIONS AND FUNDING**

The current AFMC/ASC direction started sometime in 2004. To show the AFMC/ASC impact on the three depot operations, the B-52 Weapons System Review (WSR) is used as an example. The B-52 WSR example is echoed throughout each and every weapon system platform assigned to the three logistics depots.

The Air Combat Command 2<sup>nd</sup> Bomb Wing, Barksdale AFB, Louisiana hosted the B-52 WSR on 13-16 April 2004. The Tinker B-52 System Program Office personnel briefed their assigned responsibilities as noted in the attached agenda. Note that the base designation for the B-52 SPO office is OC-ALC/LH. The attached agenda designates the Briefer by name and office. All work is done at Tinker for the B-52 until November 2004 when the workload and funds were taken over by HQ AFMC/ASC.

At the April B-52 WSR, the dollar amounts for each agenda topic were briefed as well as the technical presentation. The total dollar amounts briefed are:

Tinker B-52 funding for 2004 and out years:	3400 funds	\$130.1M
Robins B-52 funding for 2004 and out years: (Sustaining funds for support equipment)	583 mod funds	\$2M

These funds represent the B-52 budget to be used by OC-ALC/LH and WR-ALC/LE. None were programmed to go to HQ AFMC/ASC at the April 2004 B-52 WSR. That situation changed at the November 2004 B-52 WSR. The money is now in the hands of HQ AFMC/ASC.