

E-mail from Lt. Gen. James Mattis following the Laser Safety Review Board's decision to not certify the Dazzler laser requested by Marines in Iraq.

-----Original Message-----

From: Mattis LtGen James

Sent: Sunday, February 18, 2007 15:07

To: Amos LTGEN James F; Alles BGen Randolph D; Brogan BGen Michael M

Cc: Clubb Col Timothy L; Tomczak Col Jeffrey P; Stalder LtGen Keith J; Gaskin MGen Walter E;

Subject: RE: LE CHPLD LSRB Certification results

Tamer: Only the fact that you, Tex and Mike Brogan are engaged in this fight on our behalf keeps me from climbing on an airplane and hunting down these rear-echelon [REDACTED] who would question the requirement out of theater. I could not agree more with your email below. Don't hesitate to call on MARCENT should you need more info, etc.

The last thing we need are some smug, safe, stay-at-home [REDACTED] questioning the need to avert tragic EOF engagements because they've chosen to dismiss the requests from our lads in the fight. If there are bonafide technical shortcomings, so be it -- we'll address or resolve those problems or forego the CHP. But the claptrap reported in part below in Mr. Forrester's email is not compelling since the technical decision appears to be personalized and bordering on irresponsible.

We have Marines in difficult positions and need to work together to help them resolve EOF without killing folks due to a less than capable laser that they wish to replace with a more capable version.

Thank you, and Mike and Tex as well, for your usual efforts on our behalf. Please let me know if you need reinforcing fires from MARCENT.

MARCENT will continue to control and sequester all CHPS until I hear it is certified (at which time we will issue them) or that it has bonafide technical problems precluding its certification (in which case MARCENT will ship them back to LOGCOM for destruction).

s/f Jim

E-mail from Lt. Col. T.J. Jankowski after a Marine board decides to purchase the Green Beam laser instead of the Dazzler requested by units in Iraq.

From: Jankowski LtCol Thaddeus L [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, January 18, 2007 6:08 PM
To: Blasiol GS15 Len A
Cc: Chewning CIV Tracey L; Marshall CTR Bryan C; Mattocks CIV Julie A; MCSC Watchofficer; Reed GS12 Bernadette J; Powell GS-13 JoAnn M; Lewis GS09 Elaine; Eckberg LtCol Stephen A; Leonard LtCol Thomas E; Hostetter LtCol Robert L; Hill GS12 Richard A; Lapierre LtCol Martin E; Plager Sgt John F; Vilas LtCol Thomas M (INEF FWD DEPUTY G-9); Bruton Col Timothy M; Foreman Maj Andrew J; Forrester CIV Robert A; Huelse LtCol Scott A; Roper Maj Gregory T; [REDACTED] Ferris NH-III Timothy B; Connell CIV Christopher J; Nelson LtCol Thomas M
Subject: RE: CHP Laser Dissuasion Capability UUNS

Mr. Blasiol,

I did some research this morning, and I am confused. II MEF (FWD) asked for this in July 2005!! (CDTS #05209UB). And MCCDC is only now approving a sole-source(???)...for a different system.

1. In that II MEF UUNS #05209UB, they specifically ask for the CHP. Now, this year, I MEF FWD not only concurs with that request, in fact Gen Zilmer and his staff are evidently standing firm on the technical superiority of the original II MEF recommendation. So we have both MEFs in agreement on a recommended solution that is not even considered due to the Sole Source.

2. I've seen independent reports and other data that seems reasonable that CHP is a superior capability. Yet 18 months later, you are sole-sourcing to someone else? I guess I would have thought that the CHP would have been submitted to the LSRB along with this other system you are fielding, and if you take 18 months to approve the requirement, you would have chosen to compete it...or sole-source the better (CHP) system.

3. Why are we only now delivering a capability, almost two years after the Urgent UUNS from II MEF was submitted...for a COTS item?

4. LSRB is the most often cited reason for this delay...but why do we permit a bunch of people on a board in America to meet only every six months, when a capability useful in-theater goes unfilled? I bet if we asked them to meet on-order, they would. Even Congress is willing to spend \$1.5B on MRAPs, so I think LSRB can be led to respond more quickly.

5. In a joint world, one standard is supposed to apply whenever possible. We know very substantial capability differences exist between Angel Fire and Constant Hawk, so we ask for Angel Fire and get it. We know very substantial capability differences exists between C-RAM and G-BOSS (two cameras v. 1, networking for immediate forensics, yet with no less local capability at the FOB that CRAM provides), so we are in the process of making sure what we acquire truly meets the COMUSMARCENT-approved G-BOSS requirement (including networking). Yet in this case, CHP dazzlers are being used for the exact same reason elsewhere in-theater, so why isn't the Army's or SOCOM's approval of CHP good enough for USMC?

6. I've asked I MEF (FWD) for some risk analysis that estimates the probable decrease in escalation events and associated Iraqi casualties. This risk analysis centers on the question: if we had sole-sourced in Oct 2005 and delivered by Jan 2006, how many innocent I2 would not have needlessly been killed or injured? Just like the C-RAM engineer's recommendation to stop the presses on the ITS towers was an example of one-sided risk analysis (sure, the generator might hit a bump, rip away from frame flop over and kill a Marine, but what is the comparative likelihood of that system getting safely emplaced & saving 10 Marines from an IED...etc), perhaps here we might have benefited from risk analysis associated with an 18 month path to fielding the dazzlers, too.

V/R

TJ
Thaddeus Jankowski
LtCol USMC
Branch Head
Policy, Requirements, Programs