

DCN: 12003



> Member Services

HOME MY AT&T E-MAIL FEATURES SEARCH TOOLS SHOP HELP

Friday, Aug 19

E-mail | Address Book | Calendar

E-mail Options

Mailbox Usage

31% of 25 MB



martha.

Message: 2 of 80 < Pre

> MAILBOX mart..ebs

INBOX [35]

Draft

SentMail

Trash empty

⊕ MY FOLDERS add

Reply Reply All Forward Delete Close



Move to folder: INBOX > go

> Save Address

From: "Orringer, Neal (Dodd)" <Neal_Orringer@dodd.senate.gov>
To: <martha.krebs@att.net>
Cc: "Payne, Alan (Lieberman)" <Alan_Payne@lieberman.senate.gov>
Subject: Proposed Questions
Date: Fri, 19 Aug 2005 19:58:27 +0000 [View Source]

- > Folder Manager
- > Mailbox Manager
- Address Book
- > Calendar

Dear Commissioner Coyle:

I understand that you have spoken to Sen. Dodd recently. He has asked me on a VERY short letter that summarizes New London's national security arg will do so as soon as it is signed.

In the meantime, in preparation for tomorrow's hearing, he and Sen, Lieber respectfully request that you consider asking the questions below to the witr be reached on my cell phone at 202-309-2432. Sen. Lieberman's military fe Payne; he can be reached on his cell phone at 703-627-9138.

Thank you so much for your consideration.

Neal and Alan

ALAN PAYNE

CURRENT SETTINGS

Spam Blocker

Virus Protection

More E-mail Options

Google SEARCH THE WEB

> GO

Questions for BRAC Commission Hearing
Saturday, Aug. 20, 2005

1. **NOTED OPPOSITION.** DoD's recommendation to close Sub Bas London has generated considerable opposition from various distinguished N and military policymakers, to name a few:

ALAN
PAYNE

- A former President of the United States
- Chairman of the House Services Forces Committee,
- Chairman of the House Projection Forces Subcommittee,
- Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee,
- Chairman of the House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee.

DCN: 12003

- A former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
- Three former Chiefs of Naval Operations
- And several other retired senior Navy leadres

HAS that any
They have made forceful arguments for why closing down Submarir
London would imperil U.S. National Security. It is not clear to me that the
entirely proven the case that such a closure would enhance our nation's safety
supposed savings would justify breaking up the Navy's undersea center of ex

CONCERN'S
Question: How do you square the arguments put forth by this list of military
with the Navy's contention that closing the base will somehow improve our
security?

2. INTERNAL NAVY OPPOSITION. The January 13, 2005 minute
 Navy's Infrastructure Evaluation Group show that Fleet Forces Command (I
 not concur with the recommendation to close Submarine Base New London

- OF THE*
- CFFC said that shutting down New London would deprive the *NAVY*
 flexibility to "surge or increase the size of the east coast fleet.
 - This was the only instance where Fleet Forces Command opposed a
 recommendation that was ultimately put on the closure list.
 - Since we must make our decisions primarily based on the milita
 criteria, this disagreement is of great concern to the Commission

the NAVY'S
Question: Why did Navy leadership choose to reject the recommendation of
top operational command (CFFC) to retain SUBASE New London?

> Change your options to hide images within all messages.

Reply	Reply All	Forward			Move to folder:
Delete	Close		Report Spam	Print	INBOX ▾ >

Message: 2 of 80 < Pre

[Check E-mail](#) | [Compose](#) | [Folders](#) | [Mailboxes](#) | [E-mail Options](#) | [E-mail Help](#) | [E-Logout](#) | [E-mail](#) | [Calendar](#) | [Address Book](#) | [AT&T Worldnet Home](#) | [Feedba](#)

[Terms and Conditions](#). [AT&T Online Privacy Policy](#).
 Copyright 2005, AT&T. All rights reserved.