



# 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report

## Table of Contents

<u>Section Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
Cover Letter to President	—
Executive Summary	—
Chapter One: Commission Findings & Recommendations	
Commission Strategic Overview	—
Chapter One: Army	—
Chapter One: Navy/Marine Corps	—
Chapter One: Air Force	—
Chapter One: Education & Training	—
Chapter One: HQ & Support Activities	—
Chapter One: Industrial	—
Chapter One: Intelligence	—
Chapter One: Medical	—
Chapter One: Supply & Storage	—
Chapter One: Technical	—
Chapter Two: Issues for Further Consideration <i>five</i>	—
Chapter Three: Previous Experience with Base Closures <i>— SIX</i>	—
<i>2</i> Chapter Four: Environmental Remediation	—
Chapter Five: The 2005 BRAC Process <i>— seven Two</i>	—
Chapter ????: Costs and Savings of BRAC 2005 <i>— three</i>	—
<i>C</i> <i>Economic Analysis — Three</i>	

<b>PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS &amp; 2005 BRAC REPORT ACTION PLAN + WORKSHEET</b>				
				Updated as of: 08/01/2005
<b>Project Element Name</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible For Providing</b>	<b>When Accomplishable?</b>	<b>Project Status</b>	<b>Editing and Review Plan</b>
Cover Page	Andy Napoli + graphics layout assistance from ANSER	Completed	Completed.	Completed.
Cover letter to President	Chris Yoder + Andy Napoli		AVN has written draft. Forwarded to Chris Yoder and others for review.	After Chris Yoder reviews and edits, present to Charlie and Chmn. Principi in early August. If approved, show to other 8 Commissioners for final review & signature.
Table of Contents	Andy Napoli		Essentially completed barring changes. Also need to number at the very end of the process.	
Executive Summary	Chris Yoder + Andy Napoli		Yoder to write, based on LTC Govern's strategic overview, plus insights from Ch 2 (issues for further consideration), plus Commissioner and R&A feedback.	Chris Yoder and Andy write, then show to Charlie, then to Chmn. Principi.
<b>Chapter 1: Commission Findings &amp; Recommendations [Note: will include vote results within "Commission Recommendations"]</b>	Each R&A analyst assigned to his/her specific recommendations will provide sections on "community concerns" and "Commission Findings." Legal will write the final approved Recommendation. AVN will transcribe the DoD recommendations and justifications.		AVN has entered all 190 recommendations into a "default" status as discussed with Frank Cirillo and Bob Cook. Community concerns solicited and should be written between 18 July and 6 August.	See separate proposed review process
Ch1: Commission Strategic Overview	LtCol Kevin Govern		Will consist of about 2-3 pages of Commission overall assessment of DoD BRAC Recommendations.	LtCol Govern writes, then Andy and Chris Yoder edit, then Charlie approves.
Ch1: Army	Designees from Army team		AVN has entered all Army recommendations into a "default" status as discussed with Frank Cirillo and Bob Cook	See separate proposed review process
Ch1: Navy/Marine Corps	Designees from Navy Team		AVN has entered all Navy/Marine recommendations into a "default" status as discussed with Frank Cirillo and Bob Cook	See separate proposed review process
Ch1: Air Force	Designees from Air Force Team		AVN has entered all Air Force recommendations into a "default" status as discussed with Frank Cirillo and Bob Cook	See separate proposed review process
Ch1: E&T	Designees from Joint Issues Team		AVN has entered all Ed & Training recommendations into a "default" status as discussed with Frank Cirillo and Bob Cook	See separate proposed review process
Ch1: H&SA	Designees from Joint Issues Team		AVN has entered all H&SA recommendations into a "default" status as discussed with Frank Cirillo and Bob Cook	See separate proposed review process
Ch1: Ind	Designees from Joint Issues Team		AVN has entered all Industrial recommendations into a "default" status as discussed with Frank Cirillo and Bob Cook	See separate proposed review process

PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS & 2005 BRAC REPORT ACTION PLAN + WORKSHEET			Updated as of: 08/01/2005	
Project Element Name	Person(s) Responsible For Providing	When Accomplishable?	Project Status	Editing and Review Plan
Ch1: Int	Designees from Joint Issues Team		AVN has entered all Intelligence recommendations into a "default" status as discussed with Frank Cirillo and Bob Cook	See separate proposed review process
Ch1: Med	Designees from Joint Issues Team		AVN has entered all Medical recommendations into a "default" status as discussed with Frank Cirillo and Bob Cook	See separate proposed review process
Ch1: S&S	Designees from Joint Issues Team		AVN has entered all Supply & Storage recommendations into a "default" status as discussed with Frank Cirillo and Bob Cook	See separate proposed review process
Ch1: Tech	Designees from Joint Issues Team		AVN has entered all Technical recommendations into a "default" status as discussed with Frank Cirillo and Bob Cook	See separate proposed review process
<b>Chapter 2: Issues for further Consideration</b>				
Ch2: Strategic Considerations and Timing of BRAC	Jim Hanna (Navy)		AVN forwarded ideas on discussion topics within this area, received feedback from Rumu Sarkar and incorporated several of her suggestions. Awaiting further review from Charlie, R&A, et. Al	
Ch2: Other Methodological Problems	Interagency Team		AVN forwarded ideas on discussion topics within this area, received feedback from Rumu Sarkar and incorporated several of her suggestions. Awaiting further review from Charlie, R&A, et. Al	
Ch2: Coordination of BRAC with the Air National Guard	Air Force Team		AVN forwarded ideas on discussion topics within this area, received feedback from Rumu Sarkar and incorporated several of her suggestions. Awaiting further review from Charlie, R&A, et. Al	
Ch2: Joint Cross Service Groups and Promoting Jointness	Designee from Dave Van Saun's Joint Cross-Service Team		AVN forwarded ideas on discussion topics within this area, received feedback from Rumu Sarkar and incorporated several of her suggestions. Awaiting further review from Charlie, R&A, et. Al	
Ch2: Implementing Joint Bases	Jim Hanna (Navy) + Joint Cross-Service Team		AVN forwarded ideas on discussion topics within this area, received feedback from Rumu Sarkar and incorporated several of her suggestions. Awaiting further review from Charlie, R&A, et. Al	
Ch2: Coordination of BRAC with Other Government Agencies	Interagency Team		AVN forwarded ideas on discussion topics within this area, received feedback from Rumu Sarkar and incorporated several of her suggestions. Awaiting further review from Charlie, R&A, et. Al	
Ch2: Commission Independence and the Future of BRAC	Andy Napoli + Dan Else		AVN has written parts of this section, awaiting review from Charlie and Diane. Dan Else to contribute other portions.	
Ch2: Recommendations on Statutory Changes to BRAC	Legal + Dan Else		AVN forwarded ideas on discussion topics within this area, received feedback from Rumu Sarkar and incorporated several of her suggestions. Awaiting further review from Charlie, R&A, et. Al	

PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS & 2005 BRAC REPORT ACTION PLAN + WORKSHEET			Updated as of: 08/01/2005	
Project Element Name	Person(s) Responsible For Providing	When Accomplishable?	Project Status	Editing and Review Plan
Ch2: Other optional issues	TBD		Will add new topics as needed	
<b>Chapter 3: Previous Experience with Base Closure</b>	Andy Napoli		AVN has written; Chris Yoder has edited and reviewed 1st time. AVN has incorporated 1st review into document. Yoder will review again.	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.
Ch3: History and Results from Prior Base Closures	Andy Napoli		AVN has written; Chris Yoder has edited and reviewed 1st time. AVN has incorporated 1st review into document. Yoder will review again.	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.
Ch3: Discussion of BRAC history from 1995 to 2005	Andy Napoli		AVN has written; Chris Yoder has edited and reviewed 1st time. AVN has incorporated 1st review into document. Yoder will review again.	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.
<b>Chapter 4: Environmental Remediation</b>				
Ch4: Limits of the COBRA model to assess BRAC costs	Gary Miller (R&A)		Gary Miller has presented outline, is using GAO report to and Aug 11th hearing to flesh out the material	Gary to write materials, then show to Andy and Bob Cook. Once approved, review by Chris Yoder, then Charlie, then Chmn. Principi.
Ch4: Environmental Regulatory and Statutory Requirements Affecting BRAC	Gary Miller (R&A)		Gary Miller has presented outline, is using GAO report to and Aug 11th hearing to flesh out the material	Gary to write materials, then show to Andy and Bob Cook. Once approved, review by Chris Yoder, then Charlie, then Chmn. Principi.
<b>Chapter 5: The 2005 BRAC Process</b>				
Ch5: Congress Authorizes the 2005 BRAC Commission	Andy Napoli		AVN has written; Chris Yoder has edited and reviewed 1st time. AVN has incorporated 1st review into document. Yoder will review again.	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Frank Cirillo, Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.
Ch5: Key Provisions of Current Law	Andy Napoli + assistance from Legal		AVN has written; Chris Yoder has edited and reviewed 1st time. AVN has incorporated 1st review into document. Yoder will review again.	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Frank Cirillo, Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.
Ch5: Requirements for DoD	Andy Napoli		AVN has written; Chris Yoder has edited and reviewed 1st time. AVN has incorporated 1st review into document. Yoder will review again.	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Frank Cirillo, Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.
Ch5: Selection Criteria Finalized	Andy Napoli		AVN has written; Chris Yoder has edited and reviewed 1st time. AVN has incorporated 1st review into document. Yoder will review again.	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Frank Cirillo, Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.
Ch5: Overseas Basing and BRAC	Andy Napoli		AVN has written; Chris Yoder has edited and reviewed 1st time. AVN has incorporated 1st review into document. Yoder will review again.	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Frank Cirillo, Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.
Ch5: Force Structure, Worldwide Inventory, Certification	Andy Napoli		AVN has written; Chris Yoder has edited and reviewed 1st time. AVN has incorporated 1st review into document. Yoder will review again.	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Frank Cirillo, Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.

PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS & 2005 BRAC REPORT ACTION PLAN + WORKSHEET			Updated as of: 08/01/2005	
Project Element Name	Person(s) Responsible For Providing	When Accomplishable?	Project Status	Editing and Review Plan
Ch5: Procedural Differences between 2005 and Prior BRAC rounds	Andy Napoli + assistance from Legal		AVN has written; Chris Yoder has edited and reviewed 1st time. AVN has incorporated 1st review into document. Yoder will review again.	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Frank Cirillo, Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.
Ch5: Composition of the 2005 BRAC Commission	Andy Napoli		AVN has written; Chris Yoder has edited and reviewed 1st time. AVN has incorporated 1st review into document. Yoder will review again.	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Frank Cirillo, Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.
Ch5: DOD procedures and process for 2005 round	Andy Napoli + assistance from R&A		AVN has written; sent to Chris Yoder for review (most material is taken directly from DoD's report)	Chris Yoder to review again. Then show to Frank Cirillo, Charlie, and finally to Chmn. Principi. Not sure if other 8 Commissioners need to review.
Ch5: Commission Review	Legal + R&A		AVN has written beginning part, also wrote and distributed guidance to R&A	Andy to review R&A/Legal work, then review by Chris Yoder, Charlie, and Chmn. Principi
Ch 5: Additions	Andy Napoli + Legal		AVN has written; sent to Legal for review	Andy to review R&A/Legal work, then review by Chris Yoder, Charlie, and Chmn. Principi
Ch5 Criteria 1 thru 4	Legal + R&A			Andy to review R&A/Legal work, then review by Chris Yoder, Charlie, and Chmn. Principi
Ch5: Criteria 5 thru 8	Legal + R&A			Andy to review R&A/Legal work, then review by Chris Yoder, Charlie, and Chmn. Principi
Ch5: The Role of the GAO	Designee from GAO		AVN has written; sent to R&A for review.	Andy to review R&A/Legal work, then review by Chris Yoder, Charlie, and Chmn. Principi
<b>Appendix</b>				
A. Abbreviations	Andy Napoli		AVN has completed. Has solicited comments from R&A staff for additions or subtractions from list	Andy has reviewed, also sent to R&A for review. Requires review by either Frank Cirillo, or send to Charlie and Chmn. Principi.
B. Definitions	Andy Napoli		AVN has completed. Has solicited comments from R&A staff for additions or subtractions from list	Andy has reviewed, also sent to R&A for review. Requires review by either Frank Cirillo, or send to Charlie and Chmn. Principi.
C. BRAC Statute for 2005 round	Andy Napoli + Legal		AVN has written a index of statute to include before the actual 39 pages of law, to serve as a 'guide' to where certain provisions are likely to be located.	After legal and Andy have reviewed, send to Charlie and then to Chmn. Principi
D. Force Structure Plan (uncl)	Andy Napoli		AVN has completed. Have transferred PDF into MS Word file.	Chris Yoder reviews, then completed.
E. Final Selection Criteria	Andy Napoli		AVN has completed. Also included a comparison chart showing differences between 1995 and 2005 final selection criteria	Chris Yoder reviews, then completed.
F. Closures and Realigns by state, 1988 thru 1995	Andy Napoli		AVN has completed.	Someone reviews Andy's work, then completed.
G. Commissioner Biographies	Andy Napoli		AVN has completed. Photos of commissioners will be B/W barring any unforeseen circumstances.	Charlie and Chmn. Principi and other 8 commissioners review, then completed.
H. Staff List + Org Chart	Andy Napoli		AVN has mostly completed staff list + org charts	Have sent org chart to staff for review. Then Diane and Charlie review one final time, then completed.
I. Hearings held by Commission	Christine Hill		AVN has listed almost all Commission hearings held thus far; has sent to Leg Affairs Team for review.	Christine's shop writes, Andy reviews, then Chris Yoder then completed.

PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS & 2005 BRAC REPORT ACTION PLAN + WORKSHEET			Updated as of: 08/01/2005	
Project Element Name	Person(s) Responsible For Providing	When Accomplishable?	Project Status	Editing and Review Plan
J. Commissioner and Staff Base Visits	Christine Hill + R&A + Col. Marty Heigh		AVN has created template. Have added all Commissioner visits for May, June, and July. Have included most "staff only" visits.	Andy reviews, then Col. Heigh and Frank Cirillo, then Charlie and Chmn. Principi
K. DoD Closure and Re-align Recommendation List	R&A		AVN has worked with Tyler Oborn on a database printout of all 190 recommendations, which in turn list out each facility being affected by the recommendation, and how many jobs are at stake. If layout approved, this appendix could be considered complete.	Andy and Chris Yoder review, then Frank Cirillo, then completed.
L. Bases Added by Commission and Major Changes to 2005 DoD recommendations	Andy Napoli + R&A		AVN has mostly completed. Will need to be updated to reflect final status of 'adds' once votes are complete.	Andy reviews, then Frank Cirillo, then Charlie and Chmn. Principi
M. Economic Impact of Recommendations, Listed by DoD Recommendation #	Designees from Econ Analysts		Will use database printout from Tyler Oborn which shows the integrated effects of all recommendation on each installation affected by BRAC, with each installation grouped by recommendation.	Andy reviews, then Frank Cirillo, then Charlie and Chmn. Principi
N. Economic Impact of Recommendations, Listed by State	Designees from Econ Analysts		Will use database printout from Tyler Oborn which shows the integrated effects of all recommendation on each installation affected by BRAC, with each installation grouped by state, then by installation.	Andy reviews, then Frank Cirillo, then Charlie and Chmn. Principi
O. Flow Charts showing where functions are going and coming in selected and particularly complex realignments	Designee from R&A (Ed Brown_ + ANSER		Spider Charts are already being created. ANSER will turn into usable files and analysts will pick which ones we'll use. Likely use those complex recommendations that BRAC Commission has changed from DoD initial recommend. May load all charts into CD which will accompany report	Frank Cirillo reviews then Andy, then Charlie, then Chmn. Principi
P. Final Commission Recommendations	Legal Team		Legal will provide a complete set of all Commission final decisions, in legislative text format.	Legal writes, then Andy reviews, then Charlie and then Chmn. Principi
Q. "Life after BRAC" key contact persons, phone numbers, and web sites	Diane Carnevale			Diane writes, then Andy reviews, then Chris Yoder, then Charlie, then Chmn. Principi
R. Environmental Issues	Gary Miller + other R&A analyst(s)		Will include any charts or slides that are needed for Enviro chapter.	Gary writes, then Andy reviews, then Chris Yoder, then Charlie, then Chmn. Principi.
S: Maps and Charts: national map	R&A (Phil Plack)		Phil has maps of US with dots showing BRAC actions. Will refine maps as needed. May put maps in back of report.	Andy reviews maps from Phil, then show to Frank Cirillo and Charlie Battaglia. Uncertain if Commissioners need to review the maps.
S: Maps and Charts: regional maps	R&A (Phil Plack)		Phil has maps of US with dots showing BRAC actions. Will refine maps as needed. May put maps in back of report.	Andy reviews maps from Phil, then show to Frank Cirillo and Charlie Battaglia. Uncertain if Commissioners need to review the maps.
Maps and Charts: optional	TBD		May include NGA map showing all existing US bases, overlaid onto states and major highways. (same as hanging on walls) May put at the back of report.	Andy reviews maps from Phil, then show to Frank Cirillo and Charlie Battaglia. Uncertain if Commissioners need to review the maps.

<b>PROPOSED TABLE OF CONTENTS &amp; 2005 BRAC REPORT ACTION PLAN + WORKSHEET</b>				Updated as of: 08/01/2005	
<b>Project Element Name</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible For Providing</b>	<b>When Accomplishable?</b>	<b>Project Status</b>	<b>Editing and Review Plan</b>	
Index by State	Andy Napoli			Andy, then Chris Yoder, then ANSER	
Index by Recommendation	Andy Napoli			Andy, then Chris Yoder, then ANSER	

## **Chapter One Review and Editing Plan**

*Part 1: DoD Recommendations.* Frank Cirillo (either himself or his designees) at R&A decides how the DoD recommendations should be structured or phrased. Andy Napoli/Chris Yoder reviews the final R&A decision. Then they are finalized and handed to ANSER for outside layout and review.

*Part 2: DoD Justifications.* Frank Cirillo (either himself or his designees) at R&A decides how the DoD justifications should be structured or phrased. Andy Napoli/Chris Yoder reviews the final R&A decision. Then they are finalized and handed to ANSER for outside layout and review.

*Part 3: Community Concerns.* Each R&A lead analyst writes their synopsis or narrative. Andy Napoli/Chris Yoder review. Then the R&A Team Leader reviews each narrative. Charlie Battaglia and a subset of Commissioners review some or all of the community narratives as desired. After that, they are finalized and handed off to ANSER for layout and outside review.

*Part 4: Commission Findings.* Each R&A lead analyst writes their synopsis or narrative. Frank Cirillo (either himself or his designees) at R&A reviews each finding. Andy Napoli/Chris Yoder review. Lastly, Charlie Battaglia and a subset of Commissioners review some or all of the Commission Findings as desired for approval and consent. Lastly, they are finalized and handed off to ANSER for layout and outside review.

*Part 5: Commission Recommendations.* Legal takes all final and Commissioner approved recommendations from the mark-up, and adds the vote results into the recommendation wording. Andy and Chris Yoder review for typo mistakes only. Then R&A Team Leaders/Frank Cirillo at R&A reviews final recommendation for accuracy. Lastly, they are handed off to ANSER for layout and outside review.

## Community Concerns

As you know, in the Final Report, Chapter One is the heart of the Report. Chapter One consists of all 190 DoD recommendations, broken down into five major subsections for each DoD recommendation: (1) Recommendation, (2) Justification, (3) Community Concerns, (4) Findings, and (5) Commission Recommendation. Parts (1) and (2) are essentially done already, because they were submitted by DoD on May 13<sup>th</sup>, 2005. The part we're working on right now is (3) Community Concerns.

When writing up a community's concerns about a DoD recommendation, compose the summary in a narrative format exactly like it would appear in the Final Report. *Do not send bullet points or a series of disconnected, stand-alone facts.* Chris Yoder and I will not be in a position to write 190+ narratives from scratch. Please refer to this section in the 1993 and 1995 Commission Reports to give you an idea of the level of detail expected.

A primary purpose of this portion of Chapter One is to demonstrate to the affected communities that the Commission has carefully listened to, and properly understood, the objections and arguments made to us. You do not need to list every single argument that a community might have made, but you do need to discuss the most important ones that were raised during the site visits, regional hearings, and meetings. While every analyst will perceive what the Community thinks they've told them a little differently, the real "audience" of this section is not just the President, nor the Commission, but the communities who made their case to us. It's one thing for a community to emerge from this process and be disappointed that the Commission heard, but did not accept, their best arguments. But it's another thing for a community to feel like the Commission didn't hear, or didn't understand, what they were saying to us. In Frank's words, the latter predicament is one we must avoid at all cost.

Another purpose of these write-ups is to assist the Commissioners in understanding the gist of the community's key arguments about a recommendation before they cast their final vote. As editor, it is my intention to provide draft copies of Chapter 1 to the Commissioners at least a week prior to Final Deliberations for both informational and editorial purposes.

The length of a "Community Concerns" narrative will vary, but it should generally be between one sentence ("There were no formal expressions from the community") and about ten or twelve sentences. A well written "community concerns" narrative will be six or seven sentences long for a moderately complicated recommendation, to ten or more for a very complex recommendation. Again, please refer to prior Reports, or check with me with any questions.

I would recommend starting with the community argument that was the most powerful or persuasive, and/or which the community felt was the most important, and work your way down to the economic and least important or powerful arguments. That way, if we have to cut material to make it all fit on the page, we know where we can cut without crippling the final product.

Realistically, after the regional hearings are over for a particular recommendation, there will be very little truly "new" arguments presented to the Commission. Therefore, there's no reason why the write-ups of the community's concerns couldn't be completed by the end of July. Frank

reminded me that your referral back to the community concerns expressed in the respective “base visit report,” “memorandum of meeting,” and “regional hearing hearing issue summary” will be the basis of this section.

Lastly, note that some recommendations have several communities who are weighing in. I would recommend that you make it clear which community is making which argument. And that the most text is allocated to discussing the community with the greatest amount of jobs to lose.

**EXAMPLE:** 1995 Final Commission Report, page 1-33, on “Red River Army Depot, Texas.”

“The community argues closure of Red River Army Depot will destroy the special efficiencies that result from collocation of the Red River Army Depot with the Defense Logistics Agency Distribution Depot, Red River. They claim DoD substantially deviated from the final selection criteria by not conducting a combined value assessment of the two. They also believe closing Red River Army Depot will overload Anniston Army Depot, limit surge capability, and jeopardize readiness. Retention of only one maintenance depot for ground combat vehicles will severely limit the Army’s ability to respond to national emergencies. The community also believes that the Army understated the costs associated with the recommendation. Additionally, the community claims the Army analysis is flawed by omitting significant mission requirements, such as the Missile Recertification Office, and by including non-BRAC personnel savings. The community also believes the Army understated unemployment costs in their economic analysis. The community proposes retention of Red River Army Depot and Anniston Army Depot, realignment of Letterkenny Army Depot to Anniston and Red River and downsizing of both to core. To fill vacant infrastructure, the community recommends teaming with industry.”

**COMMENTARY:**

As you can see, in this write-up, we have a summary of why the community felt DoD substantially deviated from the selection criteria and force structure, as well as what the community asked the Commission to do instead. The key arguments are not only listed, but the narrative is tied together logically. Obviously the community presented far more than just this to the Commission, but it’s clear from this narrative that the essence of their concerns were boiled down and accurately captured.

## MEMORANDUM

To: Charlie Battaglia  
From: Andy Napoli  
Re: Pending issues and Status of Report  
Date: July 14, 2005

### Status of Final Report:

We are in good shape, but we will only stay in good shape if several pending issues start being resolved relatively quickly. We're about to hit the final stretch, and this is where the real team work needs to happen.

### Printing Update:

I'm still waiting for a definitive update from Legal on whether we are required to go through DAPS, or whether we can simply amend our contract with ANSER and essentially pick our subcontractor. Mike Murtha from WHS seems to think we are required to print our report through DAPS. I don't know if he's correct or not. Diane and I had a good meeting with the DAPS representatives this morning. They seem to fully understand the time pressures we're under, and if we have to use them, I think we'll be OK. They printed the much larger DoD BRAC report for 2005, and so they understand the game. They reviewed our technical requirements document I prepared (and shared with you and Diane previously) and said it was just what they needed. They'll examine their in-house and external capacities and get back to us by tomorrow with an estimate.

On a parallel track, ANSER had already identified two high-speed iGEN3 laser printer-capable shops (for our first run of 1000) and two offset printers (for our second run of 2000-2500 copies). One of the most promising iGEN3 shops identified by ANSER is supposed to be a government approved contractor, meaning we should be able to use them as an external vendor through DAPS if DAPS cannot do the job in-house. From what ANSER's printing experts believe, we want iGEN3 technology on the 1<sup>st</sup> run because this is a very high speed process and we can go directly from computer disk to print-outs without waiting for any printer plate preparation process (which can take more than a day to set up). Plus you don't have to wait for the ink to dry before you start binding.

The costs should be somewhere in the vicinity of about \$50 per report copy, slightly higher maybe with the laser printers if we want more color slides, or if we order fewer offset copies, and slightly lower if we order 2500 or more offset copies for the 2<sup>nd</sup> run. At 3,000 copies anticipated, this should run about \$150,000. I believe this is slightly more than Magda and I estimated a few weeks ago, but the most recent offset cost estimates are slightly higher than we expected due to the combination of some color and mostly black-and-white pages. There are things we can do to reduce the cost of the report if this cost becomes a serious problem. I have tried to base my estimates on the high side so we do not have any nasty surprises.

### **Editing and Review Process:**

In order to establish the right deadlines during the last sprint to the finish line, I need to have a firm handle on who's in charge of approving what sections of the Report. We need a system that has enough layers to ensure good quality and catch errors, but not so many layers that it jeopardizes our ability to put a computer disk into the hands of ANSER by September 1<sup>st</sup> (so they can have something in the hands of the printer on September 4<sup>th</sup>). I don't know how much material you, the other division heads, and the Commissioners themselves will want to review. Some Commissioners might not want to see any text at all after they've cast their final votes, while others might want to review every single word in the entire Report before they affix their signature to the front cover letter to the President. It's important to settle this issue now before it's a serious problem and a Commissioner suddenly and unexpectedly injects him or her self into the review process at the end game when it's very difficult to accommodate their desire.

I've laid out a proposed editing/review 'chain of custody' sequence for each major section of the report. Some sections won't require many layers of review, while others should have many layers. After you've had a chance to review my proposal, and we make necessary changes, I'd propose we sit down with Chris Yoder and the Chairman and go over it, and if Tony wants the Commissioners to sign off on it too, then we'll proceed accordingly. Optimally, we should have an agreement on who is supposed to review what before we can call it "officially approved" and send it over to the ANSER layout and technical editing folks, before the end of July.

### **Community Concerns:**

I have worked out with Frank an approach to generating the R&A summary of the community concerns portion of Chapter One. If the process works properly, we should have almost all of the Community Concerns narratives in hand (at least a first-cut version of them) by the end of July. Chris Yoder should be fully aboard by then and we can plow through them in the first week of August. Most of them we can either polish or update into a finalized version by the 2<sup>nd</sup> week of August. Some might take longer before we can finalize them, especially the most high-stakes contested recommendations where the community will be submitting new material right up the last day before deliberations.

The key is to first make sure we have the right R&A analyst placed in charge of doing the community concern write up of the right DoD recommendation. I've sent around a list and solicited R&A feedback to make sure my list has the proper staffer in charge of each recommendation. Then I'll start hounding the analysts to get me material from now until the end of the month. I'll officially start hounding and busting chops on Monday, July 18<sup>th</sup> if that is OK with you.

### **Issues for Further Consideration:**

This Chapter has the least detail associated with it at the moment, and necessarily so. Only now are the issues becoming clearer. I have put together a more detailed outline for Chapter 2, and have proposed four new optional topics that I believe are probably warranted for discussion.

Another issue that might also be considered for further discussion is the “leased space” issue. The BRAC team should come to agreement on Chapter Two fairly quickly, so we can assign the right person for the right topic.

I believe we can accomplish most of Chapter Two during the last two weeks of July, and the first two weeks of August. We should have Chapter Two almost completely finished before we go into final deliberations. And then after the deliberations are completed, we should review the product one final time to make sure we update it appropriately where our deliberations changed our analysis in certain places.

**Cover Designs:**

Based on the staff votes and other feedback I’ve received, I’ve proposed some final edits to ANSER to make to all three design options. After those changes are made (sometime next week), I’d like to schedule a time to sit down with you, and the Chairman, and present the options to him and reach a final decision. This is something I’d like to square away for good as soon as I can.

**Re-Use Section:**

While Gary Miller from the R&A division has been tasked with writing the bulk of a chapter on environmental issues in BRAC, we still have not identified the writer (or writers) who will do a section on re-use of facilities. There’s a fairly compelling case to be made to support our original decision to do a section on re-use. But we need to either identify a person in-house to do this section, or bring in an outside consultant to do it for us.

## Final Deliberations and the Commission Report:

### Major Activities

- Production of Commission Findings
- Converting approved motions into written Commission Recommendations
- Managing complex and constantly moving finished products into the Report

### Key Issues and Steps

- Findings should support the Commission's final vote result. Therefore, they will need to be written *before* the Commission's final vote, but will also require modification *after* the final vote so that they make sense if the Commission votes differently than the R&A staff's findings.
- Establishing a 'chain of custody or review' to determine which individuals must review, edit, and approve a "Finding" and "Recommendation" before it can be declared "officially approved" and then sent to the next level of editing/layout.
- Crafting realistic deadlines so that the 'chain of review' does not take so long as to put the Report's completion schedule at risk.
- Going back and inserting or changing other parts of the Report which are dependent on final Commission outcomes in order to be finalized.
- Reaching consensus on the way to write up Commission final recommendations when the Commission approves some, but not all, of a recommendation's parts.

### Proposals to Consider

- A proposed "Editing and Review Plan" has been crafted. We should modify the plan as needed and reach the necessary consensus as soon as possible. This way everybody knows who's responsible for the next step, and things are not delayed due to misperceptions of "I was waiting for X to tell me it was approved." Similarly, we do not want items that have not been properly reviewed to wind up in the Final Report.

## **Chapter One Review and Editing Plan**

*Part 1: DoD Recommendations.* Frank Cirillo (either himself or his designees) at R&A decides how the DoD recommendations should be structured or phrased. Andy reviews the final R&A decision. Then they are finalized and handed to ANSER for outside layout and review.

*Part 2: DoD Justifications.* Frank Cirillo (either himself or his designees) at R&A decides how the DoD justifications should be structured or phrased. Andy reviews the final R&A decision. Then they are finalized and handed to ANSER for outside layout and review.

*Part 3: Community Concerns.* Each R&A lead analyst writes their synopsis or narrative. Andy and/or Chris Yoder review. Then Frank Cirillo (either himself or his designees) at R&A reviews each narrative. Charlie Battaglia, Chmn. Principi, or the other eight Commissioners can review some or all of the community narratives if desired. After that, they are finalized and handed off to ANSER for layout and outside review.

*Part 4: Commission Findings.* Each R&A lead analyst writes their synopsis or narrative. Frank Cirillo (either himself or his designees) at R&A reviews each finding. Andy and/or Chris Yoder review. Lastly, Charlie Battaglia, Chmn. Principi, and the other eight Commissioners review all Commission findings for approval or consent. Lastly, they are finalized and handed off to ANSER for layout and outside review.

*Part 5: Commission Recommendations.* Legal takes all final and Commissioner approved recommendations from the mark-up, and adds the vote results into the recommendation wording. Andy and Chris Yoder review. Then Frank Cirillo (either himself or his designees) at R&A reviews final recommendation for accuracy. Lastly, they are handed off to ANSER for layout and outside review.

**PROPOSED SAMPLE WRITE UP FOR CHPT ONE:*****Recommendation #: 2******Title of Recommendation: Fort Gillem, Georgia******# of Elements in Recommendation: seven******One-time Cost: \$56.8M******Savings (FY2006 thru FY2011): savings of \$85.5M******Return on Investment: annual savings: \$35.3M (payback expected in 1 year).******FINAL ACTION:******Secretary of Defense Recommendation***

Close Fort Gillem, GA. Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Rock Island Arsenal, IL. Relocate the 2nd Recruiting Brigade to Redstone Arsenal, AL. Relocate the 52<sup>nd</sup> Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Group to Fort Campbell, KY. Relocate the 81<sup>st</sup> RRC Equipment Concentration Site to Fort Benning, GA. Relocate the 3rd US Army Headquarters support office to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Headquarters US Forces Command (FORSCOM) VIP Explosive Ordnance Support to Pope Air Force Base, NC. Close the Army- Air Force Exchange System (AAFES) Atlanta Distribution Center and establish an enclave for the Georgia Army National Guard, the remainder of the 81<sup>st</sup> RRC units and the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) Forensics Laboratory.

***Secretary of Defense Justification***

This recommendation closes Fort Gillem, an Army administrative installation and an AAFES distribution center. The recommendation moves the major tenant organizations to Rock Island Arsenal, Redstone Arsenal, Fort Benning, and Fort Campbell. It also moves small components of the Headquarters 3rd US Army and US Army Forces Command to Pope AFB and Shaw AFB. It enhances the Army's military value, is consistent with the Army's Force Structure Plan, and maintains adequate surge capabilities to address future unforeseen requirements. This closure allows the Army to employ excess capacities at installations that can accomplish more than administrative missions.

The closure of Fort Gillem also enables the stationing of its tenant units at locations that will increase their ability to associate with like units and promote coordination of efforts. Both the 52<sup>nd</sup> EOD Group and the 2nd Recruiting Brigade have regional missions in the Southeastern United States. The 52<sup>nd</sup> EOD Group was co-located with operational forces at Fort Campbell to provide training opportunities. The 2nd Recruiting Brigade is recommended to relocate to Redstone Arsenal because of its central location in the Southeast and its access to a transportation center in Huntsville, AL. The Army is converting the 1st US Army Headquarters into the single Headquarters for oversight of Reserve and National Guard mobilization and demobilization. To support this conversion the Army decided to relocate 1st Army to Rock Island Arsenal, a central location in the United States. The 81<sup>st</sup> RRC Equipment concentration Site is relocated to Fort Benning where there are improved training opportunities with operational forces.

### ***Community Concerns***

There were no formal expressions from the community.

### ***Commission Findings***

The Commission generally found that five of the seven elements in this recommendation conformed to the selection criteria and force structure plan. In the case of the recommendation to do XXXX, the Commission found that DoD significantly underestimated the likely costs of moving XXXX, due to the specialized equipment involved. The recommendation to move YYY was found to deviate substantially from military value criteria XYZ. Data supplied by the Community showed the costs for this YYY element of the recommendation were understated by a factor of 2.5. Moreover, a detailed COBRA run analysis shows that all of the net savings for this recommendation are generated by just three of the seven elements (1, 2, 3), while four of the seven actually generate negative cost savings (4, 5, 6, 7). DoD's decision to combine these three elements with four other unrelated components makes the net whole appear to generate cost savings. The July 1, 2005 Government Accountability Office (GAO) analysis of the DoD recommendations as whole also concurred with the Commission finding that DoD frequently combined unrelated proposals under the heading of a single recommendation. Removing two of the elements of the DoD recommendation (elements X and Y) will increase net cost savings by SSS, while also conforming to military value criteria 1234 and the force structure plan.

### ***Commission Recommendations***

The Commission finds that the Secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the force-structure plan and the statutorily required military value criteria. Therefore, the Commission recommends the following: close Fort Gillem. Relocate the Headquarters, 1st US Army to Rock Island Arsenal, IL. Relocate the 52<sup>nd</sup> Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD) Group to Fort Campbell, KY. Relocate the 81<sup>st</sup> RRC Equipment Concentration Site to Fort Benning, GA. Relocate the 3rd US Army Headquarters support office to Shaw Air Force Base, SC. Relocate the Headquarters US Forces Command (FORSCOM) VIP Explosive Ordnance Support to Pope Air Force Base, NC. Establish an enclave for the Georgia Army National Guard, the 2nd Recruiting Brigade, the Army- Air Force Exchange System (AAFES) Atlanta Distribution Center, the remainder of the 81<sup>st</sup> RRC units and the Criminal Investigation Division (CID) Forensics Laboratory. All elements within the original Department of Defense recommendation remain unchanged by the Commission unless otherwise specified above.