

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC*Cirillo
Old Sent Folder*

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 5:17 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

All need to remember that shutting down this operation, in whatever timelines current contracts allow, will save between \$8-10 million a year, at minimal impact to MV.

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

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 4:59 PM
To: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Gentlemen: Here's the word from Martin Pankove, AF attorney, who assures me that Ken has been provided with a copy of a briefing paper entitled, "Warm Basing: Alaska Forward Operating Locations," dated 08 July 2005. He has informally indicated that there are no AF personnel at the location, nor is there an AF flying mission there. However, the AF has retained contractors in order to maintain the airfield as a useable asset. He is not sure about the exact terms of the real estate-related arrangements, but indicated that there is an aerial photo in the briefing paper that shows about 40 buildings. While he cannot be sure about the exact status of each building, he informed me that it was his understanding that the AF owned about 6 acres; that the AF leased a portion of that owned space to the State of Alaska; and that the AF paid its utilities to the State of Alaska.

He indicated that there is no certified data for this location since the AF did not seek any; it's below the BRAC "threshold," and basically, the AF has lost interest in the site despite the fact this "installation" is being kept "warm" in furtherance of classified plans and/or operations that he could not reveal to me.

In light of the above, and the vigorous foregoing discussion on this matter, perhaps it would be wise to meet to come to a collective decision on how to proceed from here.
 Thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
 Associate General Counsel
 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
 2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18 Arlington, VA 22202-3920
 Tel: (703) 699-2973
 Cell: (703) 901-7843
 Fax: (703) 699-2735

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

From: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 2:47 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dave - et al - I have already launched a question to the OSD Clearinghouse that should establish the level of Air Force interest in any buildings and equipment at Galena. I have asked for facility account codes for the buildings (which is the precursor to charging Federal expenses to a building) as well as the same time of information for the aircraft arresting barriers and navigation aids.

Ken

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

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 2:38 PM
To: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Ken, Frank,

We will inquire of the AF legal folks to see if the US Govt. has a real property interest (owns, leases) in Galena. Between us and Ken, we'll get the answer and be able to decide the issue.

David

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

From: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 1:34 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Frank et al

I have a Clearinghouse question at the AF requesting whether they have facility account codes for buildings at Galena, as well as particular questions about the aircraft arresting barriers on the runway and the navigation/approach aids. This question will provide an answer to a couple of questions:

1. Does the air force consider its establishment at Galena a facility on the real property records of the USG 2. Is there real property installed equipment to which the air force assigns costs and provides high value equipment accounting.

As far as a small, under the radar, installation below the BRAC Commission threshold, that same discussion affects about half of the ANG and AFRes actions (if we parc out the portion of an airport that is closely defined as belonging to the assigned unit in question. I suggest that the BRAC Commission address all real estate questions presented to the Commission, big or small.

Ken

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 1:20 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Thanks Rumu

Ken and Craig - over to you. I do note that Galena does have a four character "Installation Code"

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

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:18 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Just a note to consult with Craig Hall regarding whether Galena should be considered an "installation" under the statute since there is only a contract in place that may be

terminated, from what I understand, under the actual contract terms, or under FAR provisions. Craig has further details on this.

I have discussed this matter with Gen. Hague, and there are at least two options to approaching this issue if there is an R&A determination that Galena does NOT qualify as a "military installation" within the scope of the BRAC statute. The R&A staff could simply present this information at the final deliberations and withdraw the "adds" of Galena from the proceedings, and the Chairman can call for a vote affirming this decision from the Commissioners. Alternatively, R&A staff can point out that there is some issue with regard to the status of Galena, and the Commission could take this issue under advisement and decide on the adds motion anyway. (For example, the R&A staff could recommend a "conditional" closure of Galena, to be deleted from the final recommendations is a factual finding is later made (say, within 3 months of the recommendations being issued by the Commission) with respect to its eligibility for inclusion in the BRAC process.

If there is a firm determination by R&A from its background research on Galena that it does NOT qualify as an "installation," the first option of withdrawing it from consideration may be best since ruling on the adds motion may later be seen as a decision that falls outside the scope of the BRAC statute. However, since there may be some continuing confusion on the factual circumstances, a "belt and suspenders" approach discussed in the second option is also feasible.

Thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18 Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

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

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:02 AM
To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Here be. As I understand it, all eight adds will be done up front, first the "totally new," meaning Broadway, Galena, Prof Dev & Ed, Joint Med Commands, then the four "further realignments or closures," meaning Brunswick, Oceana, Pope and DFAS. Where the "furthers" bring up an existing recommendation, that will be brought to the fore and dealt with regardless of whether the add passes.

There will only be one 7 of 9 vote on each add. If it passes, it can be amended later by 5 of 9 (so long as the amendment doesn't further realign or close what was voted in by 7 of 9). If it fails, it's gone for good.

V/R

Dan Cowhig
Deputy General Counsel and Designated Federal Officer
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street
Suite 600 Room 600-20
Arlington Virginia 22202-3920
Voice 703 699-2974
Fax 703 699-2735
dan.cowhig@wso.whs.mil
www.brac.gov

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:46 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dan,
Can you send me the example we discussed briefly on Saturday? How many times will Commissioners "vote" on Adds during final hearings?
Also, will adds be deliberated separately or will Broadway be included with other DON recommendations?
Thank you,
Brian

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:33 AM
To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Afar as I know the changes have not impacted the way we'll do adds.

V/R

Dan

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:20 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dan,

We spoke on Saturday but with every other "format" changing, I was wondering what's the latest approach GC is recommending for the "ADDs"?

Thanks,
Brian

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 3:26 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Good - Ken has asked the CH but another source will be great.

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

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 2:38 PM
To: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Ken, Frank,

We will inquire of the AF legal folks to see if the US Govt. has a real property interest (owns, leases) in Galena. Between us and Ken, we'll get the answer and be able to decide the issue.

David

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

From: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 1:34 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Frank et al

I have a Clearinghouse question at the AF requesting whether they have facility account codes for buildings at Galena, as well as particular questions about the aircraft arresting barriers on the runway and the navigation/approach aids. This question will provide an answer to a couple of questions:

1. Does the air force consider its establishment at Galena a facility on the real property records of the USG? 2. Is there real property installed equipment to which the air force assigns costs and provides high value equipment accounting.

As far as a small, under the radar, installation below the BRAC Commission threshold, that same discussion affects about half of the ANG and AFRes actions (if we par out the portion of an airport that is closely defined as belonging to the assigned unit in question. I suggest that the BRAC Commission address all real estate questions presented to the Commission, big or small.

Ken

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 1:20 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Thanks Rumu

Ken and Craig - over to you. I do note that Galena does have a four character "Installation Code"

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

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:18 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Just a note to consult with Craig Hall regarding whether Galena should be considered an "installation" under the statute since there is only a contract in place that may be terminated, from what I understand, under the actual contract terms, or under FAR provisions. Craig has further details on this.

I have discussed this matter with Gen. Hague, and there are at least two options to approaching this issue if there is an R&A determination that Galena does NOT qualify as a "military installation" within the scope of the BRAC statute. The R&A staff could simply present this information at the final deliberations and withdraw the "adds" of Galena from the proceedings, and the Chairman can call for a vote affirming this decision from the Commissioners. Alternatively, R&A staff can point out that there is some issue with regard to the status of Galena, and the Commission could take this issue under advisement and decide on the adds motion anyway. (For example, the R&A staff could recommend a

"conditional" closure of Galena, to be deleted from the final recommendations is a factual finding is later made (say, within 3 months of the recommendations being issued by the Commission) with respect to its eligibility for inclusion in the BRAC process.

If there is a firm determination by R&A from its background research on Galena that it does NOT qualify as an "installation," the first option of withdrawing it from consideration may be best since ruling on the adds motion may later be seen as a decision that falls outside the scope of the BRAC statute. However, since there may be some continuing confusion on the factual circumstances, a "belt and suspenders" approach discussed in the second option is also feasible.

Thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18 Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

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

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:02 AM
To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Here be. As I understand it, all eight adds will be done up front, first the "totally new," meaning Broadway, Galena, Prof Dev & Ed, Joint Med Commands, then the four "further realignments or closures," meaning Brunswick, Oceana, Pope and DFAS. Where the "furthers" bring up an existing recommendation, that will be brought to the fore and dealt with regardless of whether the add passes.

There will only be one 7 of 9 vote on each add. If it passes, it can be amended later by 5 of 9 (so long as the amendment doesn't further realign or close what was voted in by 7 of 9). If it fails, it's gone for good.

V/R

Dan Cowhig
Deputy General Counsel and Designated Federal Officer
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street
Suite 600 Room 600-20
Arlington Virginia 22202-3920
Voice 703 699-2974
Fax 703 699-2735
dan.cowhig@wso.whs.mil
www.brac.gov

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:46 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dan,
Can you send me the example we discussed briefly on Saturday? How many times will Commissioners "vote" on Adds during final hearings?
Also, will adds be deliberated separately or will Broadway be included with other DON

recommendations?

Thank you,
Brian

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:33 AM
To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Afar as I know the changes have not impacted the way we'll do adds.

V/R

Dan

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:20 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dan,

We spoke on Saturday but with every other "format" changing, I was wondering what's the latest approach GC is recommending for the "ADDs"?

Thanks,
Brian

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 2:13 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

I just found out that maybe not so fast - I saw a code that may have been BRAC developed - Ken is following up.

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

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 1:55 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Great: I am glad that we've come to closure on this and agree with Frank that if DoD has put Galena on the installation list that it should be treated as such, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18 Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 1:40 PM
To: Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Sounds legal and sounds sound to me

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

From: Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 12:37 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

I am not a lawyer (nor did I sleep at a Holiday Inn last night) but if forced to render a legal opinion...

R&A position is since Galena is a "military installation" as defined by the law, eg "under the jurisdiction of the DOD", it "could" be closed under BRAC, but "could" also be closed w/o BRAC, since it is below threshold.

If the Commissioners reject it on procedural/legal grounds (which is fine by me), then I highly recommend that other recommendations that do not "have" to be accomplished thru BRAC also be rejected (e.g below threshold) for the sake of consistency.

Craig

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

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:18 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Just a note to consult with Craig Hall regarding whether Galena should be considered an "installation" under the statute since there is only a contract in place that may be terminated, from what I understand, under the actual contract terms, or under FAR provisions. Craig has further details on this.

I have discussed this matter with Gen. Hague, and there are at least two options to approaching this issue if there is an R&A determination that Galena does NOT qualify as a "military installation" within the scope of the BRAC statute. The R&A staff could simply present this information at the final deliberations and withdraw the "adds" of Galena from the proceedings, and the Chairman can call for a vote affirming this decision from the Commissioners. Alternatively, R&A staff can point out that there is some issue with regard to the status of Galena, and the Commission could take this issue under advisement and decide on the adds motion anyway. (For example, the R&A staff could recommend a "conditional" closure of Galena, to be deleted from the final recommendations is a factual finding is later made (say, within 3 months of the recommendations being issued by the Commission) with respect to its eligibility for inclusion in the BRAC process.

If there is a firm determination by R&A from its background research on Galena that it does NOT qualify as an "installation," the first option of withdrawing it from consideration may be best since ruling on the adds motion may later be seen as a decision that falls outside the scope of the BRAC statute. However, since there may be some continuing confusion on the factual circumstances, a "belt and suspenders" approach discussed in the second option is also feasible.

Thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18 Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

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

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:02 AM
To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Here be. As I understand it, all eight adds will be done up front, first the "totally new," meaning Broadway, Galena, Prof Dev & Ed, Joint Med Commands, then the four "further realignments or closures," meaning Brunswick, Oceana, Pope and DFAS. Where the "furthers" bring up an existing recommendation, that will be brought to the fore and dealt with regardless of whether the add passes.

There will only be one 7 of 9 vote on each add. If it passes, it can be amended later by 5 of 9 (so long as the amendment doesn't further realign or close what was voted in by 7 of 9). If it fails, it's gone for good.

V/R

Dan Cowhig
Deputy General Counsel and Designated Federal Officer
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street
Suite 600 Room 600-20
Arlington Virginia 22202-3920
Voice 703 699-2974
Fax 703 699-2735
dan.cowhig@wso.whs.mil
www.brac.gov

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:46 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dan,
Can you send me the example we discussed briefly on Saturday? How many times will Commissioners "vote" on Adds during final hearings?
Also, will adds be deliberated separately or will Broadway be included with other DON recommendations?
Thank you,
Brian

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:33 AM
To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Afar as I know the changes have not impacted the way we'll do adds.

V/R

Dan

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:20 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dan,

We spoke on Saturday but with every other "format" changing, I was wondering what's the latest approach GC is recommending for the "ADDs"?

Thanks,
Brian

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 1:44 PM
To: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Oborn, Tyler, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

We have it's "Installation Code" in the OSD database. See Tyler

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

From: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 1:34 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Frank et al

I have a Clearinghouse question at the AF requesting whether they have facility account codes for buildings at Galena, as well as particular questions about the aircraft arresting barriers on the runway and the navigation/approach aids. This question will provide an answer to a couple of questions:

1. Does the air force consider its establishment at Galena a facility on the real property records of the USG 2. Is there real property installed equipment to which the air force assigns costs and provides high value equipment accounting.

As far as a small, under the radar, installation below the BRAC Commission threshold, that same discussion affects about half of the ANG and AFRes actions (if we parc out the portion of an airport that is closely defined as belonging to the assigned unit in question. I suggest that the BRAC Commission address all real estate questions presented to the Commission, big or small.

Ken

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 1:20 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Thanks Rumu

Ken and Craig - over to you. I do note that Galena does have a four character "Installation Code"

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

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:18 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Just a note to consult with Craig Hall regarding whether Galena should be considered an "installation" under the statute since there is only a contract in place that may be terminated, from what I understand, under the actual contract terms, or under FAR provisions. Craig has further details on this.

I have discussed this matter with Gen. Hague, and there are at least two options to approaching this issue if there is an R&A determination that Galena does NOT qualify as a "military installation" within the scope of the BRAC statute. The R&A staff could simply present this information at the final deliberations and withdraw the "adds" of Galena from the proceedings, and the Chairman can call for a vote affirming this decision from the Commissioners. Alternatively, R&A staff can point out that there is some issue with regard to the status of Galena, and the Commission could take this issue under advisement and decide on the adds motion anyway. (For example, the R&A staff could recommend a "conditional" closure of Galena, to be deleted from the final recommendations if a factual finding is later made (say, within 3 months of the recommendations being issued by the Commission) with respect to its eligibility for inclusion in the BRAC process.

If there is a firm determination by R&A from its background research on Galena that it does NOT qualify as an "installation," the first option of withdrawing it from consideration may be best since ruling on the adds motion may later be seen as a decision that falls outside the scope of the BRAC statute. However, since there may be some continuing confusion on the factual circumstances, a "belt and suspenders" approach discussed in the second option is also feasible.

Thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18 Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

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

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:02 AM
To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Here be. As I understand it, all eight adds will be done up front, first the "totally new," meaning Broadway, Galena, Prof Dev & Ed, Joint Med Commands, then the four "further realignments or closures," meaning Brunswick, Oceana, Pope and DFAS. Where the "furthers" bring up an existing recommendation, that will be brought to the fore and dealt with regardless of whether the add passes.

There will only be one 7 of 9 vote on each add. If it passes, it can be amended later by 5 of 9 (so long as the amendment doesn't further realign or close what was voted in by 7 of 9). If it fails, it's gone for good.

V/R

Dan Cowhig
Deputy General Counsel and Designated Federal Officer

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street
Suite 600 Room 600-20
Arlington Virginia 22202-3920
Voice 703 699-2974
Fax 703 699-2735
dan.cowhig@wso.whs.mil
www.brac.gov

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:46 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dan,
Can you send me the example we discussed briefly on Saturday? How many times will Commissioners "vote" on Adds during final hearings?
Also, will adds be deliberated separately or will Broadway be included with other DON recommendations?
Thank you,
Brian

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:33 AM
To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Afar as I know the changes have not impacted the way we'll do adds.

V/R

Dan

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:20 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dan,

We spoke on Saturday but with every other "format" changing, I was wondering what's the latest approach GC is recommending for the "ADDs"?

Thanks,
Brian

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 1:40 PM
To: Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Sounds legal and sounds sound to me

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

From: Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 12:37 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

I am not a lawyer (nor did I sleep at a Holiday Inn last night) but if forced to render a legal opinion...

R&A position is since Galena is a "military installation" as defined by the law, eg "under the jurisdiction of the DOD", it "could" be closed under BRAC, but "could" also be closed w/o BRAC, since it is below threshold.

If the Comissioners reject it on procedural/legal grounds (which is fine by me), then I highly recommend that other recommendations that do not "have" to be accomplished thru BRAC also be rejected (e.g below threshold) for the sake of consistency.

Craig

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

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:18 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Just a note to consult with Craig Hall regarding whether Galena should be considered an "installation" under the statute since there is only a contract in place that may be terminated, from what I understand, under the actual contract terms, or under FAR provisions. Craig has further details on this.

I have discussed this matter with Gen. Hague, and there are at least two options to approaching this issue if there is an R&A determination that Galena does NOT qualify as a "military installation" within the scope of the BRAC statute. The R&A staff could simply present this information at the final deliberations and withdraw the "adds" of Galena from the proceedings, and the Chairman can call for a vote affirming this decision from the Commissioners. Alternatively, R&A staff can point out that there is some issue with regard to the status of Galena, and the Commission could take this issue under advisement and decide on the adds motion anyway. (For example, the R&A staff could recommend a "conditional" closure of Galena, to be deleted from the final recommendations if a factual finding is later made (say, within 3 months of the recommendations being issued by the Commission) with respect to its eligibility for inclusion in the BRAC process.

If there is a firm determination by R&A from its background research on Galena that it does NOT qualify as an "installation," the first option of withdrawing it from consideration may be best since ruling on the adds motion may later be seen as a decision that falls outside the scope of the BRAC statute. However, since there may be some continuing confusion on the factual circumstances, a "belt and suspenders" approach discussed in the second option is also feasible.

Thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18 Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

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

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:02 AM
To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Here be. As I understand it, all eight adds will be done up front, first the "totally new," meaning Broadway, Galena, Prof Dev & Ed, Joint Med Commands, then the four "further realignments or closures," meaning Brunswick, Oceana, Pope and DFAS. Where the "furthers" bring up an existing recommendation, that will be brought to the fore and dealt with regardless of whether the add passes.

There will only be one 7 of 9 vote on each add. If it passes, it can be amended later by 5 of 9 (so long as the amendment doesn't further realign or close what was voted in by 7 of 9). If it fails, it's gone for good.

V/R

Dan Cowhig
Deputy General Counsel and Designated Federal Officer
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street
Suite 600 Room 600-20
Arlington Virginia 22202-3920
Voice 703 699-2974
Fax 703 699-2735
dan.cowhig@wso.whs.mil
www.brac.gov

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:46 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dan,
Can you send me the example we discussed briefly on Saturday? How many times will Commissioners "vote" on Adds during final hearings?
Also, will adds be deliberated separately or will Broadway be included with other DON recommendations?
Thank you,
Brian

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:33 AM
To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Afar as I know the changes have not impacted the way we'll do adds.

V/R

Dan

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:20 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: ADDS for Final Deliberation

Dan,

We spoke on Saturday but with every other "format" changing, I was wondering what's the latest approach GC is recommending for the "ADDs"?

Thanks,
Brian

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 1:20 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Thanks Rumu

Ken and Craig - over to you. I do note that Galena does have a four character "Installation Code"

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

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:18 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Just a note to consult with Craig Hall regarding whether Galena should be considered an "installation" under the statute since there is only a contract in place that may be terminated, from what I understand, under the actual contract terms, or under FAR provisions. Craig has further details on this.

I have discussed this matter with Gen. Hague, and there are at least two options to approaching this issue if there is an R&A determination that Galena does NOT qualify as a "military installation" within the scope of the BRAC statute. The R&A staff could simply present this information at the final deliberations and withdraw the "adds" of Galena from the proceedings, and the Chairman can call for a vote affirming this decision from the Commissioners. Alternatively, R&A staff can point out that there is some issue with regard to the status of Galena, and the Commission could take this issue under advisement and decide on the adds motion anyway. (For example, the R&A staff could recommend a "conditional" closure of Galena, to be deleted from the final recommendations is a factual finding is later made (say, within 3 months of the recommendations being issued by the Commission) with respect to its eligibility for inclusion in the BRAC process.

If there is a firm determination by R&A from its background research on Galena that it does NOT qualify as an "installation," the first option of withdrawing it from consideration may be best since ruling on the adds motion may later be seen as a decision

that falls outside the scope of the BRAC statute. However, since there may be some continuing confusion on the factual circumstances, a "belt and suspenders" approach discussed in the second option is also feasible.

Thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18 Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

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

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 11:02 AM
To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Here be. As I understand it, all eight adds will be done up front, first the "totally new," meaning Broadway, Galena, Prof Dev & Ed, Joint Med Commands, then the four "further realignments or closures," meaning Brunswick, Oceana, Pope and DFAS. Where the "furthers" bring up an existing recommendation, that will be brought to the fore and dealt with regardless of whether the add passes.

There will only be one 7 of 9 vote on each add. If it passes, it can be amended later by 5 of 9 (so long as the amendment doesn't further realign or close what was voted in by 7 of 9). If it fails, it's gone for good.

V/R

Dan Cowhig
Deputy General Counsel and Designated Federal Officer
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street
Suite 600 Room 600-20
Arlington Virginia 22202-3920
Voice 703 699-2974
Fax 703 699-2735
dan.cowhig@wso.whs.mil
www.brac.gov

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:46 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dan,
Can you send me the example we discussed briefly on Saturday? How many times will Commissioners "vote" on Adds during final hearings?
Also, will adds be deliberated separately or will Broadway be included with other DON recommendations?
Thank you,
Brian

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:33 AM

To: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Brian -

Afar as I know the changes have not impacted the way we'll do adds.

V/R

Dan

From: McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 10:20 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Dan,

We spoke on Saturday but with every other "format" changing, I was wondering what's the latest approach GC is recommending for the "ADDs"?

Thanks,
Brian

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 12:21 PM
To: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Resolution to OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0863C - Navy Marine Corps Question: WWF 13

Jim - Thanks Jim -Generally on these CH replies - I am just passing the mail after I read them to make sure they get to the right folks.

From: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 7:29 AM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Miller, Gary, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Resolution to OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0863C - Navy Marine Corps Question: WWF 13

Frank,

Thanks. I don't see anything unusual here - only the fact that it is five years old. You may check with Gary Miller about how long this noise footprint would be considered "valid" under NEPA (I think there is a time limit or other criteria that MAY necessitate that a new study would have to be done depending on the zoning and who there now is going to move out - not 100% sure), but I think since I've heard the rumor that some F-18's actually go to Whitehouse (from Oceana) to practice bounce patterns because they can "stack" there and actually simulate more realistic carrier ops (since they are restricted at Fentress) I would think some updated noise contours would be out there somewhere - especially if there are some closet groups (like in ANY community) that don't like the noise? If not - guess there isn't a problem at Whitehouse. As the old saying goes, however: "It only takes one".

Same would apply to Cecil. From what I've seen thus far, seems like JAX area is more environmentally friendly for Naval Aviation than Virginia Beach.

Hope this is helpful,

Jim

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2005 6:40 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Resolution to OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0863C - Navy Marine Corps Question: WWF 13

Info in case it has not reached you

From: RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 2:44 PM
To: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Flood, Glenn, CIV, OASD-PA; Hoggard, Jack, CTR, WSO-OSD_DST JCSG; marsha Warren
Subject: FW: Resolution to OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0863C - Navy Marine Corps Question: WWF 13

Attached is the response to your inquiry, OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker #0863C (pdf file is provided).
OSD BRAC Clearinghouse

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

From: bracprocess [mailto:bracprocess@navy.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 2:34 PM
To: RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse
Cc: bracprocess
Subject: Resolution to OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0863C - Navy Marine Corps Question: WWF 13

Please find resolution to subject tasker attached below.

VR, LCDR Bossuyt

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

From: RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse [mailto:Clearinghouse@wso.whs.mil]
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 15:42
To: bracprocess
Cc: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0863C - Navy Marine Corps Question: WWF 13

Please provide a response to the inquiry below and return to OSD BRAC Clearinghouse NLT noon **Wednesday, 10 August 2005**, with the designated signature authority, in PDF format.

When contacting the Clearinghouse, please refer to OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker **0863C**.

Thank you for your cooperation and timeliness in this matter.

OSD BRAC Clearinghouse

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

From: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 3:35 PM
To: RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse
Cc: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Meyer, Robert, CTR, OSD-ATL
Subject: Navy Marine Corps Question: WWF#13

Please provide the tracking number and response directly to me. Thank you.

<<Clearinghouse request WWF #13.doc>>

Michael Kessler

Navy Team Associate Analyst

BRAC Commission

Office of Review and Analysis

www.brac.gov

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2005 5:03 PM
To: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Thanks - provide to Nat for consolidation.

From: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2005 12:51 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: A Question and a Request

FYI - Interagency will know if there are any such requirements by Monday noon.

From: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2005 12:44 PM
To: Wasleski, Marilyn, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Miller, Gary, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Tran, Duke, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Gingrich, Karl, CIV, WSO-BRAC;
Saxon, Ethan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: A Question and a Request

Marilyn

Please canvas the analysts and determine if there are any recommendations which will require special language. Better to be all inclusive than restrictive - we can sort it out later.

Bob

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 5:39 PM
To: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Nat - Rumu:

Please let me know what the results of this action was so I can be comfortable something is working. One new example might be a contingent motion regarding Oceana if that is something the Commissioners express interest in developing.

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 4:20 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Team Leads: Please see Rumu's request and my note to her. I need your consolidated input to be submitted through Nat to indicate those items that you as team leads in concert with your analysts anticipate or foresee as having a potential of requiring special language to be drafted by GC. Some examples I have heard discussed which I need you to include and expand upon or add to if at all possible - If I am correct, so include; if not, so state; if not all inclusive, so develop:

- JCSG - General Newton stated that he wants the eventual ANG recommendation language to be crafted such that even if "tail number" moves are not specified that the language allows the understanding of reduction and or addition of specific aircraft from and to specified locations - thus facilitating programmatic moves by USAF. - Please elaborate
- DoN - General Hill requested that we develop contingency language as related to the NSANO - Federal Activity. - Please elaborate
- JCSG (and I believe A, others?) - are working with potential issues of Privatization-in-place which must be explicitly stated in the language in order to be possible - please assure all such items are identified and detailed.
- Issues - any contingent language expected related to environmental or economic impact issues - please list and elaborate
- I am sure there are others - think out of the box and list before it is too late.

Team Leads Only Please - Respond directly to Nat for consolidation with info directly to Rumu and myself NLT August 12th

Rumu:

As to the first part; I indeed owe Andy what we can resurrect about that date as part of an annex I need to provide by the middle of the month. As I mentioned to him - it is not a single date but a compilation of many - my words to Andy at the time:

"We received Volume I, Parts 1 and 2 on May 13th, three days earlier than legislatively required. Over the next week OSD delivered the three specific Service and five of the six JCSG specific Analysis and Recommendation Volumes (V- XII) and the Classified Volume II (Force Structure Plan) by May 19th. Between May 18th and May 28th we received the corresponding "Supplemental Information" CDs for Volumes III - XII.

A large part of the information was not fully declassified for some time but a "Reading Room" was set up for Commission use on ??? The long pole in the tent was the remaining data base, questionnaire, Service Executive Groups and COBRA info which was declassified over the next three weeks.

More to come."

As to the second part; Good point - see above.

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 1:48 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: A Question and a Request

Hi Frank: I have a question for you, namely, when did the Commission decide that it had 100% (or acceptable lesser percentage) of the certified data provided by DoD? I know that we went through several weeks of back and forth of declassification, etc. from the May 13 submission date. The exact date is being entered into the report, so an accurate statement is important.

Secondly, I am working on the request for legal opinion submitted to OGC by George and Liz that takes into account a number of community and Congressional requests to amend or otherwise change DoD proposed recommendations. I want to ensure that OGC is looking at all such proposals that may have legal implications before the recommendations are drafted in final. Gen. Hague suggested that I attend one of R&A's staff meetings to raise this issue with your staff. While I am happy to do so, I will rely on your best judgment re: sourcing all proposed BRAC recommendations that may have legal implications so that we do not take a piecemeal approach, but a consolidated one.

Many thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18
Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2005 11:05 AM
To: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

info

From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2005 8:57 AM
To: Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

Yes. Pls be guided once again by the Staff Support Handbook.

From: Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 3:20 PM
To: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

Charlie - are you envisioning a package much like what Legislative Affairs has done for each regional hearing (with significant input from Kristen, travel, and R&A)?
Example attached :

<< File: Monterey, CA INFORMATION PACKETfnal.doc >> We can certainly beef it up for two weeks of activities.

Christine

Christine O. Hill
Director, Legislative Affairs
BRAC Commission
703-699-2950

From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 1:45 PM
To: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-

Cc: BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC
RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

I am seeing some overlap of effort within our Staff on the Hyatt preparations and operations. As we move into the final phase of deliberations and final report, please be guided by Sections H, I, and J of the R&As Staff Support Handbook 2005 that we provided to everyone when you came aboard. The exceptions to Section J are as follows:

1. Director of Administration - prepare a comprehensive schedule of all events as well as a schedule for each Commissioner from all his/her events). As annexes, we need plans and schedules for surface and air transportation, meals, briefings, deliberations, base visits (Cecil and Kingsville), etc. I have asked Christine to make available members of her Advance Team for assignment to each Commissioner with responsibility for getting him/her to the right place with the right material and the right time. I want to FEDEX this to all Commissioners by Monday. Diane will be around to get your input.
2. Director of Communications. Make available copies of the recommendations to be voted upon to the public and to press during the period of deliberations. However, the opening remarks for the hearings on Aug 20 and the opening deliberation on Aug 27 will be prepared by Chris Yoder.

From: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 11:13 AM
To: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

Thank you. Will add this request to the list.

From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 6:20 PM
To: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

Diane/Magda, I want 12 door key cards for the Suite. I will control the cards. Pls give to me on the 23rd. We need the suite for the evenings of 23, 24, 25 and 26 Aug.
I'll want to visit the hotel on the afternoon circa 2 pm on 23 Aug to review the setup in the Ballroom, the Green room, Regency room and suite. I'll also want to check out the IT equipment - AV setup and voting lights.

From: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 10:01 AM
To: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Estrada, Christina, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Confirm: Support at the HYATT
Importance: High

Bob, Christina-

Here is an updated summary of the BRAC support we will need for the week of final deliberations at the Hyatt-- Please review it and let us know if there is anything else that you can think of that we will require. If so, let me know and I will amend the request. Final request has not yet been sent to WHS or Hyatt- I will only do so after I get the "move forward" from both of you--

Hyatt Regency Crystal City at Reagan National Airport, 2799 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202
Direct Phone: (703) 418-7233 Hotel: (703) 418-1234 Fax: (703) 413- 6873

1- IT Support required beginning:
Tuesday, August 23 from 6:00 P.M. - 11:00 P.M. - The site will be available for us to set up

Wednesday, 24 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - First day of deliberations
Thursday, 25 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - Second day of deliberations
Friday, 26 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - Third day of deliberations
Saturday 27 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - Tentative, to confirm by Friday, 26 August COB

2- Regency Room - "War Room" (free of charge for Aug 23-27 for the hours detailed above) Need high-speed internet capability for 8 laptops, 2 printers (one B&W, one Color), 1 fax, 1 photocopier. BRAC email access.

3- One on-site help-desk support technician for the hours detailed above for each day.

4- Press Room - Green Room (free of charge)- Include sofas, tables, chairs to accommodate about 30. 2 floor fans.

5- Suite (free of charge) - 2 refrigerators stocked with ice, cold sodas/juice/water/beer/wine.

6- Keep regular IT support back at Polk Building.

I suspect we should set aside enough paper and all office supplies needed for this week in separate boxes so that we are not short of anything at the hotel- Can a list be made up so that if there is anything lacking we can order it ahead of time?

Did I miss anything? Look forward to your feedback,
Magda

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2005 8:22 AM
To: Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Exactly - sheeeesh

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

From: Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 8:40 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: A Question and a Request

He must have too much time on his hands. Better jack up our production.

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil>
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Andrew.Napoli@wso.whs.mil>
CC: Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC <David.VanSaun@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Fri Aug 12 20:26:28 2005
Subject: Re: A Question and a Request

Thanks for your insight.

This e-mail has been sent from the Blackberry of Frank Cirillo, Director of Review and Analysis, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

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

From: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Andrew.Napoli@wso.whs.mil>
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil>; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Nathaniel.Sillin@wso.whs.mil>
CC: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC <rumu.sarkar@wso.whs.mil>; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC <James.Hanna@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Fri Aug 12 20:22:48 2005
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

I have mentioned this before, but my \$0.02, based on my Congressional experience in pushing for the creation of at least one of the Joint Bases, is that the Joint Base proposal should be "approved" by the Commission without specifying which Service Branch will 'control' the new Joint Base. Instead, the approval should be made conditional on DoD's creation of a special office to manage and oversee the Joint Bases.

If we really want consolidation of services at the Joint Bases, rather than just new

signage and some fences removed, we cannot just switch a few hats and kill a few base CO billets. Joint Bases should not have two or three security services, multiple lawn cutting contracts, multiple deals with nearby utility companies, multiple human resource departments, multiple base contracting offices, multiple fire and EMS departments, each with their own separately managed and procured fireengines, facilities, ranks, etc. There should be one support operation for each major base operating function. BOS funds should be merged, then purged as consolidation takes place. Leaving this up to each service dept is a recipe for disaster and we'll see no savings.

I'll give you two specific examples of where real Joint Base savings were thrown away, just by the Navy alone. In one case, the Navy insisted on doing its regional housing PPV initiative only with other Northeast Navy bases. We begged them to have Lakehurst do its PPV as a Joint initiative with Dix and McGuire, who had their own joint PPV housing project underway. We said why would the Navy want to do the Lakehurst housing piece as a separate entity when there was a perfectly good Joint PPV initiative going right across the fenceline? Lakehurst's military housing market has absolutely nothing in common with Brunswick, or Newport, or anybody else except maybe Earle, and even then not really. The Navy told us to buzz off, and a chance to really solidify a Joint housing approach was lost. In a second case, the Navy insisted on downsizing fire fighter services in a Navy stovepipe fashion. Again, we asked them to downsize Lakehurst by consolidating the firefighters of both Dix and McGuire, that way they'd have one top captain for all three bases, less trucks, less overhead, etc. You would have thought we had asked them for their first born child. If it didn't benefit the Navy's budget line, they couldn't care less about wasteful spending at Dix or McGuire. They cared nothing about Jointness, or efficiency, or improving the quality of the product. It was the Navy uber alles.

In my view, only special contingent language can force DoD to cut through the service-rivalries and make the Joint Bases really function like they were intended. I can tell you first hand that the Air Force should not be running the McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst complex. The AF fought the Joint Base concept tooth and nail for three years. They were dragged kicking and screaming the whole way. Only when we briefed DuBois, HT Johnson, and others and got major buy-in from the highest OSD levels did the AF back off and let the Joint Installation Partnership agreement get signed (which I attended). But the second the high-level focus was shifted, the AF was right back at it trying to do things their way without coordinating anything with the Army or Navy. It was their way or the highway. Handing them total control of the Joint Base is a recipe for disaster, based on my experiences with them.

Again, I share these experiences only because I happened to have been a first-hand participant in some of the debates.

Andrew V. Napoli
Editor in Chief
Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC)
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Main Phone: 703-699-2950
Direct: 703-699-2981
Fax: 703-699-2735

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 5:39 PM
To: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Nat - Rumu:

Please let me know what the results of this action was so I can be comfortable something is working. One new example might be a contingent motion regarding Oceana if that is something the Commissioners express interest in developing.

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 4:20 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Team Leads: Please see Rumu's request and my note to her. I need your consolidated input to be submitted through Nat to indicate those items that you as team leads in concert with your analysts anticipate or foresee as having a potential of requiring special language to be drafted by GC. Some examples I have heard discussed which I need you to include and expand upon or add to if at all possible - If I am correct, so include; if not, so state; if not all inclusive, so develop:

- * JCSG - General Newton stated that he wants the eventual ANG recommendation language to be crafted such that even if "tail number" moves are not specified that the language allows the understanding of reduction and or addition of specific aircraft from and to specified locations - thus facilitating programmatic moves by USAF. - Please elaborate
- * DoN - General Hill requested that we develop contingency language as related to the NSANO - Federal Activity. - Please elaborate
- * JCSG (and I believe A, others?) - are working with potential issues of Privatization-in-place which must be explicitly stated in the language in order to be possible - please assure all such items are identified and detailed.
- * Issues - any contingent language expected related to environmental or economic impact issues - please list and elaborate
- * I am sure there are others - think out of the box and list before it is too late.

Team Leads Only Please - Respond directly to Nat for consolidation with info directly to Rumu and myself NLT August 12th

Rumu:

As to the first part; I indeed owe Andy what we can resurrect about that date as part of an annex I need to provide by the middle of the month. As I mentioned to him - it is not a single date but a compilation of many - my words to Andy at the time:

"We received Volume I, Parts 1 and 2 on May 13th, three days earlier than legislatively required. Over the next week OSD delivered the three specific Service and five of the six JCSG specific Analysis and Recommendation Volumes (V- XII) and the Classified Volume II (Force Structure Plan) by May 19th. Between May 18th and May 28th we received the corresponding "Supplemental Information" CDs for Volumes III - XII.

A large part of the information was not fully declassified for some time but a "Reading Room" was set up for Commission use on ??? The long pole in the tent was the remaining data base, questionnaire, Service Executive Groups and COBRA info which was declassified over the next three weeks.

More to come."

As to the second part; Good point - see above.

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 1:48 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: A Question and a Request

Hi Frank: I have a question for you, namely, when did the Commission decide that it had 100% (or acceptable lesser percentage) of the certified data provided by DoD? I know that we went through several weeks of back and forth of declassification, etc. from the May 13

submission date. The exact date is being entered into the report, so an accurate statement is important.

Secondly, I am working on the request for legal opinion submitted to OGC by George and Liz that takes into account a number of community and Congressional requests to amend or otherwise change DoD proposed recommendations. I want to ensure that OGC is looking at all such proposals that may have legal implications before the recommendations are drafted in final. Gen. Hague suggested that I attend one of R&A's staff meetings to raise this issue with your staff. While I am happy to do so, I will rely on your best judgment re: sourcing all proposed BRAC recommendations that may have legal implications so that we do not take a piecemeal approach, but a consolidated one.

Many thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18 Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Saturday, August 13, 2005 8:22 AM
To: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; 'Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net)'
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Thanks Rumu.

Nat - Do you have more from the TLs?

TLs:

This seems very incomplete - I am certain we need something for at least Oceana, NSANO, Tail Number issue in USAF, Oceana-Cecil, any P-I-P, etc. Please review so GC is prepared and able to research any out of the ordinary language.

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 8:34 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; 'Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net)'; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Frank: The only contingent motion that I am aware of so far is one that George and Liz are considering drafting for the Deseret, Newport and Umatilla chemical depots that recommend closure, conditioned on the completion of their chemical demilitarization missions which fall outside the 6 year BRAC implementation timeframe. Thus, the staff will recommend that the closures be made in accordance with BRAC recommendations once the demil missions have finished. I haven't seen the draft yet.

Thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18
Arlington, VA 22202-3920

Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 5:39 PM
To: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Nat - Rumu:

Please let me know what the results of this action was so I can be comfortable something is working. One new example might be a contingent motion regarding Oceana if that is something the Commissioners express interest in developing.

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 4:20 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Team Leads: Please see Rumu's request and my note to her. I need your consolidated input to be submitted through Nat to indicate those items that you as team leads in concert with your analysts anticipate or foresee as having a potential of requiring special language to be drafted by GC. Some examples I have heard discussed which I need you to include and expand upon or add to if at all possible - If I am correct, so include; if not, so state; if not all inclusive, so develop:

- JCSG - General Newton stated that he wants the eventual ANG recommendation language to be crafted such that even if "tail number" moves are not specified that the language allows the understanding of reduction and or addition of specific aircraft from and to specified locations - thus facilitating programmatic moves by USAF. - Please elaborate
- DoN - General Hill requested that we develop contingency language as related to the NSANO - Federal Activity. - Please elaborate
- JCSG (and I believe A, others?) - are working with potential issues of Privatization-in-place which must be explicitly stated in the language in order to be possible - please assure all such items are identified and detailed.
- Issues - any contingent language expected related to environmental or economic impact issues - please list and elaborate
- I am sure there are others - think out of the box and list before it is too late.

Team Leads Only Please - Respond directly to Nat for consolidation with info directly to Rumu and myself NLT August 12th

Rumu:

As to the first part; I indeed owe Andy what we can resurrect about that date as part of an annex I need to provide by the middle of the month. As I mentioned to him - it is not a single date but a compilation of many - my words to Andy at the time:

"We received Volume I, Parts 1 and 2 on May 13th, three days earlier than legislatively required. Over the next week OSD delivered the three specific Service and five of the six JCSG specific Analysis and Recommendation Volumes (V- XII) and the Classified Volume II (Force Structure Plan) by May 19th. Between May 18th and May 28th we received the corresponding "Supplemental Information" CDs for Volumes III - XII.

A large part of the information was not fully declassified for some time but a "Reading Room" was set up for Commission use on ??? The long pole in the tent was the remaining data base, questionnaire, Service Executive Groups and COBRA info which was declassified over the next three weeks.

More to come."

As to the second part; Good point - see above

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 1:48 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: A Question and a Request

Hi Frank: I have a question for you, namely, when did the Commission decide that it had 100% (or acceptable lesser percentage) of the certified data provided by DoD? I know that we went through several weeks of back and forth of declassification, etc. from the May 13 submission date. The exact date is being entered into the report, so an accurate statement is important.

Secondly, I am working on the request for legal opinion submitted to OGC by George and Liz that takes into account a number of community and Congressional requests to amend or otherwise change DoD proposed recommendations. I want to ensure that OGC is looking at all such proposals that may have legal implications before the recommendations are drafted in final. Gen. Hague suggested that I attend one of R&A's staff meetings to raise this issue with your staff. While I am happy to do so, I will rely on your best judgment re: sourcing all proposed BRAC recommendations that may have legal implications so that we do not take a piecemeal approach, but a consolidated one.

Many thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18
Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 8:26 PM
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: A Question and a Request

Thanks for your insight.

This e-mail has been sent from the Blackberry of Frank Cirillo, Director of Review and Analysis, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

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

From: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Andrew.Napoli@wso.whs.mil>
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil>; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Nathaniel.Sillin@wso.whs.mil>
CC: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC <rumu.sarkar@wso.whs.mil>; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC <James.Hanna@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Fri Aug 12 20:22:48 2005
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

I have mentioned this before, but my \$0.02, based on my Congressional experience in pushing for the creation of at least one of the Joint Bases, is that the Joint Base proposal should be "approved" by the Commission without specifying which Service Branch will 'control' the new Joint Base. Instead, the approval should be made conditional on DoD's creation of a special office to manage and oversee the Joint Bases.

If we really want consolidation of services at the Joint Bases, rather than just new

signage and some fences removed, we cannot just switch a few hats and kill a few base CO billets. Joint Bases should not have two or three security services, multiple lawn cutting contracts, multiple deals with nearby utility companies, multiple human resource departments, multiple base contracting offices, multiple fire and EMS departments, each with their own separately managed and procured fireengines, facilities, ranks, etc. There should be one support operation for each major base operating function. BOS funds should be merged, then purged as consolidation takes place. Leaving this up to each service dept is a recipe for disaster and we'll see no savings.

I'll give you two specific examples of where real Joint Base savings were thrown away, just by the Navy alone. In one case, the Navy insisted on doing its regional housing PPV initiative only with other Northeast Navy bases. We begged them to have Lakehurst do its PPV as a Joint initiative with Dix and McGuire, who had their own joint PPV housing project underway. We said why would the Navy want to do the Lakehurst housing piece as a separate entity when there was a perfectly good Joint PPV initiative going right across the fenceline? Lakehurst's military housing market has absolutely nothing in common with Brunswick, or Newport, or anybody else except maybe Earle, and even then not really. The Navy told us to buzz off, and a chance to really solidify a Joint housing approach was lost. In a second case, the Navy insisted on downsizing fire fighter services in a Navy stovepipe fashion. Again, we asked them to downsize Lakehurst by consolidating the firefighters of both Dix and McGuire, that way they'd have one top captain for all three bases, less trucks, less overhead, etc. You would have thought we had asked them for their first born child. If it didn't benefit the Navy's budget line, they couldn't care less about wasteful spending at Dix or McGuire. They cared nothing about Jointness, or efficiency, or improving the quality of the product. It was the Navy uber alles.

In my view, only special contingent language can force DoD to cut through the service-rivalries and make the Joint Bases really function like they were intended. I can tell you first hand that the Air Force should not be running the McGuire-Dix-Lakehurst complex. The AF fought the Joint Base concept tooth and nail for three years. They were dragged kicking and screaming the whole way. Only when we briefed DuBois, HT Johnson, and others and got major buy-in from the highest OSD levels did the AF back off and let the Joint Installation Partnership agreement get signed (which I attended). But the second the high-level focus was shifted, the AF was right back at it trying to do things their way without coordinating anything with the Army or Navy. It was their way or the highway. Handing them total control of the Joint Base is a recipe for disaster, based on my experiences with them.

Again, I share these experiences only because I happened to have been a first-hand participant in some of the debates.

Andrew V. Napoli
Editor in Chief
Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC)
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Main Phone: 703-699-2950
Direct: 703-699-2981
Fax: 703-699-2735

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 5:39 PM
To: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Nat - Rumu:

Please let me know what the results of this action was so I can be comfortable something is working. One new example might be a contingent motion regarding Oceana if that is something the Commissioners express interest in developing.

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 4:20 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Team Leads: Please see Rumu's request and my note to her. I need your consolidated input to be submitted through Nat to indicate those items that you as team leads in concert with your analysts anticipate or foresee as having a potential of requiring special language to be drafted by GC. Some examples I have heard discussed which I need you to include and expand upon or add to if at all possible - If I am correct, so include; if not, so state; if not all inclusive, so develop:

- * JCSG - General Newton stated that he wants the eventual ANG recommendation language to be crafted such that even if "tail number" moves are not specified that the language allows the understanding of reduction and or addition of specific aircraft from and to specified locations - thus facilitating programmatic moves by USAF. - Please elaborate
- * DoN - General Hill requested that we develop contingency language as related to the NSANO - Federal Activity. - Please elaborate
- * JCSG (and I believe A, others?) - are working with potential issues of Privatization-in-place which must be explicitly stated in the language in order to be possible - please assure all such items are identified and detailed.
- * Issues - any contingent language expected related to environmental or economic impact issues - please list and elaborate
- * I am sure there are others - think out of the box and list before it is too late.

Team Leads Only Please - Respond directly to Nat for consolidation with info directly to Rumu and myself NLT August 12th

Rumu:

As to the first part; I indeed owe Andy what we can resurrect about that date as part of an annex I need to provide by the middle of the month. As I mentioned to him - it is not a single date but a compilation of many - my words to Andy at the time:

"We received Volume I, Parts 1 and 2 on May 13th, three days earlier than legislatively required. Over the next week OSD delivered the three specific Service and five of the six JCSG specific Analysis and Recommendation Volumes (V- XII) and the Classified Volume II (Force Structure Plan) by May 19th. Between May 18th and May 28th we received the corresponding "Supplemental Information" CDs for Volumes III - XII.

A large part of the information was not fully declassified for some time but a "Reading Room" was set up for Commission use on ??? The long pole in the tent was the remaining data base, questionnaire, Service Executive Groups and COBRA info which was declassified over the next three weeks.

More to come."

As to the second part; Good point - see above.

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 1:48 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: A Question and a Request

Hi Frank: I have a question for you, namely, when did the Commission decide that it had 100% (or acceptable lesser percentage) of the certified data provided by DoD? I know that we went through several weeks of back and forth of declassification , etc. from the May 13

submission date. The exact date is being entered into the report, so an accurate statement is important.

Secondly, I am working on the request for legal opinion submitted to OGC by George and Liz that takes into account a number of community and Congressional requests to amend or otherwise change DoD proposed recommendations. I want to ensure that OGC is looking at all such proposals that may have legal implications before the recommendations are drafted in final. Gen. Hague suggested that I attend one of R&A's staff meetings to raise this issue with your staff. While I am happy to do so, I will rely on your best judgment re: sourcing all proposed BRAC recommendations that may have legal implications so that we do not take a piecemeal approach, but a consolidated one.

Many thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18 Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 6:21 PM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

Please make sure none of the info copies scream at my take - I do stand by it as 100% accurate.

From: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 6:19 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

Thank you!

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 6:18 PM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

The subject was two Community Presentations Discussion to different Commissioners regarding the Community request for consideration of Cecil Field as the East Coast Master Jet Base, should the Commission elect to close NAS Oceana. The request for consideration was initiated by the Community during the Florida presentation at the New Orleans regional Hearing.

From: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 5:26 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: florida visit

Mr. Cirillo--So sorry to bother you about this, but would the subject of the meeting with the FL delegation yesterday just be that it was a discussion of Cecil Field as a replacement for NAS Oceana? Thanks!

AJ

From: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 11:39 AM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

YEs, no Commissioner Hill.

I don't know about any memos or who records what. I suggest that you ask Frank Cirillo about that.

However, I do think, without that memo, you have enough to answer the question.

Bottom line is that Commissioners have met or spoke to on the phone a dozen governors in the past 2 weeks. Obviously the subject has been the controversial installations in their state. And records aren't kept except that the meeting happened because by the law, it is not a public meeting without 5 or more Commish's. Did they discuss Cecil Field? Of course. But it wasn't anything that was out of the ordinary....

What was said was not recorded and not part of the public record. Any notes that R&A took are just that, notes. They will probably be in the public record when the process is all said and done but not immediately.

From: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 11:35 AM
To: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

Great. Was I right about Commissioner Hill? And previously, when I have spoken to Gen. Hague, he has said that we just have a memo of the subject of the meeting--that's it. Would that be just a discussion of the possibility of relocating NAS Oceana to Cecil Field? Thanks!

AJ

From: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 11:32 AM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

2 Seperate Meetings

4 Commissioners at each meeting with Frank Cirillo and Jim Hanna representing R&A at both, myself at both and Charlie at the 7:00 am.

Nothing was recorded from either meeting but we never put anything on the record from informal meetings with Commissioners and elected officials.

From: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 11:27 AM
To: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: florida visit

Rory, do you know what will be put on the record re: the FL meetings? And wasn't it all the Commissioners, in 2 separate meetings, except for Commissioner Hill? Thanks!

AJ

From: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 11:21 AM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

def talk to rory on this one

From: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 10:53 AM
To: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: florida visit

Nat--Do you know the details about the meeting with the FL delegation this week, i.e what Jim mentions below? Is this a question for Rory? Thanks!

AJ

From: Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 6:10 PM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

Find out who attended contact R/A and determine what will be put on the record and then call her back asap with the information.

From: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 5:39 PM

To: Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: florida visit

Do you know? Thanks!

AJ

From: Patty Culhane [mailto:patty.culhane@wavy.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 10:09 AM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: florida visit

Audrey,

We are going to have to agree to disagree. Whether it was a hearing or an informal meeting the spirit of the question was, will they be meeting? They obviously are. I need to know who from the commission was in attendance and if what was said will be made part of the record.

Patty Culhane
WAVY-TV
757-403-3107

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 6:19 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Navy Team, status update, community concerns

I know - and am proud :) Plus by you (and Army) being done saves some skin off my butt tomorrow.

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 5:56 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Navy Team, status update, community concerns

And ours are all done....

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 5:43 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Navy Team, status update, community concerns

Drop that issue - Documenting Community Concerns is a major part of analysis - Suspense was August 6th

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 2:08 PM

To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Navy Team, status update, community concerns

Ok, guess Andy's work takes priority over analysis.

From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 2:03 PM
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Furlow, Clarenton, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Navy Team, status update, community concerns

I hope that these have been provided to Andy.

Andy, pls advise of any others that are due.

From: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 7:16 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Furlow, Clarenton, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Navy Team, status update, community concerns

As of 7 PM, on August 10, I still do not have the following community concerns narratives:

67	Naval Station Pascagoula, MS	Brian McDaniel	
69	Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME	CW Furlow	
71	Naval Station Ingleside, TX and NAS Corpus Christi, TX		Bill Fetzer
72	Engineering Field Activity	CW Furlow	
75	Navy Regions	CW Furlow	
164	Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA		CW Furlow
166	Naval Shipyard Detachments	CW Furlow	
192	Navy Broadway Complex		Brian McDaniel
193	NAS Oceana (closure or realign)		Bill Fetzer

Please, I need these ASAP. I have a steady series of deadlines between now and Sept 8th, and there is very little slippage I can afford. The due dates on these were last week, August 6th. I'm already pushing +4 or +5 days past the due date. I'm not looking for every single possible argument the community made. Just the major ones. The ones you think are the most important, and which the community thinks were the most important.

Andrew V. Napoli
Editor in Chief
Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC)
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Main Phone: 703-699-2950
Direct: 703-699-2981
Fax: 703-699-2735

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 6:18 PM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

The subject was two Community Presentations Discussion to different Commissioners regarding the Community request for consideration of Cecil Field as the East Coast Master Jet Base, should the Commission elect to close NAS Oceana. The request for consideration was initiated by the Community during the Florida presentation at the New Orleans regional Hearing.

From: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 5:26 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: florida visit

Mr. Cirillo--So sorry to bother you about this, but would the subject of the meeting with the FL delegation yesterday just be that it was a discussion of Cecil Field as a replacement for NAS Oceana? Thanks!

AJ

From: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 11:39 AM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

YEs, no Commissioner Hill.

I don't know about any memos or who records what. I suggest that you ask Frank Cirillo about that.

However, I do think, without that memo, you have enough to answer the question.

Bottom line is that Commissioners have met or spoke to on the phone a dozen governors in the past 2 weeks. Obviously the subject has been the controversial installations in their state. And records aren't kept except that the meeting happened because by the law, it is not a public meeting without 5 or more Commish's. Did they discuss Cecil Field? Of course. But it wasn't anything that was out of the ordinary....

What was said was not recorded and not part of the public record. Any notes that R&A took are just that, notes. They will probably be in the public record when the process is all said and done but not immediately.

From: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 11:35 AM
To: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

Great. Was I right about Commissioner Hill? And previously, when I have spoken to Gen. Hague, he has said that we just have a memo of the subject of the meeting--that's it. Would that be just a discussion of the possibility of relocating NAS Oceana to Cecil Field? Thanks!

AJ

From: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 11:32 AM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

2 Seperate Meetings

4 Commissioners at each meeting with Frank Cirillo and Jim Hanna representing R&A at both, myself at both and Charlie at the 7:00 am.

Nothing was recorded from either meeting but we never put anything on the record from informal meetings with Commissioners and elected officials.

From: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 11:27 AM
To: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: florida visit

Rory, do you know what will be put on the record re: the FL meetings? And wasn't it all the Commissioners, in 2 separate meetings, except for Commissioner Hill? Thanks!

AJ

From: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 11:21 AM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

def talk to rory on this one

From: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 10:53 AM
To: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: florida visit

Nat--Do you know the details about the meeting with the FL delegation this week, i.e what Jim mentions below? Is this a question for Rory? Thanks!

AJ

From: Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 6:10 PM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: florida visit

Find out who attended contact R/A and determine what will be put on the record and then call her back asap with the information.

From: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 5:39 PM
To: Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: florida visit

Do you know? Thanks!

AJ

From: Patty Culhane [mailto:patty.culhane@wavy.com]
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 10:09 AM
To: Jones, Audrey, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: florida visit

Audrey,

We are going to have to agree to disagree. Whether it was a hearing or an informal meeting the spirit of the question was, will they be meeting? They obviously are. I need to know who from the commission was in attendance and if what was said will be made part of the record.

Patty Culhane
WAVY-TV
757-403-3107

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 6:04 PM
To: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Heigh, Martin, COL, WSO-BRAC; Mulkey, Grant, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

Thanks Diane -

Please get us what you know of the Commissioners Schedule by Saturday Noon - or no later than the day before the earliest arriving Commissioner. I think Commissioner Coyle arrives late Monday with one or two more Tuesday - some fly back out Thursday, some fly Friday, all are in hearings Saturday.

We will turn around the Team By Team schedule for each commissioner to you within a day so we can nail their time in one consistent document.

Commissioner-by Commissioner format will work fine - probably best.

Frank

From: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 4:44 PM
To: Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Heigh, Martin, COL, WSO-BRAC; Mulkey, Grant, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

We can take all of your input and create a one page Master Calendar Schedule for an easier read for the Commissioners. With this new requirement, I see Admin's role as a complement to your existing processes and your providing of important, substantive information.

We will want to make every effort to meet the Monday deadline and coordinate a FEDEX mailout. This hard push to come to terms with the Commissioner's time now and covering their next two weeks will make lives easier in the long run. Clearing the administrative decks this way will especially allow Frank to focus on maximizing the Commissioners' time with R&A staff, given our short deadlines before the deliberations. That seems to be the key point here.

Christine, I think your information packages are always terrific and very comprehensive. We look forward to your input and coordination with Marty and our travel team, to include Matt.

Frank, we will ensure that you and Nat receive the Commissioner's schedules for the next two weeks through Kristen's consistently thorough efforts.

Kristen, please stay especially close to LA and the Commissioners as plans are generated for the Commissioners. Our timeframe is just this weekend to pull this all off.

Grant, please see me regarding the Master Calendar Schedule.

Katy, stand by for any and all assists this weekend. I want both you and Grant to be present on Saturday and Sunday as we get this all together and team the project for a Monday deliverable to Charlie.

Diane

From: Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 4:01 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC;

Subject: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Heigh, Martin, COL, WSO-BRAC
RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

I can take the inputs and put them in an information package (like for the regional hearings) with line-by-line itineraries - as well as daily schedule reminder cards

Christine

Christine O. Hill
Director, Legislative Affairs
BRAC Commission
703-699-2950

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 3:58 PM
To: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Heigh, Martin, COL, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT
Importance: High

Charlie: This will work fine.

Diane: Please give Nat and I a schedule of Commissioner Schedules for next two weeks to include their arrivals next week, internal travels (Texas and FL) and any and all meetings currently scheduled. That should also include any evening activities they might have after their arrival between August 15th and August 24th. From that I can let you know the blocks of time and whom they will be meeting with in R&A.

Rest assured R&A will need every waking and alert moment we can get with each Commissioner - including the Chairman to prepare them for final deliberations.

Thanks

From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 1:45 PM
To: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

I am seeing some overlap of effort within our staff on the Hyatt preparations and operations. As we move into the final phase of deliberations and final report, please be guided by Sections H, I, and J of the R&As Staff Support Handbook 2005 that we provided to everyone when you came aboard. The exceptions to Section J are as follows:

1. Director of Administration - prepare a comprehensive schedule of all events as well as a schedule for each Commissioner from all his/her events). As annexes, we need plans and schedules for surface and air transportation, meals, briefings, deliberations, base visits (Cecil and Kingsville), etc. I have asked Christine to make available members of her Advance Team for assignment to each Commissioner with responsibility for getting him/her to the right place with the right material and the right time. I want to FEDEX this to all Commissioners by Monday. Diane will be around to get your input.
2. Director of Communications. Make available copies of the recommendations to be voted upon to the public and to press during the period of deliberations. However, the opening remarks for the hearings on Aug 20 and the opening deliberation on Aug 27 will be prepared by Chris Yoder.

From: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 11:13 AM
To: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

Thank you. Will add this request to the list.

From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 6:20 PM
To: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

Diane/Magda, I want 12 door key cards for the Suite. I will control the cards. Pls give to me on the 23rd. We need the suite for the evenings of 23, 24, 25 and 26 Aug.

I'll want to visit the hotel on the afternoon circa 2 pm on 23 Aug to review the setup in the Ballroom, the Green room, Regency room and suite. I'll also want to check out the IT equipment - AV setup and voting lights.

From: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 10:01 AM
To: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Estrada, Christina, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Confirm: Support at the HYATT
Importance: High

Bob, Christina-

Here is an updated summary of the BRAC support we will need for the week of final deliberations at the Hyatt-- Please review it and let us know if there is anything else that you can think of that we will require. If so, let me know and I will amend the request. Final request has not yet been sent to WHS or Hyatt- I will only do so after I get the "move forward" from both of you--

Hyatt Regency Crystal City at Reagan National Airport, 2799 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202
Direct Phone: (703) 418-7233 Hotel: (703) 418-1234 Fax: (703) 413- 6873

1- IT Support required beginning:

Tuesday, August 23 from 6:00 P.M. - 11:00 P.M. - The site will be aviable for us to set up

Wednesday, 24 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - First day of deliberations

Thursday, 25 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - Second day of deliberations

Friday, 26 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - Third day of deliberations

Saturday 27 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - Tentative, to confirm by Friday, 26 August COB

2- Regency Room - "War Room" (free of charge for Aug 23-27 for the hours detailed above) Need high-speed internet capability for 8 laptops, 2 printers (one B&W, one Color), 1 fax, 1 photocopier. BRAC email access.

3- One on-site help-desk support technician for the hours detailed above for each day.

4- Press Room - Green Room (free of charge)- Include sofas, tables, chairs to accommodate about 30. 2 floor fans.

5- Suite (free of charge) - 2 refrigerators stocked with ice, cold sodas/juice/water/beer/wine.

6- Keep regular IT support back at Polk Building.

I suspect we should set aside enough paper and all office supplies needed for this week in separate boxes so that we are not short of anything at the hotel- Can a list be made up so that if there is anything lacking we can order it ahead of time?

Did I miss anything? Look forward to your feedback,
Magda

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 5:43 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Navy Team, status update, community concerns

Drop that issue - Documenting Community Concerns is a major part of analysis - Suspense was August 6th

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 2:08 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Navy Team, status update, community concerns

Ok, guess Andy's work takes priority over analysis.

From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 2:03 PM
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Furlow, Clarenton, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Navy Team, status update, community concerns

I hope that these have been provided to Andy.

Andy, pls advise of any others that are due.

From: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 7:16 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Furlow, Clarenton, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Navy Team, status update, community concerns

As of 7 PM, on August 10, I still do not have the following community concerns narratives:

67	Naval Station Pascagoula, MS	Brian McDaniel	
69	Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, ME	CW Furlow	
71	Naval Station Ingleside, TX and NAS Corpus Christi, TX		Bill Fetzer
72	Engineering Field Activity	CW Furlow	
75	Navy Regions	CW Furlow	
164	Ship Intermediate Maintenance Activity Norfolk, VA		CW Furlow
166	Naval Shipyard Detachments	CW Furlow	
192	Navy Broadway Complex		Brian McDaniel
193	NAS Oceana (closure or realign)		Bill Fetzer

Please, I need these ASAP. I have a steady series of deadlines between now and Sept 8th, and there is very little slippage I can afford. The due dates on these were last week, August 6th. I'm already pushing +4 or +5 days past the due date. I'm not looking for every single possible argument the community made. Just the major ones. The ones you think are the most important, and which the community thinks were the most important.

Andrew V. Napoli
Editor in Chief
Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC)
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Main Phone: 703-699-2950

Direct: 703-699-2981
Fax: 703-699-2735

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 5:39 PM
To: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Nat - Rumu:

Please let me know what the results of this action was so I can be comfortable something is working. One new example might be a contingent motion regarding Oceana if that is something the Commissioners express interest in developing.

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 4:20 PM
To: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: A Question and a Request

Team Leads: Please see Rumu's request and my note to her. I need your consolidated input to be submitted through Nat to indicate those items that you as team leads in concert with your analysts anticipate or foresee as having a potential of requiring special language to be drafted by GC. Some examples I have heard discussed which I need you to include and expand upon or add to if at all possible - If I am correct, so include; if not, so state; if not all inclusive, so develop:

- JCSG - General Newton stated that he wants the eventual ANG recommendation language to be crafted such that even if "tail number" moves are not specified that the language allows the understanding of reduction and or addition of specific aircraft from and to specified locations - thus facilitating programmatic moves by USAF. - Please elaborate
- DoN - General Hill requested that we develop contingency language as related to the NSANO - Federal Activity. - Please elaborate
- JCSG (and I believe A, others?) - are working with potential issues of Privatization-in-place which must be explicitly stated in the language in order to be possible - please assure all such items are identified and detailed.
- Issues - any contingent language expected related to environmental or economic impact issues - please list and elaborate
- I am sure there are others - think out of the box and list before it is too late.

Team Leads Only Please - Respond directly to Nat for consolidation with info directly to Rumu and myself NLT August 12th

Rumu:

As to the first part; I indeed owe Andy what we can resurrect about that date as part of an annex I need to provide by the middle of the month. As I mentioned to him - it is not a single date but a compilation of many - my words to Andy at the time:

"We received Volume I, Parts 1 and 2 on May 13th, three days earlier than legislatively required. Over the next week OSD delivered the three specific Service and five of the six JCSG specific Analysis and Recommendation Volumes (V- XII) and the Classified Volume II (Force Structure Plan) by May 19th. Between May 18th and May 28th we received the corresponding "Supplemental Information" CDs for Volumes III - XII.

A large part of the information was not fully declassified for some time but a "Reading Room" was set up for Commission use on ??? The long pole in the tent was the remaining data base, questionnaire, Service Executive

Groups and COBRA info which was declassified over the next three weeks.

More to come."

As to the second part; Good point - see above.

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 1:48 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: A Question and a Request

Hi Frank: I have a question for you, namely, when did the Commission decide that it had 100% (or acceptable lesser percentage) of the certified data provided by DoD? I know that we went through several weeks of back and forth of declassification, etc. from the May 13 submission date. The exact date is being entered into the report, so an accurate statement is important.

Secondly, I am working on the request for legal opinion submitted to OGC by George and Liz that takes into account a number of community and Congressional requests to amend or otherwise change DoD proposed recommendations. I want to ensure that OGC is looking at all such proposals that may have legal implications before the recommendations are drafted in final. Gen. Hague suggested that I attend one of R&A's staff meetings to raise this issue with your staff. While I am happy to do so, I will rely on your best judgment re: sourcing all proposed BRAC recommendations that may have legal implications so that we do not take a piecemeal approach, but a consolidated one.

Many thanks, Rumu

Rumu Sarkar
Associate General Counsel
2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Room 600-18
Arlington, VA 22202-3920
Tel: (703) 699-2973
Cell: (703) 901-7843
Fax: (703) 699-2735

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 3:58 PM
To: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Heigh, Martin, COL, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT
Importance: High

Charlie: This will work fine.

Diane: Please give Nat and I a schedule of Commissioner Schedules for next two weeks to include their arrivals next week, internal travels (Texas and FL) and any and all meetings currently scheduled. That should also include any evening activities they might have after their arrival between August 15th and August 24th. From that I can let you know the blocks of time and whom they will be meeting with in R&A.

Rest assured R&A will need every waking and alert moment we can get with each Commissioner - including the Chairman to prepare them for final deliberations.

Thanks

From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 1:45 PM
To: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

I am seeing some overlap of effort within our staff on the Hyatt preparations and operations. As we move into the final phase of deliberations and final report, please be guided by Sections H, I, and J of the R&As Staff Support Handbook 2005 that we provided to everyone when you came aboard. The exceptions to Section J are as follows:

1. Director of Administration - prepare a comprehensive schedule of all events as well as a schedule for each Commissioner from all his/her events). As annexes, we need plans and schedules for surface and air transportation, meals, briefings, deliberations, base visits (Cecil and Kingsville), etc. I have asked Christine to make available members of her Advance Team for assignment to each Commissioner with responsibility for getting him/her to the right place with the right material and the right time. I want to FEDEX this to all Commissioners by Monday. Diane will be around to get your input.
2. Director of Communications. Make available copies of the recommendations to be voted upon to the public and to press during the period of deliberations. However, the opening remarks for the hearings on Aug 20 and the opening deliberation on Aug 27 will be prepared by Chris Yoder.

From: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 11:13 AM
To: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

Thank you. Will add this request to the list.

From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 6:20 PM
To: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Confirm: Support at the HYATT

Diane/Magda, I want 12 door key cards for the Suite. I will control the cards. Pls give to me on the 23rd. We need the suite for the evenings of 23, 24, 25 and 26 Aug.
I'll want to visit the hotel on the afternoon circa 2 pm on 23 Aug to review the setup in the Ballroom, the Green room, Regency room and suite. I'll also want to check out the IT equipment - AV setup and voting lights.

From: Angulo, Magda, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 10:01 AM
To: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Estrada, Christina, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Confirm: Support at the HYATT
Importance: High

Bob, Christina-

Here is an updated summary of the BRAC support we will need for the week of final deliberations at the Hyatt-- Please review it and let us know if there is anything else that you can think of that we will require. If so, let me know and I will amend the request. Final request has not yet been sent to WHS or Hyatt- I will only do so after I get the "move forward" from both of you--

Hyatt Regency Crystal City at Reagan National Airport, 2799 Jefferson Davis Highway, Arlington, VA 22202
Direct Phone: (703) 418-7233 Hotel: (703) 418-1234 Fax: (703) 413-6873

1- IT Support required beginning:
Tuesday, August 23 from 6:00 P.M. - 11:00 P.M. - The site will be available for us to set up

Wednesday, 24 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - First day of deliberations
Thursday, 25 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - Second day of deliberations

Friday, 26 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - Third day of deliberations
Saturday 27 August from 8:00 A.M. - 5:00 P.M. - Tentative, to confirm by Friday 26 August COB

2- Regency Room - "War Room" (free of charge for Aug 23-27 for the hours detailed above) Need high-speed internet capability for 8 laptops, 2 printers (one B&W, one Color), 1 fax, 1 photocopier. BRAC email access.

3- One on-site help-desk support technician for the hours detailed above for each day.

4- Press Room - Green Room (free of charge)- Include sofas, tables, chairs to accommodate about 30. 2 floor fans.

5- Suite (free of charge) - 2 refrigerators stocked with ice, cold sodas/juice/water/beer/wine.

6- Keep regular IT support back at Polk Building.

I suspect we should set aside enough paper and all office supplies needed for this week in separate boxes so that we are not short of anything at the hotel- Can a list be made up so that if there is anything lacking we can order it ahead of time?

Did I miss anything? Look forward to your feedback,
Magda

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 12:51 PM
To: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Cecil Field Meeting Cancelled

Amen - Don't tell anyone and I will pretend I am there and get some work done.

From: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 12, 2005 9:55 AM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Cecil Field Meeting Cancelled

Per Jim's instructions, I cancelled the Cecil Field Meeting scheduled for today.

Thanks,
Rory

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 6:05 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: Oceana environmental restoration cost data

That's nice

This e-mail has been sent from the Blackberry of Frank Cirillo, Director of Review and Analysis, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC <James.Hanna@wso.whs.mil>
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Thu Aug 11 14:04:26 2005
Subject: RE: Oceana environmental restoration cost data

WE HAVE IT!!!!!!!!!!!!!! THAT'S WHAT I'VE BEEN TRYING TO SAY!!!!!! YOU FORWARDED IT YESTERDAY!!

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 2:04 PM
To: Miller, Gary, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: Oceana environmental restoration cost data

I remind all - we want OSD BRAC Certified Data. Please request.

Frank

This e-mail has been sent from the Blackberry of Frank Cirillo, Director of Review and Analysis, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

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

From: Miller, Gary, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Gary.Miller@wso.whs.mil>
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC <James.Hanna@wso.whs.mil>
CC: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Robert.Cook@wso.whs.mil>; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Thu Aug 11 14:00:26 2005
Subject: Oceana environmental restoration cost data

From the FY 2003 report to Congress and from the Summary of Cumulative environmental Impacts, DoD is showing a cost to complete environmental restoration of \$8.3M and the DERA money spent through FY2003 of \$18.4M.

Gary Miller, P.E.
Environmental Analyst
BRAC Commission
703-699-2930
gary.miller@wso.whs.mil

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 10:46 AM
To: Miller, Gary, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: new

Thanks Gary can you get figures for NAS Oceana, VA?

From: Miller, Gary, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 4:54 PM
To: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: new

<< File: Environmental Restoration and MMRP Cost.doc >> The previous message had a problem with the attachment, hopefully this one goes through.

Gary

All,
Please forward to your staff:

For the 33 major proposed closures, please use the Environmental Restoration Cost numbers from the attached table, these have been updated based upon clearinghouse responses. For the Army facilities there are several that have operational ranges the cost to close these are not included in the Totals, if you want to list the additional costs they are listed

as a range of costs in the far right column.

If you need any other assistance with environmental write-ups please come by.

Thanks,
Gary

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 2:04 PM
To: Miller, Gary, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: Oceana environmental restoration cost data

I remind all - we want OSD BRAC Certified Data. Please request.

Frank

This e-mail has been sent from the Blackberry of Frank Cirillo, Director of Review and Analysis, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

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

From: Miller, Gary, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Gary.Miller@wso.whs.mil>
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC <James.Hanna@wso.whs.mil>
CC: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Robert.Cook@wso.whs.mil>; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Thu Aug 11 14:00:26 2005
Subject: Oceana environmental restoration cost data

From the FY 2003 report to Congress and from the Summary of Cumulative environmental Impacts, DoD is showing a cost to complete environmental restoration of \$8.3M and the DERA money spent through FY2003 of \$18.4M.

Gary Miller, P.E.
Environmental Analyst
BRAC Commission
703-699-2930
gary.miller@wso.whs.mil

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 10:46 AM
To: Miller, Gary, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: new

Thanks Gary can you get figures for NAS Oceana, VA?

From: Miller, Gary, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 4:54 PM
To: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: new

<< File: Environmental Restoration and MMRP Cost.doc >> The previous message had a problem with the attachment, hopefully this one goes through.

Gary

All,
Please forward to your staff:

For the 33 major proposed closures, please use the Environmental Restoration Cost numbers from the attached table, these have been updated based upon clearinghouse responses. For the Army facilities there are several that have operational ranges the cost to close these are not included in the Totals, if you want to list the additional costs they are listed as a range of costs in the far right column.

If you need any other assistance with environmental write-ups please come by.

Thanks,
Gary

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 11:23 AM
To: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: Cecil attendees for tomorrow

I have accepted - only Jim and I were the only two on the BRAC invite?

This e-mail has been sent from the Blackberry of Frank Cirillo, Director of Review and Analysis, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

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

From: Cooper, Rory, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Rory.Cooper@wso.whs.mil>
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC <James.Hanna@wso.whs.mil>
CC: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil>; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Robert.Cook@wso.whs.mil>; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Nathaniel.Sillin@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Thu Aug 11 11:16:21 2005
Subject: Fw: Cecil attendees for tomorrow

Jim, below are the attendees for the 2-230 meeting tomorrow for Cecil community. (This is the half hour we offered per Charlie last week). Conference Room B is scheduled.

Do you know what BRAC staff will be attending?

Thanks, Rory

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

From: Robert J.Natter <rjnatter@natterllc.com>
To: Cooper, Rory <rory.cooper@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Thu Aug 11 11:08:05 2005
Subject: Cecil attendees for tomorrow

Mayor John Peyton
Dan McCarthy
John Leenhouts
Lisa Lutka
Pam Dana
Kurt Rodriguez
Adm Robert Natter

Robert J. Natter
R J NATTER & ASSOCIATES, LLC
rjnatter@natterllc.com
904 376-5861

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 11:08 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: Need for C Field Certified Info

Jim - not sure of your answer - but if has to do with clean up of either CF or NASO it will be useful - The Question however is another item - asking for whatever certified data we can request regarding Cecil Field.

More later

This e-mail has been sent from the Blackberry of Frank Cirillo, Director of Review and Analysis, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC <James.Hanna@wso.whs.mil>
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil>
CC: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC <C.Battaglia@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Thu Aug 11 09:54:20 2005
Subject: RE: Need for C Field Certified Info

We have that. It came in at \$1.6B. (More than Moody or any other option...just about the price of a greenfield build) Recreated Oceana in it's entirety. Did not consider anything that already existed at Cecil. We're cross walking to eliminate redundancy and to ensure proper costing factors were considered.

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2005 9:40 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Need for C Field Certified Info

Charie wants you to develop a major CH request for Certified Material on CF - no further guidance other than huge Gehman issue. Prepare a draft asap

This e-mail has been sent from the Blackberry of Frank Cirillo, Director of Review and Analysis, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2005 7:36 PM
To: BRAC Calendar
Subject: Accepted: Community Meeting - Cecil Field

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 8:51 PM
To: Buzzell, Ashley, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; 'Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net)'; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hood, Wesley, CIV, WSO-BRAC; MacGregor, Timothy, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Manuel, Donald, CTR, WSO-BRAC; Rhody, Dean, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Saxon, Ethan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schmidt, Carol, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Turner, Colleen, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Wasleski, Marilyn, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Tickle, Harold, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Breitschopf, Justin, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Butler, Aaron, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dean, Ryan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Heigh, Martin, COL, WSO-BRAC; Gingrich, Karl, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Final Deliberation Slides
Attachments: Shell Slide.ppt

Team Leaders, ETC.: Please pass to all

Attached is the now latest final cut of the final deliberation slides.

In essence;

Slides 1-4 remained the same as this AM. The only slide drastically changed was the issues summary **slide 4** from a then check list version to a now list of clean, defined statements (see example).

All issues will be listed on **the full issues matrix** which will be used during the in briefs to Commissioners, put on a back-up slide as in the attached and included in the Commissioners books.

The **Issues Back-up slides** (for each issue) will be exactly as we released this AM.

White Smoke - Rock and Roll

Reminder:

We will be filming a mock Final Delib Scripted Run on Monday with internal scripted dry run Saturday AM:

I believe we agreed the examples would be Gillem, Joint Medical Add, Hector and a Leased Space Recommendation.

See Ethan (after 4 on Wed) and Dan regarding developing supporting Motions - you will need to do first cut at some motion options.

Dave, Frank, Ethan are at RH, Jim at Cecil for Wed. Bob will be here.

Frank

From: Saxon, Ethan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 7:32 PM

To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Final Deliberation Slides

Enclosed please find the final deliberation slides. After an exhaustive process with which we are all familiar, the product has been pared down to the first four slides, with supporting slides used in your briefing dialogue with the Commissioners and for questions during the final deliberation.

The first four slides are:

- A. The Recommendation**
- B. The Spider Chart**
- C. The DoD Justification**
- D. The Issues Summary**

In addition, there would be **back-up slides** that provide the **DoD position, Community Position and R&A staff findings for each issue**, along with the **issue matrix, maps** etc.

The enclosed example is for Ft. Gillem.

Once you have completed your slides save it into **S:/R&A/R&A Shells/Final Deliberation/**

Name your slides in the following format:
Section Number Name of Recommendation

le: 2 Fort Gillem, GA

To complete these slides you will need:

1. The legislative document (a hard copy will be printed for each team)
2. A Spider Chart (these are on the S drive R&A/BRAC05 folder)
3. The DoD Justification, COBRA data and Personnel numbers (from the DoD report)
4. A summary of your analysis (based on dialogue with the Commissioners, community meeting memos, base visit reports and questions to the clearing house)

Sincerely,



Shell Slide.ppt (404
KB)

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 8:48 PM
To: Buzzell, Ashley, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net); Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hood, Wesley, CIV, WSO-BRAC; MacGregor, Timothy, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Manuel, Donald, CTR, WSO-BRAC; Rhody, Dean, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Saxon, Ethan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Schmidt, Carol, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Turner, Colleen, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Wasleski, Marilyn, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Tickle, Harold, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Breitschopf, Justin, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Butler, Aaron, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Buzan, Thadd, Mr, OSD-ATL; Dean, Ryan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Heigh, Martin, COL, WSO-BRAC; Gingrich, Karl, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Final Deliberation Slides
Attachments: Shell Slide.ppt

Team Leaders, ETC.: Please pass to all

Attached is the now latest final cut of the final deliberation slides.

In essence;

Slides 1-4 remained the same as this AM. The only slide drastically changed was the issues summary **slide 4** from a then check list version to a now list of clean, defined statements (see example).

All issues will be listed on **the full issues matrix** which will be used during the in briefs to Commissioners, put on a back-up slide as in the attached and included in the Commissioners books.

The **Issues Back-up slides** (for each issue) will be exactly as we released this AM.

White Smoke - Rock and Roll

Reminder:

We will be filming a mock Final Delib Scripted Run on Monday with internal scripted dry run Saturday AM:

I believe we agreed the examples would be Gillem, Joint Medical Add, Hector and a Leased Space Recommendation.

See Ethan (after 4 on Wed) and Dan regarding developing supporting Motions - you will need to do first cut at some motion options.

Dave, Frank, Ethan are at RH, Jim at Cecil for Wed. Bob will be here.

Frank

From: Saxon, Ethan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 7:32 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Final Deliberation Slides

Enclosed please find the final deliberation slides. After an exhaustive process with which we are all familiar, the product has been pared down to the first four slides, with supporting slides used in your briefing dialogue with the Commissioners and for questions during the final deliberation.

The first four slides are:

- A. The Recommendation
- B. The Spider Chart
- C. The DoD Justification
- D. The Issues Summary

In addition, there would be back-up slides that provide the DoD position, Community Position and R&A staff findings for each issue, along with the issue matrix, maps etc.

The enclosed example is for Ft. Gillem.

Once you have completed your slides save it into S:/R&A/R&A Shells/Final Deliberation/

Name your slides in the following format:
Section Number Name of Recommendation

le: 2 Fort Gillem, GA

To complete these slides you will need:

1. The legislative document (a hard copy will be printed for each team)
2. A Spider Chart (these are on the S drive R&A/BRAC05 folder)
3. The DoD Justification, COBRA data and Personnel numbers (from the DoD report)
4. A summary of your analysis (based on dialogue with the Commissioners, community meeting memos, base visit reports and questions to the clearing house)

Sincerely,



Shell Slide.ppt (404 KB)

Tracking:

Recipient

Buzzell, Ashley, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Ed Brown (edbrown61@verizon.net)
 Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Hood, Wesley, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 MacGregor, Timothy, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Manuel, Donald, CTR, WSO-BRAC
 Rhody, Dean, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Saxon, Ethan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Schmidt, Carol, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Turner, Colleen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Wasleski, Marilyn, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Tickle, Harold, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Breitschopf, Justin, CIV, WSO-BRAC
 Butler, Aaron, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Recall

Succeeded: 8/9/2005 8:52 PM
 Succeeded: 8/10/2005 6:47 AM
 Succeeded: 8/10/2005 7:26 AM
 Succeeded: 8/9/2005 8:52 PM

 Succeeded: 8/11/2005 7:41 AM
 Succeeded: 8/10/2005 9:24 AM
 Succeeded: 8/9/2005 8:53 PM
 Succeeded: 8/10/2005 8:12 AM
 Succeeded: 8/10/2005 9:51 AM
 Failed: 8/10/2005 7:55 AM
 Succeeded: 8/10/2005 8:03 AM
 Succeeded: 8/10/2005 4:38 PM
 Failed: 8/10/2005 7:47 AM
 Failed: 8/9/2005 8:53 PM
 Failed: 8/9/2005 8:53 PM
 Succeeded: 8/9/2005 8:55 PM
 Succeeded: 8/10/2005 6:54 AM
 Failed: 8/10/2005 4:01 PM
 Succeeded: 8/10/2005 7:17 AM
 Succeeded: 8/10/2005 8:24 AM
 Failed: 8/10/2005 8:00 AM

Recipient	Recall
Buzan, Thadd, Mr, OSD-ATL	Succeeded: 8/9/2005 8:54 PM
Dean, Ryan, CIV, WSO-BRAC	Failed: 8/10/2005 8:05 AM
Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC	
Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC	
Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC	Succeeded: 8/10/2005 6:53 AM
Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC	Failed: 8/10/2005 10:44 AM
Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC	Succeeded: 8/9/2005 8:53 PM
Heigh, Martin, COL, WSO-BRAC	
Gingrich, Karl, CIV, WSO-BRAC	Succeeded: 8/10/2005 8:01 AM

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 2:51 PM
To: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Resolution to Clearinghouse Taskers 223, 225, 226, 227, 237, & 244 (WWF 6-11)

sorry

From: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 2:34 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Resolution to Clearinghouse Taskers 223, 225, 226, 227, 237, & 244 (WWF 6-11)

Frank - I have received three e-mail today that I think you intended to send to Hanna.

While the AF would be pleased to take all the Navy assets, I don't think we have the ability to take on their problems also. With all due respect, they can have Oceana-Kingsville-Corpus Christi....I am not sure about OLF Pickett.

Ken

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 2:30 PM
To: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Resolution to Clearinghouse Taskers 223, 225, 226, 227, 237, & 244 (WWF 6-11)

info

From: RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 10:53 AM
To: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Flood, Glenn, CIV,

OASD-PA; Hoggard, Jack, CTR, WSO-OSD_DST JCSG; marsha Warren
Subject: FW: Resolution to Clearinghouse Taskers 223, 225, 226, 227, 237, & 244 (WWF 6-11)

Attached is the response for taskers 0637C, 0640C, 0641C, 0642C, 0643C, and 0669C

OSD BRAC Clearinghouse

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

From: bracprocess [mailto:bracprocess@navy.mil]

Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 10:20 AM

To: RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse

Cc: bracprocess

Subject: Resolution to Clearinghouse Taskers 223, 225, 226, 227, 237, & 244 (WWF 6-11)

Clearinghouse,

The attached document consolidates responses to the listed taskers. Please close these 6 Clearinghouse taskers.

CH 223 (WWF#10) **0637C**

CH 225 (WWF#6) **0640C**

CH 226 (WWF#9) **0642C**

CH 227 (WWF#8) **0643C**

CH 237 (WWF#7) **0641C**

CH 244 (WWF#11) **0669C**

VR, LCDR Bossuyt

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 2:25 PM
To: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: WE Need To Talk -

Thanks Jim A - Good information.

Jim - Retaining the anchoring system and hopefully the "pits" for the aircraft arresting system (think cables and "tail Hook") could conceivably make returning such systems to operation more cost effective. Although I would assume there has been some technology improvements in the last six years?

Jim H and Bill: For your use as appropriate and inclusion in analysis.

From: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 1:04 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: WE Need To Talk -

Frank,

A couple messages here that went to Cook twice due to my mistake in addressing. That was the email I was referring to in that meeting with Charlie and Bob on Friday - but you didn't get it because I hit Bob twice with it. Sorry.

I read the testimony on Oceana - interesting. Perhaps some of my comments below will be helpful. I've talked to every FAA facility involved from Washington Center, the FAA's System Command Center in Herndon, VA, JAX and Miami Centers, and finally JAX tower and Approach control. My comments are supported by their remarks to me.

I think the airspace considerations of today are more manageable and neither side has shown all their "dirty laundry", although the Southern Warnings Areas off JAX have been re-worked even though Cecil has closed to facilitate other military missions (see below for elaboration of comment). Certainly more there than what the testimony leads one to believe.

I think Oceana has more airspace problems than they want to admit. Oceana claims 5 minutes to unrestricted airspace vs.: six at Cecil. Bounce patterns at Whitehouse may be more realistic than Fentress for carrier ops, and all the updated "lens" to "call the ball" are current with what's on the carrier fleet now. Other aircraft types are training for carrier landings there daily. I am advised that the "bolt's are still in the ground" for the arresting gear, which apparently means something to someone since it was brought to my attention.

For what it's worth,

Jim

From: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 09, 2005 7:45 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Deputy, Carl W. CDR BRAC
Subject: RE: WE Need To Talk -

Bill,

Yes, I've read that a dozen times. The main issue there WAS some altitude restrictions on some heavily traveled routes to and from the Caribbean. However, I believe that wasn't as big an issue (way overstated) as some other factors that were mentioned "other mission needs"; and political stuff, maybe?) Today - With things closing down in Puerto Rico, people tend to forget that those ops have been able to be accommodated off the JAX coast in the "Whiskey" airspace. In fact, new procedures were enacted in 2003 to streamline ops off the JAX area.

You've heard what the Oceana folks have said about the move to Cecil and the weather issues. I've commented on that.

All things being equal (including some ugly things about the Oceana operation you didn't hear from them; poor coordination and unpleasant relationship with Washington Center for "real-time" situations, and weather problems with arrivals to Philly and New York from the East when there are weather issues up there), I think the move to Cecil from an airspace perspective is viable. There have been new and emerging technologies that have enabled cockpit operations and ATC separation standards to be more precise. We can put more airplanes in less airspace today than we could ten years ago - or even two for that matter. I would expect that the "old" letter's of agreement (LOA) in Florida (All Controlling and Using Agency's) would be able to be tweaked for a better operation than before (unfortunately, not by the time the report is due to the President). But, certainly within the time frame of this BRAC round.

The big problem in my mind is on the ground at Oceana. The FAA can work airspace with the military wherever they end up. There will ALWAYS be people on both sides of the fence no matter what decision is made. The only thing I can't speak to is the military's own opinion on their operational efforts and mission needs. I'm sure that's as wide as the Pacific Ocean as well. As far as FAA, all they have to do is put it on the table and the grunts will work it out on both sides - Cecil, or Oceana.

Given these things; I think in your meeting Wednesday if I were discussing airspace, I would approach it from what can be done today, in reality, as opposed to just enabling things the way they were at Cecil back when. I think there's room for a lot more creativity. And, there's certainly a good basis to begin from since the airspace off the coast has been very well utilized since operations at Cecil ceased.

"Whoever yells the loudest gets heard": Anonymous

Jim

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 08, 2005 8:20 AM
To: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Deputy, Carl W. CDR BRAC
Subject: RE: WE Need To Talk -

Jim, If you look at the 93 Commission report (p-1-20), you will see that the 93 Commission opined that the air encroachment argument at Cecil was "overstated."

I plan to check it all out on Wednesday. If you have specific questions that I might ask the state/local officials, please advise. I will let you continue to work the FAA side of this. I appreciate your rapid feedback.

Thanks, Bill Fetzer

From: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 05, 2005 9:41 AM
To: Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: WE Need To Talk -

Gentlemen:

I have a lot of new information regarding Oceana and Cecil Field - INCLUDING: an Official Memorandum from the FAA's Navy Liaison Officer, Jacksonville, Florida, which is written in response to an inquiry from Gov. Bush's staff, and will be part of Gov. Bush's presentation to the Commissioner's (or whomever he is meeting with) next week. I have been given license to release this at my discretion to a limited audience as not to steal too much of Gov. Bush's thunder, but as a heads-up to the right people. I just need to make sure I give it to the appropriate people. Therefore, I'm not going to give it to just anyone for editorial jurisdiction and decision of who is going to get it. If it's deemed that no one should have it, that's fine with me, too.

Since my last email, I have had a chance to speak with the FAA's Norfolk Approach Control, Washington Air Route Traffic Control Center, and the FAA Rep. at Oceana, and another conversation with a Support Manager at Jacksonville Center. Based on these conversations, I am convinced that there are more airspace problems at Oceana than meet the eye. Everyone's looking South, but there are huge issues with Washington Center and Navy Oceana's "airspace" with traffic flows to New York area (for instance) when SWAP routes are implemented (mentioned in an email I sent out yesterday). It has been related to me that conditions for coordination are so bad between Washington Center and the Navy that issues have to be mitigated through the Air Traffic Control System Command Center in Herndon because the entities "won't even talk to one another"

This is all I care to say in email. However, let me state that I have no interest in who goes where in this issue. My interest is in the safe, orderly, and efficient flow of our nation's air traffic and equitable use of airspace by all parties concerned. So far, the 1993 BRAC argument about airspace encroachment seems "bogus".

Jim

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2005 3:14 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: NAS Oceana

... Response for me (and or you) please??

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

From: skimmers@gtlaw.com [mailto:skimmers@gtlaw.com]
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2005 2:52 PM
To: Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil
Subject: RE: NAS Oceana

what does your gut tell you?

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC [mailto:Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil]
Sent: Mon 5/23/2005 1:49 PM
To: Skinner, Samuel K. (OfCnsl-Chi-Gov/Adm)
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: NAS Oceana
Sure thing sir - if any questions please check with Jim Hanna or myself at any time. As we get more data on all recommendations from the Department, we will know more.

Frank

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

From: skimmers@gtlaw.com [mailto:skimmers@gtlaw.com]
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2005 2:44 PM
To: Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil
Subject: RE: NAS Oceana

thanks

Sam

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC [mailto:Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil]
Sent: Fri 5/20/2005 6:20 PM
To: Skinner, Samuel K. (OfCnsl-Chi-Gov/Adm)
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: NAS Oceana
Commissioner Skinner:

Reference your May 18 note to me;

" I would like to see all of the work done by the 1995 BRAC Re: Oceana NAS, as well as the workup done by the Navy this time in anticipation of the BRAC Recommendations - ASAP would be appreciated".

Jim Hanna and his Navy Team put together a one page executive summary; extractions from the 1993 and 1995 BRAC actions; and the 2005 BRAC Recommendation.

Please let Jim or I know what else might be useful to you and we will pull it together.

Frank

Frank A. Cirillo, Jr., P. E.

Director, Review and Analysis

Base Closure and Realignment Commission

2521 Clark Street, Suite 600, Arlington, VA 22202

voice (703) 699-2903 - cell (703) 501-3357

Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2005 6:53 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: NAS Oceana

Sir, background on NAS Oceana as requested by Commissioner Skinner. Bill Fetzer did a nice job gathering this together although we still do not have the deliberative documents which preceded the final decisions.

V/R Jim

<<Oceana EXEC Summary.doc>> <<TAB A NAS Oceana BRAC 2005.doc>> <<TAB B BRAC
1993 Commission Report.doc>> <<TAB C 1995 Navy Report.doc>> <<TAB D BRAC
1995 Commission Report.doc>>

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. To reply to our email administrator directly, please send an email to postmaster@gtlaw.com.

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. It is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. To reply to our email administrator directly, please send an email to postmaster@gtlaw.com.

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2005 7:21 PM
To: 'skidders@gtlaw.com'
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Baxter, Kristen, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: NAS Oceana
Attachments: Oceana EXEC Summary.doc; TAB A NAS Oceana BRAC 2005.doc; TAB B BRAC 1993 Commission Report.doc; TAB C 1995 Navy Report.doc; TAB D BRAC 1995 Commission Report.doc

Commissioner Skinner:

Reference your May 18 note to me;

" I would like to see all of the work done by the 1995 BRAC Re: Oceana NAS, as well as the workup done by the Navy this time in anticipation of the BRAC Recommendations - ASAP would be appreciated".

Jim Hanna and his Navy Team put together a one page executive summary; extractions from the 1993 and 1995 BRAC actions; and the 2005 BRAC Recommendation.

Please let Jim or I know what else might be useful to you and we will pull it together.

Frank

Frank A. Cirillo, Jr., P. E.

Director, Review and Analysis

Base Closure and Realignment Commission

2521 Clark Street, Suite 600, Arlington, VA 22202

voice (703) 699-2903 - cell (703) 501-3357

Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2005 6:53 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: NAS Oceana

Sir, background on NAS Oceana as requested by Commissioner Skinner. Bill Fetzer did a nice job gathering this together although we still do not have the deliberative documents which preceded the final decisions.

V/R Jim



Oceana EXEC Summary.doc (41 KB) TAB A NAS Oceana BRAC 2005.doc... Commission Rep... TAB B BRAC 1993 Commission Rep... TAB C 1995 Navy Report.doc (41... TAB D BRAC 1995 Commission Rep...

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2005 10:25 AM
To: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: C. Skinner Request

Thx
This e-mail has been sent from the Blackberry of Frank Cirillo, Director of Review and Analysis, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

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

From: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Nathaniel.Sillin@wso.whs.mil>
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Thu May 19 10:23:53 2005
Subject: RE: C. Skinner Request

Waiting for a call back about DEERS, should have answer in 15 min.

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2005 10:16 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: C. Skinner Request

Jim:
Commissioner Skinner wants a paper summarizing Oceana to include 2005 recommendation and prior BRAC (1995, more?) Actions. Nat can help your AA with the prior material.

His note - "ASAP would be appreciated"

Nat: develop a suspense process for C and ED tasks.

fc

This e-mail has been sent from the Blackberry of Frank Cirillo, Director of Review and Analysis, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2005 10:16 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: C. Skinner Request

Jim:
Commissioner Skinner wants a paper summarizing Oceana to include 2005 recommendation and prior BRAC (1995, more?) Actions. Nat can help your AA with the prior material.

His note - "ASAP would be appreciated"

Nat: develop a suspense process for C and ED tasks.

fc

This e-mail has been sent from the Blackberry of Frank Cirillo, Director of Review and Analysis, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2005 11:01 AM
To: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk; Meyer, Jennifer, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Robertson, Kathleen, CIV, WSO-BRAC-P; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Today's WP BRAC Article - See attachment as well for General Statistics
Attachments: GR2005051100151[1].gif

Calif. Towns Lobby To Stop Base Closing

Officials Highlight Area's Usefulness

By Kimberly Edds and Amy Argetsinger Washington Post Staff Writers
Wednesday, May 11, 2005; Page A03

YUBA CITY, Calif., May 10 -- If the Air Force closes its 63-year-old base in this sprawling valley of peach orchards and cow pastures, the effect will be nothing less than catastrophic, local officials insist: 6,000 military residents would leave homes here, and more than 2,000 civilian jobs would disappear. Businesses would lose many of their customers, and five public schools would probably have to close. In all, a \$1.2 billion loss to the economies of eight counties.

Yet none of that, ultimately, will matter to Pentagon analysts deciding this week which of the nation's 3,700 military installations to recommend for cost-saving closures. So in its impassioned campaign to keep Beale Air Force Base off the list, local organizers instead mounted a lobbying effort that markets the merits of the base to its own chiefs back in Washington -- the wide-open spaces free of flight restrictions, the prime location for monitoring missiles over the Pacific, the warm support of military-friendly neighbors.

A campaign, in other words, that is less about how much they need the Air Force than how much the Air Force needs Beale.

"We may be small, but we're the mouse that roars," said Tim Johnson, executive director of the Yuba-Sutter Economic Development Corp., "and we're going to tell the government that we play a significant role in the Department of Defense."

For communities across the nation, years of feverish booster efforts are coming to a head this week as Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld prepares to release the first new list of recommended base cuts and restructurings in a decade.

From pep rallies in Columbus, Ohio, to letter-writing campaigns out of Kittery, Maine, communities have labored to make the case that their bases should be the ones the Pentagon relies on in its leaner years to come. In some cases, state and local governments have gone out of their way to make the surroundings nicer for military populations -- improving roads around bases, extending tuition benefits or discounting utilities for people in uniform.

Maryland officials, concerned about the fate of Patuxent River Naval Air Station and Indian Head Division, passed a bill to make housing on its 11 major bases tax-free. Virginia legislators recently approved laws offering better life insurance coverage for military employees and economic development incentives for base expansion as state leaders closely monitor Forts Eustis and Monroe and Oceana Naval Air Station and the heavy

concentration of defense leased office space in Northern Virginia.

Many communities have hired lobbyists to help make their case.

Much of the frenzy stems from the fact that, compared with four rounds of base closures in 1988 through 1995, many community leaders and analysts say there are no obvious patterns in military restructuring to indicate which locales are most at risk.

And while political pleading -- occasionally on behalf of the economically neediest communities -- sometimes played a part in earlier decisions, this year's process has been designed to give more priority to global military needs than home-town concerns. Rumsfeld's recommendations must be approved first by a bipartisan Base Realignment and Closure Commission, then by President Bush and Congress; however, in past years, the bases singled out in the initial Pentagon list have generally sustained the recommended cuts.

"It's not based on jobs, nor should it be," said Jack Spencer, a senior policy analyst with the Heritage Foundation. "It's what's best for the nation's security moving forward." In California, which has lost 29 bases since closings began 17 years ago, Gov. Arnold Schwarzenegger (R) appointed a special committee to coordinate lobbying efforts across the state.

"What you're seeing is a much more aggressive effort to maintain these bases," said Leon E. Panetta, the former Democratic congressman and White House chief of staff who co-chairs the committee. "You have to make the argument that these are very valuable military assets, and if you close them you lose something that can't be replicated anywhere else."

For the Yuba City area -- whose 11 percent unemployment rate actually marks a great improvement over a few years ago -- keeping Beale became a major crusade.

Two years ago a plucky coalition of elected officials and business leaders from across Yuba and Sutter counties began meeting monthly to plan their attack. Volunteers raised private dollars -- about \$60,000 short of their \$190,000 goal, as it turned out -- to finance the effort.

The group lobbied county officials to fix the pothole-scarred roads around the base, winning more than \$4.5 million in improvements. And they took their message to Washington.

The first meetings were discouraging, said Yuba County Supervisor Hal Stocker, one of several officials who made the trip in lieu of hiring expensive lobbyists. After five minutes with the Beale delegation, a Pentagon official stopped them short, saying every community had the same story, Stocker recalled.

So they learned to hone their message. Among their talking points: the unique geographic setting in a corner of the state that is still largely undeveloped, leaving plenty of space for the military to pursue classified projects; a runway that is the second largest in California and the only one authorized by the FAA for unmanned aircraft.

Local officials even led a successful lobbying campaign to encourage the Air Force to send its squadron of Global Hawk reconnaissance drones to Beale. When the first arrived at the base last October, the community held a week-long welcoming celebration.

While such homespun efforts may seem hokey, analysts say they could make a difference. "Base commanders don't want to be somewhere where they're going to spend the next two years with the Chamber of Commerce chewing them out," said John Pike, director of the Washington-based defense policy research group GlobalSecurity.com -- they want the promise of easy relations with the surrounding community.

For now, though, Beale neighbors know they can only wait for the announcement of a decision that is likely already made.

"At least we can look ourselves in the face and say at least we cared," said Doug Sloan, general manager of

Yuba-Sutter Disposal Inc. and a member of the committee fighting to save the base. "At least we showed we cared."

Argetsinger reported from Los Angeles. Staff writers Ann Scott Tyson and Spencer S. Hsu in Washington contributed to this report.



GR2005051100151[
1].gif (21 KB)...