

**Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

**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:** Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2005 2:29 PM  
**To:** Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Cc:** Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Subject:** RE: ADDs for Final Deliberation

Craig: You informed me last week that there was only a DoD contract in place to "contract out" certain services. If you are now saying that the DoD owns buildings, and Frank is confirming, subject to other factual changes, that this is considered to be a DoD "installation," then I would say that it is fair game for the adds list.

Whom can I speak to on the AF legal side that would have more information about the legal implications for Galena?

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:** Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2005 2:24 PM  
**To:** Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, 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

The Air Force owns the buildings and utilities, not the land. Does this constitute an "installation"?

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

**From:** Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2005 2:10 PM  
**To:** Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, 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

All -

I don't think we're at closure yet. What is the DoD interest at Galena? What I understood from the Monterey hearing was that the Air Force does not own Galena and that there is no lease, merely a contract to maintain the facility to certain standards. If that's all there is, Galena is not an "installation" under the terms of the Base Closure Act.

Do we know what the DoD interest is at Galena? The fact that it appears on the list of installations does not answer the questions we have to ask.

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

-----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:** Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Sent:** Monday, August 15, 2005 1:05 PM  
**To:** Principi, Anthony, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Cc:** Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Subject:** MILVAL Rankings - BRAC 1993 Oceana - Cecil  
**Attachments:** 1993 BRAC MILVAL Rankings.pdf

Sir, MILVAL ratings from 93 BRAC. Bases listed in order, e.g., NAS Mayport #1 in MILVAL.



1993 BRAC MILVAL  
Rankings.pdf ...

**Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

**From:** Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 11, 2005 2:08 PM  
**To:** Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Subject:** FW: Resolution to Clearinghouse Taskers 223, 225, 226, 227, 237, & 244 (WWF 6-11)

**Attachments:** Reply to DoN 223 225-227 237 244 commission Oceana.pdf; 2 VFA SQDS to CHERRY POINT C5.pdf; Commission 14 VFA 106 KINGSVILLE 05.08.06 0833.CBR; Commission 15 Option 4A FEIS 05.08.05 1620.CBR; Commission 16 OLF Pickett 05.08.04 1252.CBR; Commission 17 MJB OCE-Base X 05.08.05 1604.CBR; Commission 18 OCE-Kings 05.08.05 0822.CBR; Commission 19 MJB OCE-Cecil 05.08.07 1441.CBR; HQMC Q47 to 2 VFA SQDS to Cherry Point.pdf; MJB to CECIL FIELD C5.pdf; MJB to KINGSVILLE and UPT to MERIDIAN C5.pdf; MJB to NEW DIRT C5.pdf; olf manning attachment[1].pdf; OLF PICKETT C5.pdf; Question 47 For All Scenarios.pdf; Unique Mission Requirements.pdf; VFA FRS to KINGSVILLE C5.pdf; CFFC.pdf; KINGSVILLE.pdf; OCEANA.pdf; CFFC.pdf; CHERRY\_PT.pdf; OCEANA.pdf; CFFC.pdf; CFFC.pdf; CFFC.pdf; KINGSVILLE.pdf; MERIDIAN.pdf; CFFC.pdf; OCEANA.pdf

-       
- Reply to DoN 223 225-227 237 244 commission Oceana.pdf; 2 VFA SQDS to CHERRY POINT C5.pdf; Commission 14 VFA 106 KINGSVILLE 05.08.06 0833.CBR; Commission 15 Option 4A FEIS 05.08.05 1620.CBR; Commission 16 OLF Pickett 05.08.04 1252.CBR; Commission 17 MJB OCE-Base X 05.08.05 1604.CBR; Commission 18 OCE-Kings 05.08.05 0822.CBR; Commission 19 MJB OCE-Cecil 05.08.07 1441.CBR; HQMC Q47 to 2 VFA SQDS to Cherry Point.pdf; MJB to CECIL FIELD C5.pdf; MJB to KINGSVILLE and UPT to MERIDIAN C5.pdf; MJB to NEW DIRT C5.pdf; olf manning attachment[1].pdf; OLF PICKETT C5.pdf; Question 47 For All Scenarios.pdf; Unique Mission Requirements.pdf; VFA FRS to KINGSVILLE C5.pdf; CFFC.pdf; KINGSVILLE.pdf; OCEANA.pdf; CFFC.pdf; CHERRY\_PT.pdf; OCEANA.pdf; CFFC.pdf; CFFC.pdf; CFFC.pdf; KINGSVILLE.pdf; MERIDIAN.pdf; CFFC.pdf; OCEANA.pdf
-       
- Commission 19 MJB OCE-Cecil 05.08.07 1441.CBR; HQMC Q47 to 2 VFA SQDS to Cherry Point.pdf; MJB to CECIL FIELD C5.pdf (98 KB); MJB to KINGSVILLE and UPT to MERIDIAN C5.pdf (97 KB); olf manning attachment[1].pdf; OLF PICKETT C5.pdf (52 KB)
-       
- Question 47 For All Scenarios.pdf; Unique Mission Requirements.pdf; VFA FRS to KINGSVILLE C5.pdf (42 KB); CFFC.pdf (6 KB); KINGSVILLE.pdf (39 KB); OCEANA.pdf (53 KB); CFFC.pdf (6 KB)
-       
- CHERRY\_PT.pdf (27 KB); OCEANA.pdf (42 KB); CFFC.pdf (39 KB); CFFC.pdf (82 KB); CFFC.pdf (7 KB); KINGSVILLE.pdf (85 KB); MERIDIAN.pdf (28 KB)
-  
- CFFC.pdf (76 KB); OCEANA.pdf (12 KB)

Oceana related certified data provided in response to clearing house questions....

## **Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

---

**From:** Cole, Christopher, CTR, WSO-BRAC  
**Sent:** Friday, August 05, 2005 12:27 PM  
**To:** mla dd - WSO BRAC  
**Subject:** Uncertified Oceana Transcript

**Attachments:** Uncertified Oceana Transcript.doc

Attached is the uncertified transcript from the Oceana hearing held yesterday. It will be posted on the web site momentarily.



Uncertified Oceana  
Transcript....

### ***Christopher S Cole***

Manager, ANSER BRAC Commission Support Team  
ANSER (Analytic Services Inc.)  
(703) 699-2972  
christopher.cole.ctr@wso.whs.mil

[www.brac.gov](http://www.brac.gov)

## **Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

---

**From:** Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Sent:** Friday, August 05, 2005 8:01 AM  
**To:** Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Cc:** Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Subject:** Early Bird Quote from today?

Anybody know□□□□..?

"Virginia officials who visited Oceana on Monday said they were assured by top-ranking Navy admirals that Cecil Field would not be a viable option, partly because of airspace restrictions."

Who said this and what specific "airspace" restrictions they might be referring to? When do we get the part that says Florida officials who visited Oceana were assured by The Council on Environmental Quality that land encroachment is beyond repair in Virginia Beach? I know there are "numbers" for the latter, but what's the "data" on the "airspace" restrictions?

Thanks,

Jim

## **Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

---

**From:** Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 03, 2005 2:59 PM  
**To:** Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Subject:** Oceana Hearing Questions  
**Attachments:** Regional Hearing Q's 4 AUG.doc



Regional Hearing  
Q's 4 AUG.doc...

## **Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

---

**From:** Cole, Christopher, CTR, WSO-BRAC  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 02, 2005 11:41 AM  
**To:** Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Cc:** Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dresser, Paul, CTR, WSO-BRAC; Schaefer, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Tyll, James, CTR, WSO-BRAC  
**Subject:** Oceana Comment Summary Sheet  
**Attachments:** NAS Oceana VA Comment Summary Document 2 Aug 05 pd.doc

Charlie,

Attached is the comment summary sheet for NAS Oceana that you requested at the staff meeting this morning. This information is a snapshot based upon approved comments as of about 10am this morning. If you want, we can continue to update it, but I wanted to be sure we got you something in time to be included in the books for Thursday's hearings.

Respectfully,  
Chris



NAS Oceana VA  
omment Summary .

### ***Christopher S Cole***

Manager, ANSER BRAC Commission Support Team  
ANSER (Analytic Services Inc.)  
(703) 699-2972  
christopher.cole.ctr@wso.whs.mil

[www.brac.gov](http://www.brac.gov)

## **Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

---

**From:** Cole, Christopher, CTR, WSO-BRAC  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 02, 2005 8:29 AM  
**To:** Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Cc:** Reborchick, Margaret, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Subject:** Cecil Field Letters

**Attachments:** Bush Response (1 Aug 05).pdf; Jacksonville Mayor on Cecil Field.pdf

Attached are the electronic copies of two letters we have recently received in regards to Cecil Field. The first, received yesterday, is the Governor Bush's response to Chairman Principi's letter dated 28 July. The second is from the mayor of Jacksonville received via fax for Bill Fetzer. Both documents have been added to the Commission E-Library with document control numbers 6142 and 6143 respectively.

Chris



Bush Response (1 Aug 05).pdf (... Jacksonville Mayor  
on Cecil Fi...

### ***Christopher S Cole***

Manager, ANSER BRAC Commission Support Team  
ANSER (Analytic Services Inc.)  
(703) 699-2972  
christopher.cole.ctr@wso.whs.mil

[www.brac.gov](http://www.brac.gov)

## **Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC**

---

**From:** Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 27, 2005 12:47 PM  
**To:** Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Barrett, Joe, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Cc:** Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC  
**Subject:** FW: Navy Cecil Operation (VQQ)

Gentlemen:

I was recently asked to assess the previous assertion by the Navy during the 1993 BRAC round that the airspace around Cecil Field (VQQ), Florida was "encroached" to the point that, although Cecil Field scored higher in military value than Oceania NAS, VA, Cecil Field was closed due to this alleged "airspace encroachment" and additional "higher priority missions" at Oceania. Further, that the BRAC Commission stated in it's 1993 report to the President that the alleged airspace encroachment at Cecil Field was "overstated".

Given the current recommendation for the realignment of the Naval Master Jet Base, I have spent considerable time looking into a possible move from Oceania to Cecil Field in a "present day" scenario utilizing current airport runway infrastructure (not other ground infrastructure); FAA Air Traffic Control operational integration with Naval flight operations; airspace data: including Airport Facility Directory information, Enroute Low and High Altitude FAA Navigational Charts; current Special Use Airspace (Military Operating Area's; Warning Areas; Restricted Areas; Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace); and ground encroachment issues vs. the Oceania location (from personal experience at locations where FAA has been intensely involved in these issues), along with frequency of Naval Air Operational requirements as they would pertain to demographic effects at both locations.

It is my independent conclusion as the BRAC airspace analyst (FAA detailee) that there are absolutely no AIRSPACE impediments to moving operations from Oceania, NAS, VA, to Cecil Field (VQQ), FL..

As a cross-check to my conclusions, I contacted Mr.. Al Jennings, Manager of the Jacksonville International Airport Control Tower and Terminal Radar Approach Control concerning Cecil Field as one of several alternatives that are under consideration regarding Oceania. Since we've all been on CSPAN, and the Florida political machine is making no secret of how they feel, it was no surprise to Mr. Jennings when he received my call. I asked Mr. Jennings if he could provide me with another FAA opinion on this matter. Since his facility is most affected, I think his remarks and knowledge of this issue most noteworthy.

Therefore, I will submit to you his comments regarding airspace and operations concerning Cecil field and add that I agree with the BRAC Commission's findings in 1993 about the "airspace encroachment" being indeed - "overstated".

As a final comment, I would like to encourage a comprehensive look at Facilities and Equipment (F&E) improvements and upcoming enhancements scheduled at Cecil field in the COBRA run that would benefit the Navy, particularly with regard to the existing control tower and equipment upgrades.

Please see comments in the email below from Mr. Jennings.

Jim Aarnio

---

**From:** james.aarnio@faa.gov [mailto:james.aarnio@faa.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 27, 2005 11:24 AM  
**To:** james.aarnio@wso.whs.mil  
**Subject:** Navy Cecil Operation (VQQ)

Jim Aarnio  
System Operations, ATO-R  
202-493-5304

BRAC Commission  
Interagency Team, Airspace  
703-699-2929  
[james.aarnio@wso.whs.mil](mailto:james.aarnio@wso.whs.mil)

-----Forwarded by James Aarnio/AWA/FAA on 07/27/2005 11:23AM -----

To: James Aarnio/AWA/FAA@FAA  
From: Marion Al Jennings/ASO/FAA  
Date: 07/27/2005 11:03AM  
cc: Rick Garceau/ASO/FAA@FAA, Arnie Olinger/ASO/FAA@FAA, Harry Rock/ASO/FAA@FAA, Craig Chandler/ASO/FAA@FAA  
Subject: Navy Cecil Operation (VQQ)

Jim,

As per our conversation:

**Navy Cecil (VQQ) offers an excellent alternative for the F-18 operations.**

**Positives:**

In that the Navy (F-18's) were based here (Jacksonville - VQQ) in the recent past - the following list of "**positive operations**" still exist within the Jacksonville Approach (TRACON) - Air Traffic Operations infrastructure to support the Navy flying mission at this time.

1. JAX TRACON - The **Jacksonville Air Traffic Control Specialist (controllers) are very familiar (experienced)** with Navy Jet operations in that JAX Approach continually (daily) provides direct support to the Navy flying mission at Navy Jacksonville Naval Air Station (NIP), Navy CNTRA operations from Pensacola (PNS) and Naval Air Station Meridian (NMN) at Cecil Airport (VQQ) & OLF Navy Whitehouse (NEN).

**(These Navy flying operations/training missions consist of every type of Navy aircraft from the P-3 to the F-18's with all types of varied missions which include PAR/GCA approach capability at Navy Mayport, VFR operations (bounce pattern) at Navy Whitehouse, Instrument approaches at Navy Jacksonville & Surveillance Approaches (ASR) provided by JAX TRACON.)**

2. During the time-frame that the F-18's were deployed at VQQ - Jacksonville TRACON developed a **complete range of operational procedures (Letters of Agreement)** specific to the Navy training operation, etc. These agreements in that they routinely apply at Navy Jacksonville, etc. are still in full force and would not have to be re-invented. This would mean **immediate operations without huge administration costs** of doing this type of infrastructure letter development which is time-consuming and costly to overall operations. ("**Spool up time**" would be nonexistent and JAX Approach could provide immediate air traffic control services without delay.)

3. **Jacksonville Airspace has no impediments to restrict or deter the Navy flying operations.** In the recent past the Jacksonville Approach Airspace was modified to 15,000 thousand feet to accommodate the F-18 operation prior to their departure from VQQ. This airspace is still in effect and would provide the alternatives for higher jet operations as requested by the Navy.

4. **Jacksonville Approach Airspace** adjoins the local Warning Areas(WA)/Military Operating Areas (MOA's) - thus direct hand-off's of F-18 aircraft are possible to provide a seamless transition to FACSJAX control station. (These air traffic agreements are also in effect ).

5. Naval Air Station Jacksonville has an **ASR-8 Radar and could adequately support ASR Approaches** at the present time. (NAS JAX is scheduled on the national "waterfall" for the replacement ASR-11 RADAR in 2008. This

action will also include raising the Radar antenna to 77 feet thus creating enhanced RADAR coverage at VQQ.)

6. **Flight time** for the F-18's from VQQ to the "working areas" is minimal (approximately 6 minutes) and would create additional "play time" for the training mission to be accomplished.
7. **Alternative landing areas** (Naval operations) include NS Mayport, NAS Jacksonville, & OLF Whitehouse. (These airports could provide direct Naval support for these types of aircraft.)
8. **Noise abatement issues** have been previously addressed and were minimal impact to the Navy flying operations.
9. The following **military operating areas** are available in the immediate area of VQQ and within 20 minute flight time. These were areas and bombing ranges that the F-18's when based at VQQ utilized on a daily/routine basis - **(W-158- 159 - R-2903 - 2906 - 2907 - 2910 - Live Oak MOA - Palatoka 1, 2, MOA - Pine Castle Bomb Range.)**
10. **Jacksonville Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC)** is very familiar with F-18 Operations and could provide maximum support for this Navy flying mission.

**If you have other questions, please give me a call.**

Al Jennings  
Air Traffic Manager, Jacksonville Tower/TRACON