

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Rabey363@aol.com
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2005 6:32 PM
To: William.Fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: Re: VA Beach hospital

THANK YOU FOR YOUR REPLY, MR. FETZER THE BOTTOM LINE .. IT'S NOT ABOUT WHATS GOOD FOR VA.BEACH..IT'S ABOUT WHATS GOOD FOR THE NAVAL AVIATORS AND THE NATION. CECIL BEATS OCEANA HANDS DOWN! NO REPLY NECESSARY, YOU HAVE ENOUGH TO DO.

WADE RABEY

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Reborchick, Margaret, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2005 6:36 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Brand New Hospital under Construction near crash Zone Va.Beach

Will do. Thanks.

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

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2005 5:10 PM
To: Reborchick, Margaret, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Brand New Hospital under Construction near crash Zone Va.Beach

Marcy, please enter this email into the library so that this input is recorded officially.

Thanks, Bill Fetzer

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

From: Daniel McCarthy [mailto:DanielM@coj.net]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2005 3:25 PM
To: William.Fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: Fwd: Brand New Hospital under Construction near crash Zone Va.Beach

Bill---We have gotten lots of mail. I only forward this one because the writer claims he is being muzzled and has tried to get data to the Commission.

>>> <Rabey363@aol.com> 08/21/05 12:15 PM >>>

Dear Mayor,

As a citizen of Va. Beach (45 years) I was extremely impressed by your panel's professionalism and I believe Cecil is the best place for the Superhornets.

I hope the vote goes your way.

There is some information that our reporters won't report so I am hoping that Jax can use it to their advantage. On the south west corner of the main runway Oceana, on the opposite end of the runway where the condo site is, a brand new hospital is under construction. I will be happy to send you information if you like. This hospital is in a 65-70 noise zone and within a 1000+ feet of a crash zone. I am with a coalition of landowners who are being used as pawns in the deception and misrepresentations by the city in their efforts to save Oceana and I am disgusted with the statements our Mayor, City Council and State officials are saying. This hospital news is not something they want to be known by the Brac Commission and since I've tried to let the BRAC know about this without any results, I think you may have better luck. The area the Hospital is in is called Princess Anne Commons and is in the direct landing path for the main runway. The hospital is a Sentara or Bon Secours and can be found if you look on the city's website.

I sincerely hope that this information reaches the Commissioners before the vote and I wish you and your city the best of luck.

Wade

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2005 11:58 PM
To: 'Palmer, Mollie'
Subject: RE: BRAC CONFIDENTIAL: waste cleanup costs

Mollie,

I have \$77 M to date and \$20M left to complete.

please verify if that's what you have.

Thanks, Bill

From: Palmer, Mollie [mailto:Mollie.Palmer@dep.state.fl.us]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2005 7:00 PM
To: william.fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: BRAC CONFIDENTIAL: waste cleanup costs

Bill, I think the numbers I can easily give you tomorrow morning will be the amount the Navy has spent on environmental investigation and cleanup since they started conducting environmental investigations at Cecil Field (I think around 1991) and the estimated additional amount they estimate to spend to complete cleanup. Is that sufficient or do you need it broken down somehow (which might be harder to do but we could try whatever you need)?

Mollie

(And if you need to reach me before 8:00 in a.m. or after 5:00 pm, my direct line is 850-245-2015.)

Mollie G. Palmer, Deputy Chief of Staff

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

3900 Commonwealth Boulevard, MS 50

Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Phone: 850-245-2011 Suncom 205-2011

Fax: 850-245-2021 Suncom 205-2021

For more information about DEP,

please visit <http://www.dep.state.fl.us>.

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communication may therefore be subject to public disclosure.

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Daniel McCarthy [DanielM@coj.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 6:47 AM
To: William.Fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: Encroachment in APZ at NAS Oceana "by right"



Untitled Attachment

VA delegation did not mention "by right" building in APZ which City cannot stop. Note the number of homes in the APZ...4800. That means they have 10,000+ people in the APZ! It may be true that they have more in the APZ than we have in the AICUZ! This also blows lid off any pledge from VB to control encroachment. Truth is they are powerless to do so, and unabated building in the APZ is going on right now! It also is noted that CO NAS Oceana + his SJA know about this...How can Navy laud new efforts by VB to halt encroachment in the face of this?---dan

In the home zone around Oceana
By JON W. GLASS, The Virginian-Pilot
© August 22, 2005
Last updated: 6:30 PM

Graphic: The developments

Archive: BRAC coverage

Discussion: How well did Va. make its case Saturday?

VIRGINIA BEACH — Since June, the Navy has sent nine letters to City Hall objecting to new housing developments being planned around Oceana Naval Air Station.

All but six of the 80 homes in the projects would be built in accident-potential zones, where the risk of a jet crash is greatest. And all but the same six units would be in the loudest jet-noise zone around the base.

"This is a blatant encroachment issue," Capt. P.J. Lorge, who was acting as Oceana's commanding officer, wrote June 27 about a 42-home development planned off London Bridge Road.

Building homes there, he said, is "an outright disregard for this Department of Defense facility and the health and welfare of future residents."

City officials, however, say they can't stop the construction.

That development and the other eight projects are being built "by right." That means the underlying zoning on the property allows houses to be built there without City Council review or approval. Several of the sites have old homes on them that are being demolished and replaced with duplexes.

Potentially, thousands more homes could be built around Oceana outside the City Council's purview.

The situation underscores the dilemma facing the city as it fights to save Oceana as the Navy's East Coast master jet base:

There may be only so much the city can do to buffer Oceana from the development that has put the facility in the cross hairs of a federal base-closing commission.

"It's going to have to be, do what we can where we can," said James K. Spore, Virginia Beach's city manager.

The Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission votes this week on whether to recommend closing the base.

Even if Oceana dodges the base-closing bullet, its future could hinge on the city's ability to rein in growth that the Navy views as incompatible.

Top Navy officials have said their ideal solution — at an estimated cost of at least \$1.4 billion — would be to build a new master jet base unhindered by homes and shopping malls. Adm. Mike Mullen, chief of naval operations, said during a BRAC Commission hearing earlier this month that Oceana remains the best option for the "foreseeable future." Development

that has hemmed in the base - known as encroachment - "continues to impact our training" and "has grown worse over the last few years," Mullen acknowledged.

But he expressed optimism that the recent adoption of a joint land-use study involving Virginia Beach, Chesapeake, Norfolk and the Navy is a turning point.

The \$1.4 billion question: Does it go far enough?

Some think not.

"The joint land-use study was a significant step in the right direction, but it doesn't stop encroachment like the Navy was asking," City Councilman Bob Dyer said.

The study, for example, offers no remedy for by-right development.

In addition, the recommendations do not apply to Oceana's low jet-noise zone, even though the Navy views construction of new homes in the zone as incompatible with its mission.

City officials say that residents in the low-noise zone are less likely to complain about loud jets, and that nearly 19,000 homes are already there.

Others, however, said the city and the state are moving decisively to address encroachment.

The City Council upped the ante last week when it announced plans to spend \$15 million - with the state chipping in half - to buy out a disputed condominium site on Laskin Road.

The 6-acre site, rezoned by the council nearly two years ago over the Navy's objections, is in an accident-potential zone and in a noise zone where jets roar over at 114 decibels

- louder than a rock concert.

The council also unveiled plans for an acquisition fund totaling an estimated \$161 million over 20 years to buy land or development rights from willing sellers, primarily to preserve a key flight path between Oceana and its training field in Chesapeake.

The week before, three state lawmakers from Virginia Beach and Chesapeake had announced plans to enact the study recommendations into Virginia law and to create a program to help buy development rights in accident-potential zones.

The Navy itself intends to begin meeting with developers who are planning projects viewed as harmful to Oceana, hoping to persuade them to build something more compatible - another of the study's recommendations.

All those steps will help protect Oceana in the long-term, said Bill Macali, a city deputy attorney. He is helping to draft a new zoning overlay district meant to reduce incompatible growth in Oceana's highest noise zones.

"It's probably a case where no one thing will be our silver bullet," Macali said.

The Navy views by-right development as one of the most important issues looming. In several of the Navy's recent letters objecting to the by-right projects, Capt. Tom Keeley, Oceana's commanding officer, described the planned development as "further insidious encroachment upon our operations in support of homeland security."

Cmdr. John C. Lauterbach Jr., command judge advocate at Oceana, said last week: "It is the issue for the future. The whole by-right regime is of significant concern."

City officials say the issue will be hard to resolve. The options to address it are potentially expensive, legally risky and politically controversial.

A few of the nine by-right projects the Navy is now opposing are in areas of the city that city councils during the 1970s and '80s rezoned to residential over the Navy's objections. But most are in older sections, such as Oceana Gardens, that were zoned residential years before the Navy began flying high-performance fighter jets at Oceana.

Four of the projects are sandwiched among existing homes on undeveloped lots that went unnoticed until the region's housing boom began unleashing an unquenchable demand for new homes.

The other five projects involve redevelopment, in which an outdated home is being torn down and replaced with duplexes, condos or larger single-family homes.

City officials said there's not enough money available to buy all the property, even if the owners were willing to sell. The developers of the nine projects either declined to comment, could not be reached or did not return telephone calls.

R. Edward Bourdon Jr., an attorney who represents developers, said the city would be wasting tax dollars to try to buy out by-right development.

Purchasing land to preserve the Navy's flyway between Oceana and the training field in Chesapeake "has some logic to it," he said, because that area of the city is relatively undeveloped. But much of the potential by-right development, by virtue of its existing residential zoning, is surrounded by similar development, he said.

The council's decision to buy the Laskin Road site was "ludicrous," he said, because hundreds of homes already lie in the same accident-potential zone between the site and Oceana's runway.

"No one can demonstrate any impact on operations at Oceana, either negative or positive, on whether that property is developed with condos or a hotel or left as open space," he said. "They'd have to spend billions to remove the existing encroachment."

The city estimates that 4,800 homes, assessed at an estimated \$896 million, already exist in accident-potential zones around Oceana. About 12,000 additional housing units, assessed at \$1.9 billion, are in the loudest noise zone.

Dyer said the city should investigate changing the zoning in the most critical areas to reduce future housing density, a process known as downzoning. It's legal for localities in Virginia to downzone, but Bourdon guaranteed that the city would be sued because the action would reduce property values.

The city would have a high legal standard to meet, including proving that a change in circumstances warranted the downzoning. Dyer said the military's role in the war on terror, launched after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, and the Pentagon's tougher stance against incompatible development starting in December 2002 might give the city a case.

At this point, Macali said, the city hopes to reduce housing density through voluntary rezonings that could increase property values, particularly at the resort.

At the Oceanfront, most of which is in a jet-noise zone, the Navy is concerned that the underlying zoning would allow about 9,000 additional homes. The city hopes to cap that at about 3,000 by offering incentives for owners willing to agree to a mixed zoning that would reduce the number of homes in exchange for shops, restaurants and offices. Those uses, Macali said, are compatible in the noise zones there.

"It's hard to undo past mistakes," he said, "but we're really trying to do that."

Reach Jon W. Glass at (757) 222-5119 or jon.glass@pilotonline.com.

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 6:59 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: VB paper article

In case you haven't seen this.

In the home zone around Oceana
By JON W. GLASS, The Virginian-Pilot
) August 22, 2005
Last updated: 6:30 PM

<<http://media.hamptonroads.com/images/military/jethomesspot.jpg>>

Graphic: The developments <<http://home.hamptonroads.com/stories/story.cfm?story=90977&ran=74976>>

Archive: BRAC coverage <<http://www.hamptonroads.com/pilotonline/military/brac.html>>

Discussion: How well did Va. make its case Saturday?
<<http://home.hamptonroads.com/guestbook/guestbook.cfm?id=342>>

VIRGINIA BEACH - Since June, the Navy has sent nine letters to City Hall objecting to new housing developments being planned around Oceana Naval Air Station.

All but six of the 80 homes in the projects would be built in accident-potential zones, where the risk of a jet crash is greatest. And all but the same six units would be in the loudest jet-noise zone around the base.

"This is a blatant encroachment issue," Capt. P.J. Lorge, who was acting as Oceana's commanding officer, wrote June 27 about a 42-home development planned off London Bridge Road.

Building homes there, he said, is "an outright disregard for this Department of Defense facility and the health and welfare of future residents."

City officials, however, say they can't stop the construction.

That development and the other eight projects are being built "by right." That means the underlying zoning on the property allows houses to be built there without City Council review or approval. Several of the sites have old homes on them that are being demolished and replaced with duplexes.

Potentially, thousands more homes could be built around Oceana outside the City Council's purview.

The situation underscores the dilemma facing the city as it fights to save Oceana as the Navy's East Coast master jet base:

There may be only so much the city can do to buffer Oceana from the development that has put the facility in the cross hairs of a federal base-closing commission.

"It's going to have to be, do what we can where we can," said James K. Spore, Virginia Beach's city manager.

The Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission votes this week on whether to recommend closing the base.

Even if Oceana dodges the base-closing bullet, its future could hinge on the city's

ability to rein in growth that the Navy views as incompatible.

Top Navy officials have said their ideal solution - at an estimated cost of at least \$1.4 billion - would be to build a new master jet base unhindered by homes and shopping malls.

Adm. Mike Mullen, chief of naval operations, said during a BRAC Commission hearing earlier this month that Oceana remains the best option for the "foreseeable future." Development that has hemmed in the base - known as encroachment - "continues to impact our training" and "has grown worse over the last few years," Mullen acknowledged.

But he expressed optimism that the recent adoption of a joint land-use study involving Virginia Beach, Chesapeake, Norfolk and the Navy is a turning point.

The \$1.4 billion question: Does it go far enough?

Some think not.

"The joint land-use study was a significant step in the right direction, but it doesn't stop encroachment like the Navy was asking," City Councilman Bob Dyer said.

The study, for example, offers no remedy for by-right development.

In addition, the recommendations do not apply to Oceana's low jet-noise zone, even though the Navy views construction of new homes in the zone as incompatible with its mission. City officials say that residents in the low-noise zone are less likely to complain about loud jets, and that nearly 19,000 homes are already there.

Others, however, said the city and the state are moving decisively to address encroachment.

The City Council upped the ante last week when it announced plans to spend \$15 million - with the state chipping in half - to buy out a disputed condominium site on Laskin Road. The 6-acre site, rezoned by the council nearly two years ago over the Navy's objections, is in an accident-potential zone and in a noise zone where jets roar over at 114 decibels - louder than a rock concert.

The council also unveiled plans for an acquisition fund totaling an estimated \$161 million over 20 years to buy land or development rights from willing sellers, primarily to preserve a key flight path between Oceana and its training field in Chesapeake.

The week before, three state lawmakers from Virginia Beach and Chesapeake had announced plans to enact the study recommendations into Virginia law and to create a program to help buy development rights in accident-potential zones.

The Navy itself intends to begin meeting with developers who are planning projects viewed as harmful to Oceana, hoping to persuade them to build something more compatible - another of the study's recommendations.

All those steps will help protect Oceana in the long-term, said Bill Macali, a city deputy attorney. He is helping to draft a new zoning overlay district meant to reduce incompatible growth in Oceana's highest noise zones.

"It's probably a case where no one thing will be our silver bullet," Macali said.

The Navy views by-right development as one of the most important issues looming. In several of the Navy's recent letters objecting to the by-right projects, Capt. Tom Keeley, Oceana's commanding officer, described the planned development as "further insidious encroachment upon our operations in support of homeland security."

Cmdr. John C. Lauterbach Jr., command judge advocate at Oceana, said last week: "It is the issue for the future. The whole by-right regime is of significant concern."

City officials say the issue will be hard to resolve. The options to address it are potentially expensive, legally risky and politically controversial.

A few of the nine by-right projects the Navy is now opposing are in areas of the city that city councils during the 1970s and '80s rezoned to residential over the Navy's objections.

But most are in older sections, such as Oceana Gardens, that were zoned residential years before the Navy began flying high-performance fighter jets at Oceana.

Four of the projects are sandwiched among existing homes on undeveloped lots that went unnoticed until the region's housing boom began unleashing an unquenchable demand for new homes.

The other five projects involve redevelopment, in which an outdated home is being torn down and replaced with duplexes, condos or larger single-family homes.

City officials said there's not enough money available to buy all the property, even if the owners were willing to sell. The developers of the nine projects either declined to comment, could not be reached or did not return telephone calls.

R. Edward Bourdon Jr., an attorney who represents developers, said the city would be wasting tax dollars to try to buy out by-right development.

Purchasing land to preserve the Navy's flyway between Oceana and the training field in Chesapeake "has some logic to it," he said, because that area of the city is relatively undeveloped. But much of the potential by-right development, by virtue of its existing residential zoning, is surrounded by similar development, he said.

The council's decision to buy the Laskin Road site was "ludicrous," he said, because hundreds of homes already lie in the same accident-potential zone between the site and Oceana's runway.

"No one can demonstrate any impact on operations at Oceana, either negative or positive, on whether that property is developed with condos or a hotel or left as open space," he said. "They'd have to spend billions to remove the existing encroachment."

The city estimates that 4,800 homes, assessed at an estimated \$896 million, already exist in accident-potential zones around Oceana. About 12,000 additional housing units, assessed at \$1.9 billion, are in the loudest noise zone.

Dyer said the city should investigate changing the zoning in the most critical areas to reduce future housing density, a process known as downzoning. It's legal for localities in Virginia to downzone, but Bourdon guaranteed that the city would be sued because the action would reduce property values.

The city would have a high legal standard to meet, including proving that a change in circumstances warranted the downzoning. Dyer said the military's role in the war on terror, launched after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, and the Pentagon's tougher stance against incompatible development starting in December 2002 might give the city a case.

At this point, Macali said, the city hopes to reduce housing density through voluntary rezonings that could increase property values, particularly at the resort.

At the Oceanfront, most of which is in a jet-noise zone, the Navy is concerned that the underlying zoning would allow about 9,000 additional homes. The city hopes to cap that at about 3,000 by offering incentives for owners willing to agree to a mixed zoning that would reduce the number of homes in exchange for shops, restaurants and offices. Those uses, Macali said, are compatible in the noise zones there.

"It's hard to undo past mistakes," he said, "but we're really trying to do that."

Reach Jon W. Glass at (757) 222-5119 or jon.glass@pilotonline.com.

) 2005 HamptonRoads.com/PilotOnline.com

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:30 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana (2)

Attachments: Oceana (2).doc



Oceana (2).doc (27
KB)

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Daniel McCarthy [DanielM@coj.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 8:40 AM
To: William.Fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: BRAC certification

Bill---I just noticed that we cited the wrong Section for the certification in our letters...It is section 2903(a)(5)(A) of the Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990...vice Section 2905 used in City of Jacksonville submissions. In addition, the Gov's letter says Section 2909...Both letters use the wrong Section. Please correct with pen and ink change, or consider this note to be appropriate notification of this oversight in correspondences from the Florida delegation.

I certify that all submissions forwarded by the City of Jacksonville and State of Florida on August 22, 2005 were submitted and certified pursuant to Section 2903(a)(5)(A).

thanks---dan

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 9:15 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Have You Included This Item Regarding Oceana and Langley?

Fetz,

Saw this at: "globalsecurity.org" on the web. Sounded interesting. Haven't heard it mentioned.

"Perhaps the overriding concern for this area is the potential for separate and inadequately coordinated Air Force and Navy basing actions to exceed the region's real operational capacity, whether measured in airspace access, environmental compliance or community acceptance. The Air Force has indicated that Langley AFB would be the beddown location for its first operational F-22 unit (presumably the 1 st Fighter Wing, currently stationed at Langley and equipped with F-15C/D fighter aircraft). The Navy will probably replace current Hornets (F/A-18C and F/A-18D models) at Oceana with the F/A-18E/F "Super Hornet", and perhaps eventually with the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF)."

Jim

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Palmer, Mollie [Mollie.Palmer@dep.state.fl.us]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 9:15 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: BRAC CONFIDENTIAL: waste cleanup costs

Bill, I think that is close to #'s I have heard, but we are confirming with our Navy contacts to make sure we give you accurate #'s. Will email that as soon as we get it. Will it be in time if we get to you by noon? Hope will be well before but just in case.

mollie

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

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC [mailto:William.Fetzer@wso.whs.mil]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2005 11:58 PM
To: Palmer, Mollie
Subject: RE: BRAC CONFIDENTIAL: waste cleanup costs

Mollie,

I have \$77 M to date and \$20M left to complete.

please verify if that's what you have.

Thanks, Bill

From: Palmer, Mollie [mailto:Mollie.Palmer@dep.state.fl.us]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2005 7:00 PM
To: william.fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: BRAC CONFIDENTIAL: waste cleanup costs

Bill, I think the numbers I can easily give you tomorrow morning will be the amount the Navy has spent on environmental investigation and cleanupu since they started conducting environmental investigations at Cecil Field (I think around 1991) and the estimated additional amount they estimate to spend to complete cleanup. Is that sufficient or do you need it broken down somehow (which might be harder to do but we could try whatever you need)?

Mollie

(And if you need to reach me before 8:00 in a.m. or after 5:00 pm, my direct line is 850-245-2015.)

Mollie G. Palmer, Deputy Chief of Staff

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

3900 Commonwealth Boulevard, MS 50

Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Phone: 850-245-2011 Suncom 205-2011

Fax: 850-245-2021 Suncom 205-2021

For more information about DEP,

please visit <http://www.dep.state.fl.us>.

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communication may therefore be subject to public disclosure.

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 9:26 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Oceana (2)

Attachments: Oceana (2).doc



Oceana (2).doc (27
KB)

ADM Gehman would like to enter this motion into the Oceana pile.

Thanks, Bill

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:30 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana (2)

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Keeley, Thomas CAPT NAS Oceana VA [thomas.keeley@navy.mil]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 10:09 AM
To: william.fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: Princess Anne Commons

Attachments: Hospital Map.pdf; Princess Anne Commons.pdf



Hospital Map.pdf
(108 KB)



Princess Anne
Commons.pdf (2 M..

Sir,

Mr. Wade Rabey is a realtor who represents, among others, the North Landing Coalition. NLC is a group of farmers and private landowners who are upset with the City's JLUS decision wrt the Transition Area. Their properties will now not be developed as they originally envisioned (\$\$\$\$\$\$). They (*including the author of the e-mail below*) want Oceana closed.

Attached is a graphic of the hospital plan and location wrt to the 1999 contours and APZ. It lies in the 65-70 dB DNL contour and is outside off APZ2. It does not lie directly beneath our flight paths either.

S & V/R,

TK

>>> <Rabey363@aol.com> 08/21/05 12:15 PM >>>

Dear Mayor,

As a citizen of Va. Beach (45 years) I was extremely impressed by your panel's professionalism and I believe Cecil is the best place for the Superhornets.

I hope the vote goes your way.

There is some information that our reporters won't report so I am hoping that Jax can use it to their advantage. On the south west corner of the main runway Oceana, on the opposite end of the runway where the condo

site is, a brand new hospital is under construction. I will be happy to send you information if you like. This hospital is in a 65-70 noise zone and within a 1000+ feet of a crash zone. I am with a coalition of landowners who are being used as pawns in the deception and misrepresentations by the city in their efforts to save Oceana and I am disgusted with the statements our Mayor, City Council and State officials are saying. This hospital news is not something they want to be known by the Brac Commission and since I've tried to let the BRAC know about this without any results, I think you may have better luck. The area the Hospital is in is called Princess Anne Commons and is in the direct landing path for the main runway. The hospital is a Sentara or Bon Secours and can be found if you look on the city's website. I sincerely hope that this information reaches the Commissioners before the vote and I wish you and your city the best of luck.

Wade

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Robert J.Natter [rjnatter@natterllc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 10:28 AM
To: Fetzer, Bill
Subject: SOcCom Letter

Bill,

I am happy to send this letter if you think it will help.

Bob

Dear Chairman Principi,

I am writing to reiterate my statement provided to the BRAC Commission on 20 August, under oath, concerning classified operations at NAS Oceana.

Specifically, I state again, unequivacally, that the classified mission referred to by Senator Warner and others from Virginia can be conducted at another airfield than NAS Oceana.

In his undated letter to Senator Warner, Vice Admiral Eric Olsen, signing for General Bryan D. Brown, stated that "Given USSOCCOM's current posture in Norfolk..." NAS Oceana is the only airfield that can meet the SOCCOM requirements. I agree, given their current posture and current procedures. However, I state again that this mission can be readily moved given a willingness to change posture and procedure. Furthermore, I am confident there is sufficient talent on General Brown's staff to figure out how to do that and still maintain combat readiness without external influence.

Lastly, I note with pleasure and agree with Vice Admiral Olsen's statement of appreciation for Senator Warner's support that he has given to special operations forces. I trust the same appreciation is proffered for my longstanding support for these forces. As Vice Admiral Olsen well knows, not only have I fought with and been wounded in combat fighting with these forces, but my support for the Naval Special Warfare community in particular is well known within the Navy.

I want it also noted that I received no assistance from any Senate staff in writing this letter.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Natter
Admiral, U S Navy
Retired

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

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Palmer, Mollie [Mollie.Palmer@dep.state.fl.us]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 11:08 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Dana, Pam; Nelms, Wayne
Subject: Florida letter on waste cleanup

Attachments: Principi signed ltr B - 8.22.05.pdf



Principi signed ltr B -
8.22.0...

Bill,

As promised, scanned copy. And original was put in overnight mail this a.m.

Mollie

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Dana, Pam [Pam.Dana@MyFlorida.com]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 11:34 AM
To: william.fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: FW: Cecil Field Comments, Thoughts and Information

Importance: High

Attachments: Cecil Field Thoughts.doc



Cecil Field
thoughts.doc (46 K..)

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

From: Kevin Court [mailto:kevin.court@lonesomecowboy.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 21, 2005 3:13 AM
To: Governor Jeb Bush
Cc: jpeyton@coj.net
Subject: Cecil Field Comments, Thoughts and Information
Importance: High

Kelly Blvd., #1711

18211

Dallas, Texas

August 2005

21

Governor Jeb Bush

State of Florida

Re: Your State's Presentation on Cecil Field

Governor,

I have just finished listening to both your presentation and that of the state of Virginia regarding the movement of the Master Jet Base from NAS Oceana to Cecil Field. I would like to offer my thoughts as a supplement to your information. I have no direct interest in the situation, but as a former military aviator with a background in both training and tactical fighter operations, I have a strong, continuing and abiding interest in the logical and sensible availability of proper training facilities for military aviators.

In order to establish my experience in this, I have the following background:

* I served in the United States Air Force from 1974 to 1984 after having graduated from the USAF Academy in 1974

* I flew both training aircraft and tactical fighter aircraft

* I served as the Chief of Wing Training for the 81st Tactical Fighter Wing. As an Air Force Captain, I was the youngest chief of Wing Training for a Tactical Fighter Wing in the entire USAF. This wing was the largest fighter wing in the entire free world with 6 tactical squadrons and 4 major active operating locations along with 2 additional locations used for potential war time deployment. The position is normally filled by a Lt. Colonel and I was assigned to the position because of my qualifications and abilities.

* I operated out a number of airfields, both USAF and USN, where significant flight restrictions were a fact of life and have seen the impact both on students and on training and tactical operations for pilots assigned to those facilities.

* I have over 2500 hours of flight time, all but 40 of it in high performance jet aircraft

Your team's comments and concerns regarding the impact of training in ways that differ from the ways you will fight are crucial to the arguments presented and I would like to help supplement and amplify those concerns. I offer you three concrete, vivid examples of how this kind of variation can cause problems.

1. When the German Air Force converted from the early model F-104 aircraft to the C and D models, the method of ejection completely changed. In the A & B models, the ejection seat went out the bottom of the aircraft. In the later models, the ejection seat went out the top. German pilots were trained to roll the aircraft to an inverted position in order to eject. Obviously, this procedure changed with the later aircraft. Unfortunately, an ejection situation is highly stressful and habit patterns developed in training are those that come to be used without thinking in actual use. As a result, Germany lost several experienced F-104 pilots when they reverted to trained responses and rolled aircraft inverted before ejecting. The result was a downward ejection and a resulting loss of life.

2. When the A-10 community was initially provided with flight simulators, I, as the Chief of Wing Training, was not willing to activate and use the simulator for the A-10 community in Europe because flight procedures and the habits they reinforced in order to successfully fly the simulator were inappropriate and counter intuitive to performing the same activities in the actual aircraft. Due to flight safety and training concerns, the simulator was not activated until these differences were addressed.

3. Again, using German Air Force experience as an example, there were even simple problems with the move from the F-104 to the Tornado aircraft. The procedure used to activate the afterburner during takeoff in the F-104 would result in the deployment of the thrust reverser in the Tornado. I am aware of cases where experienced pilots would revert to habit patterns developed in flying the F-104 and the result was the activation of the Tornado afterburner with the thrust reverser engaged. The result was actually quite dangerous as the jet would start to back up rapidly.

The point to all of this is really quite simple, yet quite compelling as well. In times of high stress and I think you could classify combat operations as typically stressful. The bottom line to the above examples is that military pilots react to situations in ways that mirror the ways they have trained. When training actions and activities are different than those that occur in actual flight operations, problems can and do occur. Having operated out of military facilities where operations are negatively impacted by encroachment, I know first hand the potential for negative results.

In addressing encroachment, several situations are indicative of the impact that this can

have. Operations out of facilities such as Davis Monthan AFB, Williams AFB and Luke AFB are severely limited because of such encroachment. A-10 landing training had to be moved to a runway at Fort Huachuca because of encroachment and civilian complaints about flight operations at the training base. Luke AFB has had to enact severe limitations on operations because of problems arising out of encroachment of areas such as Sun City. I know of at least one USAF pilot who was nearly killed because of his concern for the encroachment at Williams AFB where he stayed with an aircraft which was coming apart in flight because of the civilian development in the aircraft landing pattern. This is the situation which currently exists at NAS Oceana. The problem was such a concern that the USAF required an up or down vote by the civilian population of the Ogden Utah area before it would move F-16 training to Hill AFB. Even T-41 operations at the US Air Force Academy were impacted negatively by encroachment of the city of Colorado Springs. You can't roll back encroachment once it occurs. I noted that the Virginia presentation differed in one major area when addressing this concern. Florida has ensured that such encroachment will not occur. Virginia is saying that they now realize the encroachment is a problem and that they have started addressing the problem (as stated by Rep Suit of VA) "in the last 2 years to curtail encroachment". This answer is much like closing the barn door after all of the animals have escaped.

Sen. Allen of VA talked about deployment and the issues of ship locations. It is important to remember that the carrier needs to be at sea in order to receive the assigned aircraft aboard. The implication I heard was that the proximity fleet in port was crucial. This is an interesting assertion because the carrier will have to be underway before the aircraft arrive. In deployment situations, this is not something that happens in short order, but it takes time to occur and the impact to deployment planning is actually minimal for the flight crews.

Capt Granfield of VA's presentation attempted to minimize training differences while tacitly admitting that the differences were there and that they did cause the pilots to have to modify their habits once they deployed.

Capt Granfield also stressed the interservice training with Langley AFB, leaving unstated but implied that Cecil would not have that same opportunity. Actually, he is correct, but not in the negative. The opportunities at Cecil are actually much greater and more diverse. Within easy access to the Cecil training areas are units at Moody AFB, Eglin AFB, MacDill AFB, and other Guard and Reserve units, as well as units operating out of Seymour Johnson AFB, Pope AFB, Myrtle Beach AFB and MCAS Cherry Point.

Gen. Newton of the BRAC makes the strongest point of all. The CNO has already indicated that the Navy would have gladly taken Moody AFB to be the Master Jet Base if Moody was to be closed. No matter what VA says, this is probably the single most damning comment the Navy could make. Gen. Newton's comments were, I think, dead square on and cut directly to the heart of the matter.

Additionally, Commissioner Skinner appears to understand the issues and was able to state the obvious disconnects in a clear and simple manner. Senator Allen's responses to Mr. Skinner were all couched in the ability to mitigate issues, not fix them. Also, the restrictions on use in terms of time availability are important to their potential impact on training. Capt Granfield answered the concerns with the concept that "in times of war those would change." It is crucial that the training occur in preparation of possible operations, not waiting until the need is well nigh upon us.

Commissioner Hansen brought out the level of encroachment that already exists at NAS Oceana. He was very accurate in his assessment of development already existing in the actual traffic patterns - downwind, turn to final, and final. Mayor Orberndorf of

Virginia Beach answered his questions with answers that indicated that there was no way to move the encroachment. Again in Cecil's favor, this is a problem which Cecil will not face, ever.

Finally, the civilian value of the land which is NAS Oceana is certainly higher than the value of the land at Cecil. Given the level of the encroachment at the largest city in Virginia, the speed with which civilian development would occur is likely to be far faster. Additionally, the existing land use and development controls are much stronger in the case of Cecil Field.

I found that Virginia's use of statistics consistently compared apples to oranges. I suspect that comparisons based upon the same criteria would tip the scales heavily in Cecil's favor.

I would hope that the overriding purpose of the BRAC to identify and recommend actions primarily intended to

- Save money in terms of facility costs and use
- * Do so without compromising training and safety for the men and women in uniform

would be foremost in deliberations and recommendations made.

Virginia Beach touts the spending of \$6.5 million by Virginia Beach and a like amount by the State of Virginia. This is a drop in the bucket when compared to the \$50m spent by Jacksonville and the additional \$100m spent by the state of Florida.

Thank you for reading this. If you would like to forward these comments to the commission as an "interested friend", please feel free to do so. If you have any questions, or if I can be of further assistance, please contact me.

Regards,

Kevin Court
(972) 862-6459
Kevin.Court@LonesomeCowboy.com
www.LonesomeCowboy.com <<http://www.lonesomecowboy.com/>>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 12:06 PM
To: 'thomasgordy@mail.house.gov'
Subject: FW: CH 0962 DoN 0365 WWF 15

Attachments: cecil schools.ppt



cecil schools.ppt (3
MB)

FYI

From: bracprocess [mailto:bracprocess@navy.mil]
Sent: Monday, August 22, 2005 9:32 AM
To: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; bracprocess; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse
Cc: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: CH 0962 DoN 0365 WWF 15

Non-scanned file attached.

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

From: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC [mailto:Michael.Kessler@wso.whs.mil]
Sent: Sunday, August 21, 2005 8:12
To: bracprocess; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse
Cc: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: CH 0962 DoN 0365 WWF 15

Clearinghouse,

Can you please resend CH 0962 WWF#15 in a manner that will allow for the attached chart depicting DNR contours of hypothetical operations at Cecil Field to be viewed clearly. We are unable to view the chart as a result of the document being scanned. If it is possible we would appreciate an electronic version of the chart send directly to me ASAP. If you have any questions please let me know.

Thank You,

Michael Kessler

Navy Team Associate Analyst

BRAC Commission

Office of Review and Analysis

www.brac.gov

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

Sent: Friday, August 19, 2005 6:16 PM

To: RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse; bracprocess

Cc: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Subject: CH 0962 DoN 0365 WWF 15

Clearinghouse,

See attached DoN response to subject tasking.

Alex T. Remily

Major, USMC

DASN IS&A, Medical Team

2221 South Clark, Suite 900 (CP6)

Arlington, VA 22202

Phone (703) 602-6373

Fax (703) 602-6550

DRAFT DELIBERATIVE DOCUMENT □ FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY - DO NOT RELEASE UNDER FOIA

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

From: RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse [mailto:Clearinghouse@wso.whs.mil]

Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2005 11:50

To: bracprocess

Cc: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Subject: OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tracker 0962C Navy Marine Corps Question: WWF 15

Please provide a response to the inquiry below and return to OSD BRAC Clearinghouse NLT noon Friday, 19 August 2005, with the designated signature authority, in PDF format.

When contacting the Clearinghouse, please refer to OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0962C.

Thank you for your cooperation and timeliness in this matter.

OSD BRAC Clearinghouse

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

From: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Sent: Wednesday, August 17, 2005 11:29 AM

To: RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse

Cc: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Meyer, Robert, CTR, OSD-ATL

Subject: Navy Marine Corps Question: WWF#15

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

<<Clearinghouse request WWF #15.doc>>

Michael Kessler

Navy Team Associate Analyst

BRAC Commission

Office of Review and Analysis

www.brac.gov

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: tlsuit@cox.net
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 1:06 PM
To: William.Fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: PUT ALL THE CARDS ON TABLE REGARDING CECIL IMPACTS

Hello! T Suit has sent the following Jacksonville.com story to you.

Comments from T Suit:
fyi

PUT ALL THE CARDS ON TABLE REGARDING CECIL IMPACTS

The train may have already left the station on Cecil Field, as some fear, but it's not too late to slow it down and answer some questions.

Gov. Jeb Bush and Mayor John Peyton have been promising the sun, the moon and the stars to have the Navy move its master jet base from Oceana Naval Air Station in Virginia to Cecil Field.

To read this story in full, please visit http://www.jacksonville.com/tu-online/stories/082305/opl_19567155.shtml

For convenient home delivery of The Times-Union newspaper, visit our online subscription center.

<http://www.jacksonville.com/subscription/>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 1:16 PM
To: 'tlsuit@cox.net'
Subject: RE: PUT ALL THE CARDS ON TABLE REGARDING CECIL IMPACTS

thanks

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

From: tlsuit@cox.net [mailto:tlsuit@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 1:06 PM
To: William.Fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: PUT ALL THE CARDS ON TABLE REGARDING CECIL IMPACTS

Hello! T Suit has sent the following Jacksonville.com story to you.

Comments from T Suit:
fyi

PUT ALL THE CARDS ON TABLE REGARDING CECIL IMPACTS

The train may have already left the station on Cecil Field, as some fear, but it's not too late to slow it down and answer some questions.

Gov. Jeb Bush and Mayor John Peyton have been promising the sun, the moon and the stars to have the Navy move its master jet base from Oceana Naval Air Station in Virginia to Cecil Field.

To read this story in full, please visit http://www.jacksonville.com/tu-online/stories/082305/opl_19567155.shtml

For convenient home delivery of The Times-Union newspaper, visit our online subscription center.

<http://www.jacksonville.com/subscription/>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Palmer, Mollie [Mollie.Palmer@dep.state.fl.us]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 1:35 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Dana, Pam; Deirdre.Finn@MyFlorida.com; Nelms, Wayne; FL DEP; Sole, Michael
Subject: BRAC CONFIDENTIAL: waste cleanup costs at Cecil Field

Mr. Fetzer,

Per your request, following is the information on waste cleanup costs for Cecil Field as of today. We requested this information from Mark Davidson with the Naval Facilities Engineering Command in Charleston, S.C.

Starting FY92 through FY05, the Navy has spent or obligated approximately \$93 million on environmental investigation and remediation at Cecil Field. The Navy estimates that they will spend an additional \$16.9 million to complete cleanup at Cecil Field. In addition to costs for hazardous waste and petroleum cleanup, these figures include cleanup or abatement activities for other wastes such as asbestos.

I certify that the information contained in this submission to the BRAC Commission is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief as required by Section 2905 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990.

If you need any more information, please do not hesitate to call me.

Mollie Palmer

Mollie G. Palmer, Deputy Chief of Staff

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

3900 Commonwealth Boulevard, MS 50

Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Phone: 850-245-2011 Suncom 205-2011

Fax: 850-245-2021 Suncom 205-2021

For more information about DEP,

please visit <http://www.dep.state.fl.us>.

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communication may therefore be subject to public disclosure.

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Turner, Gordon [gordon.turner@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 2:09 PM
To: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; 'Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC'; 'Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC'; 'Walsh, Deirdre, CIV, WSO-BRAC'
Cc: Solomon Ortiz; 'TJ Stapleton (TJ_Stapleton@hutchison.senate.gov)'; Thomasson, Russ (Cornyn)'; Rendon, Lencho; King, Mac; McCready, Sheila; Scott Haywood; bobrasmussen@gvtc.com; Michael Smith; Shawn Strange; 'pwilson@governor.state.tx.us'; 'John Esparza'; 'wehrie@abileneind.com'; 'Loyd.Neal@HRH.com'; 'claudia.lobell@hrh.com'; 'Judy_Hawley@tmo.blackberry.net'; 'jhawley@tx.aacisd.com'; 'Dick Messbarger'; Travis, Cathy
Subject: State of Texas Financial Package
Importance: High
Attachments: Proposal of the South Texas Military Defense Community.pdf



Proposal of the
South Texas Mi...

Mr. Battaglia, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Fetzer, and Ms. Walsh,

The attached paper clarifies the financial incentive package offered by the State of Texas in support of its South Texas military facilities. This offer has been coordinated between the Governor and the local government agencies involved.

We are requesting that this information be made available to all Commissioners prior to the commencement of voting. The offer extended enables the realignment of VFA FRS from NAS Oceana to NAS Kingsville with "NO" MILCON cost to the Department of Defense. This allows for a significant mitigation of the safety, training, and encroachment issues at Oceana while avoiding the major step of NAS Oceana closure. The State of Texas offer includes an expanded air-to-ground training range and the MILCON to provide the facilities included in the Navy COBRA analysis. Additionally, this approach does not hinder the Navy in any future TACAIR basing decision because it not only keeps all options available, but it enhances current facilities at no cost to the DoD.

Respectfully,
Gordon Turner

Gordon Turner
Congressional Fellow
Office of Congressman Solomon Ortiz (TX-27)
(202) 225-7742

<<Proposal of the South Texas Military Defense Community.pdf>>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 2:23 PM
To: 'Palmer, Mollie'
Subject: RE: BRAC CONFIDENTIAL: waste cleanup costs at Cecil Field

got it - thanx. that looks better.

Bill

From: Palmer, Mollie [mailto:Mollie.Palmer@dep.state.fl.us]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 1:35 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Dana, Pam; Deirdre.Finn@MyFlorida.com; Nelms, Wayne; FL_DEP; Sole, Michael
Subject: BRAC CONFIDENTIAL: waste cleanup costs at Cecil Field

Mr. Fetzer,

Per your request, following is the information on waste cleanup costs for Cecil Field as of today. We requested this information from Mark Davidson with the Naval Facilities Engineering Command in Charleston, S.C.

Starting FY92 through FY05, the Navy has spent or obligated approximately \$93 million on environmental investigation and remediation at Cecil Field. The Navy estimates that they will spend an additional \$16.9 million to complete cleanup at Cecil Field. In addition to costs for hazardous waste and petroleum cleanup, these figures include cleanup or abatement activities for other wastes such as asbestos.

I certify that the information contained in this submission to the BRAC Commission is accurate and complete to the best of my knowledge and belief as required by Section 2905 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990.

If you need any more information, please do not hesitate to call me.

Mollie Palmer

Mollie G. Palmer, Deputy Chief of Staff

Florida Department of Environmental Protection

3900 Commonwealth Boulevard, MS 50

Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Phone: 850-245-2011 Suncom 205-2011

Fax: 850-245-2021 Suncom 205-2021

For more information about DEP,

please visit <http://www.dep.state.fl.us>.

Please note: Florida has a very broad public records law. Most written communications to or from state officials regarding state business are public records available to the public and media upon request. Your e-mail communication may therefore be subject to public disclosure.

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 2:32 PM
To: Principi, Anthony, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Bilbray, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Coyle, Phillip, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hansen, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Skinner, Samuel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Newton, Lloyd, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Turner, Sue, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Letter From Major General Douglas Burnett, Florida National Guard, Adjutant General

Mr. Charirman, Honorable Commissioners, Directors, Team Leads, and Staff,

I have read a great deal of "sworn" testimony about Oceana vs: Cecil Field. I believe if there is anything thus far that I have read that consists of cognitive, intuitive, and introspective descriptors about airspace availability and coordination with the FAA in the Jacksonville area, it is contained within this letter form Major General Burnett.

I would echo Major General Burnett's evaluation (on behalf of the FAA) of the airspace he knows so well, and hope that all of you have had a chance to consider the true merit of his commentary to Chairman Principi. I regret that I do not have a soft copy to attach to this email.

Thank you,

James Aarnio
R&A Interagency Team
FAA Detailee

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Levingston, Tammy [Tammy.Levingston@dep.state.fl.us]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 2:39 PM
To: william.fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: Waste Cleanup Costs for Cecil Field (letter attached)

Importance: High

Attachments: Fetzer, Bill.scanned.BRAC Commission.doc.pdf



Fetzer,
scanned.BRAC Com

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 3:33 PM
To: 'Levingston, Tammy'; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Waste Cleanup Costs for Cecil Field (letter attached)

got it - thnx

From: Levingston, Tammy [mailto:Tammy.Levinston@dep.state.fl.us]
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 2:39 PM
To: william.fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Subject: Waste Cleanup Costs for Cecil Field (letter attached)
Importance: High

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cole, Christopher, CTR, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 3:59 PM
To: mla dd - WSO BRAC
Subject: Transcript from 20 Aug 05 PM Hearing
Attachments: UNCERTIFIED Aug 20 PM Transcript.doc

Attached is the transcript from Saturday afternoon's hearing.



UNCERTIFIED Aug
20 PM Transcri...

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

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Principi, Anthony, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 5:32 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana Motion

Bill send me the motion as an attachment. Thanks.

Anthony J. Principi

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 6:11 PM
To: Principi, Anthony, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Oceana Motion

Attachments: Motion Language - Oceana (2).doc



Motion Language -
Oceana (2).d...

As requested.

VR

From: Principi, Anthony, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 5:32 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana Motion

Bill send me the motion as an attachment. Thanks.

Anthony J. Principi

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 6:12 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana Motion Change

Attachments: Motion Language - Oceana (2).doc

Dan FYI

This need lawyering! GEN Hill will sponsor.

Thanks. The CHMN has a draft and wants this tightened up a bit.

Thanks,

Bill



Motion Language -
Oceana (2).d...

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:28 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana

Attachments: Motion Language - Oceana V-3.doc



Motion Language -
Oceana V-3.d...

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:29 PM
To: Principi, Anthony, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana-Cecil

Attachments: Motion Language - Oceana V-3.doc



Motion Language -
Oceana V-3.d...

FYI

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:42 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Oceana

Bill -

Done - you want?

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: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:28 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana

<< File: Motion Language - Oceana V-3.doc >>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:54 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Oceana- Cecil

Attachments: Motion Language - Oceana V-3.doc



Motion Language -
Oceana V-3.d...

This!!

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:30 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Oceana- Cecil

WHAT?

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:29 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana- Cecil

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 8:14 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Principi, Anthony, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Newton, Lloyd, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Gehman, Harold, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Skinner, Samuel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana motion

Dan, FYI. There may be a few changes left throughout the evening and early tomorrow. This is supposed to be briefed at the end of the Navy issues, so it could go early.

VR, Bill

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 8:15 PM
To: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Barrett, Joe, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Tickle, Harold, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Epstein, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Furlow, Clarenton, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Oceana- Cecil
Attachments: Motion Language - Oceana V-3.doc

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:54 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Oceana- Cecil



Motion Language -
Oceana V-3.d...

This!!

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:30 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Oceana- Cecil

WHAT?

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 7:29 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana- Cecil

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 8:18 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Oceana motion

Bill -

Come on over and look at this stuff if you would.

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: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 8:14 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Principi, Anthony, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Newton, Lloyd, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Gehman, Harold, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Skinner, Samuel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana motion

Dan, FYI. There may be a few changes left throughout the evening and early tomorrow. This is supposed to be briefed at the end of the Navy issues, so it could go early.

VR, Bill

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 9:00 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana

NAS Oceana Script

Slide 1 (Jim intro recommendation)

This Add Recommendation is to consider closure or realignment of NAS Oceana – primarily due to increasing encroachment that has continued since the mid seventies.

Slide 2

Several alternatives were considered to determine if a suitable location could be found that would resolve the detrimental effects of encroachment at the NAS Oceana. Mr. Fetzer will present the staff analysis regarding Oceana.

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 9:02 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Mot 193-4A (Add 3 NAS Oceana)

Attachments: Mot 193-4A (Add 3 NAS Oceana).doc



Mot 193-4A (Add 3
NAS Oceana)....

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 9:06 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Mot 193-4A (Add 3 NAS Oceana)
Attachments: Mot 193-4A (Add 3 NAS Oceana).doc



Mot 193-4A (Add 3
NAS Oceana)....

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 9:09 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Mot 193-4A (Add 3 NAS Oceana)
Attachments: Mot 193-4A (Add 3 NAS Oceana).doc



Mot 193-4A (Add 3
NAS Oceana)....

Bill -

Based on your last comments.

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 23, 2005 11:00 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Newton, Lloyd, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana

Attachments: Mot 193-4A (Add 3 NAS Oceana) (2).doc

Dan, Please look at the attached ASAP and take to the Chairman. We are recommending that the yellow paragraph be substituted for the paragraph above it to add strength to the provision.

Thanks, Bill



Mot 193-4A (Add 3
NAS Oceana) ...

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2005 8:44 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: Oceana

Bill -

Is that the final cut? We don't have a final version over here for the hearing, yet several commissioners are itching to act on it today.

V/R

Dan

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

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC <William.Fetzer@wso.whs.mil>
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Dan.Cowhig@wso.whs.mil>
CC: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC <James.Hanna@wso.whs.mil>; Newton, Lloyd, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Lloyd.Newton@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Tue Aug 23 22:59:49 2005
Subject: Oceana

Dan, Please look at the attached ASAP and take to the Chairman. We are recommending that the yellow paragraph be substituted for the paragraph above it to add strength to the provision.

Thanks, Bill

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2005 4:26 PM
To: Estrada, Christina, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Slide?

Attachments: Cecil_Oceana.jpg



Cecil_Oceana.jpg
(2 MB)

Here. Good night!!

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

From: Estrada, Christina, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 24, 2005 4:24 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Slide?

Thx

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:02 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Cleanup Language

Attachments: Official Motion - 193-4A.doc

Dan

Attached are the words that the commission voted to add to the bill.



Official Motion -
193-4A.doc (...)

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:02 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Cleanup Language

Attachments: Official Motion - 193-4A.doc

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:02 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Cleanup Language

Dan

Attached are the words that the commission voted to add to the bill.



Official Motion -
193-4A.doc (...)

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:17 AM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Reborchick, Margaret, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cole, Christopher, CTR, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Web

Here is the full text still posted - I know the Gehman second must be in error?

Motion Number: 193-4A

Overview: A Motion to Make Additional Recommendation 3, Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, to appear at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill. Realigns Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, VA by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, FL, conditioned on prior actions by the State of Florida.

Group: Navy

Full Text

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense failed to recommend the realignment of Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission add to the list of installations to be closed or realigned the recommendation:
 - "Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, Florida,
 - if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to enact and enforce legislation to prevent further encroachment of Naval Air Station Oceana by the end of March 2006, to wit:
 - enact State-mandated zoning controls requiring the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to adopt zoning ordinances that require the governing body to follow Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) guidelines in deciding discretionary development applications for property in Noise Level 70 dB Day Night Average Noise Level DNL or greater;
 - enact state and local legislation and ordinances to establish a program to condemn and purchase all the property located within all the Accident Potential Zone One areas for Naval Air Station Oceana as depicted for 1999 AICUZ Pamphlet published by the U.S. Navy;
 - codify the 2005 Final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) recommendations;
 - legislate requirements for the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to evaluate undeveloped properties in Noise Zones 70dB DNL or greater for rezoning classifications that would not allow uses incompatible under AICUZ guidelines;
 - establish programs for purchase of development rights of the Inter-facility Traffic Area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress; Enact legislation creating the Oceana/Fentress Advisory Council." at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill, and;
 - and if the State of Florida:
 - appropriates sufficient funds to relocate commercial tenants presently located at Cecil Field, Florida,
 - appropriates sufficient funds to secure Public Private Ventures for all the personnel housing required by the Navy at Cecil Field to accomplish this relocation, and;
 - turns over fee simple title to the property comprising the former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, including all infrastructure improvements that presently exist, to the Department of Defense on or before December 31, 2006, if the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia decline from the outset to take the actions required above, or within six months of the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia failing to carry through with any of the actions set out above, whichever is later. The State of Florida may not encumber the title by any restrictions other than a reversionary clause in favor of the State of Florida and short-term tenancies consistent with the phased relocation of the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field.
 - If the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to take the all of the prescribed actions, and the

State of Florida meets the conditions established by this recommendation, the units and functions that shall relocate to Cecil Field will include, but are not limited to, all of the Navy F/A-18 Strike Fighter Wings, aviation operations and support schools, maintenance support, training and any other additional support activities the Navy deems necessary and appropriate to support the operations of the Master Jet Base." at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill, and;

- that the Commission find this additional recommendation is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Additional statement of the Commission:

The BRAC 2005 report language shall state:

"It is the sense of the Commission that the Secretary of Defense deviated from the BRAC criteria by failing to consider NAS OCEANA for closure or realignment. The long standing and steadily worsening encroachment problem around NAS OCEANA, without strong support from State and City governments to eliminate current and arrest future encroachment, will in the long term, create a situation where the military value of NAS OCEANA will be unacceptably degraded. The remedies presented to the Commission thus far have been unconvincing.

It is also the sense of the Commission that the future of Naval Aviation is not Naval Air Station Oceana. The Commission urges the Navy to begin immediately to mitigate the noise encroachment and safety issues associated with flight operations around the Virginia Beach area by transitioning high intensity training evolutions to other bases that are much less encroached such as Navy Outlying Field Whitehouse, Florida or Kingsville, Texas.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to cause a rapid, complete, due diligence review of the offer of the State of Florida to reoccupy the former NAS Cecil Field and to compare this review against any plan to build a new master jet base at any other location. This review is to be completed within six months from the date the BRAC legislation enters into force, and is to be made public to the effected states for comment.

After review of the states comments, which shall be submitted with 120 days after publishing the review, the Secretary of Defense shall forward to the oversight committees of Congress the review, the states comments and his recommendation on the location of the Navy's future Atlantic Fleet Master Jet Base."

Vote

Session: Wednesday, August 24 (1300-1800)

Result: PASSED

Offered By: Chairman Principi

Seconded By: Commissioner Gehman

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

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:11 AM

To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Cc: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Subject: Web

Frank. Has oceana been corrected on the web. David

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:21 AM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Official Motion - 193-4A (2)

This is the motion as read and amended. Underlined is Skinner's amendment. Chairman made the motion and Skinner, Hill, and Newton all seconded. Skinner made the motion to amend and again, multiple seconds...but not Gehman....

Motion Number: 193-4A

Overview: A Motion to Make Additional Recommendation 3, Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, to appear at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill. Realigns Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, VA by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, FL, conditioned on prior actions by the State of Florida.

Group: Navy

Full Text

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense failed to recommend the realignment of Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission add to the list of installations to be closed or realigned the recommendation:
 - Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, Florida,
 - if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to enact and enforce legislation to prevent further encroachment of Naval Air Station Oceana by the end of March 2006, to wit:
 - enact State-mandated zoning controls requiring the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to adopt zoning ordinances that require the governing body to follow Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) guidelines in deciding discretionary development applications for property in Noise Level 70 dB Day Night Average Noise Level DNL or greater;
 - enact state and local legislation and ordinances to establish a program to condemn and purchase all the property located within all the Accident Potential Zone One areas for Naval Air Station Oceana as depicted for 1999 AICUZ Pamphlet published by the U.S. Navy and to appropriate and spend \$15 million dollars annually for such purposes and ;
 - codify the 2005 Final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) recommendations;
 - legislate requirements for the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to evaluate undeveloped properties in Noise Zones 70dB DNL or greater for rezoning classifications that would not allow uses incompatible under AICUZ guidelines;
 - establish programs for purchase of development rights of the Inter-facility Traffic Area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress; Enact legislation creating the Oceana/Fentress Advisory Council. at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill, and;
- and if the State of Florida:
 - appropriates sufficient funds to relocate commercial tenants presently located at Cecil Field, Florida,
 - appropriates sufficient funds to secure Public Private Ventures for all the personnel housing required by the Navy at Cecil Field to accomplish this relocation, and;
 - turns over fee simple title to the property comprising the former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, including all infrastructure improvements that presently exist, to the

Department of Defense on or before December 31, 2006, if the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia decline from the outset to take the actions required above, or within six months of the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia failing to carry through with any of the actions set out above, whichever is later. The State of Florida may not encumber the title by any restrictions other than a reversionary clause in favor of the State of Florida and short-term tenancies consistent with the phased relocation of the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field.

- If the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to take the all of the prescribed actions, and the State of Florida meets the conditions established by this recommendation, the units and functions that shall relocate to Cecil Field will include, but are not limited to, all of the Navy F/A-18 Strike Fighter Wings, aviation operations and support schools, maintenance support, training and any other additional support activities the Navy deems necessary and appropriate to support the operations of the Master Jet Base. □ at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill, and;

- that the Commission find this additional recommendation is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Additional statement of the Commission:

The BRAC 2005 report language shall state:

□It is the sense of the Commission that the Secretary of Defense deviated from the BRAC criteria by failing to consider NAS OCEANA for closure or realignment. The long standing and steadily worsening encroachment problem around NAS OCEANA, without strong support from State and City governments to eliminate current and arrest future encroachment, will in the long term, create a situation where the military value of NAS OCEANA will be unacceptably degraded. The remedies presented to the Commission thus far have been unconvincing.

It is also the sense of the Commission that the future of Naval Aviation is not Naval Air Station Oceana. The Commission urges the Navy to begin immediately to mitigate the noise encroachment and safety issues associated with flight operations around the Virginia Beach area by transitioning high intensity training evolutions to other bases that are much less encroached such as Navy Outlying Field Whitehouse, Florida or Kingsville, Texas.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to cause a rapid, complete, due diligence review of the offer of the State of Florida to reoccupy the former NAS Cecil Field and to compare this review against any plan to build a new master jet base at any other location. This review is to be completed within six months from the date the BRAC legislation enters into force, and is to be made public to the effected states for comment.

After review of the states comments, which shall be submitted with 120 days after publishing the review, the Secretary of Defense shall forward to the oversight committees of Congress the review, the states comments and his recommendation on the location of the Navy's future Atlantic Fleet Master Jet Base. □

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:26 AM
To: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Barrett, Joe, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Tickle, Harold, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Epstein, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Furlow, Clarenton, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Commission Analysis

While understand their concern, their timelines are not ours. Focus on the report and getting the motions correct□Jim

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:25 AM
To: Biddick, Dennis CIV; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Davis, Anne R. SES DASN(ISA)
Subject: RE: Commission Analysis

Dennis, we are working on technical corrections. The website motions are not officical and are very suspect as there has been no QA.

Unfortunately, we will not be able to work with your folks today as we are still in the midst of deliberations and report writing. While we understand the concern your leaders have, the timelines we are focussing on are ensuring the lawyers get their act together and that the bill and report are correct before the gavel comes down tomorrow.

Jim

From: Biddick, Dennis CIV [mailto:dennis.biddick@navy.mil]
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 7:29 AM
To: WSO-BRAC Hanna (E-mail)
Cc: Davis, Anne R. SES DASN(ISA)
Subject: Commission Analysis

Jim:

Our leadership is requesting information on some of the Commission recommendations that requires we have information that you used to brief the Commission. We do not have the data you used to brief the Commission on your recommendations for Oceana, New Orleans or Broadway. I have asked my staff to contact their POC's on your staff to get the data behind the analysis you did. Would appreciate the cooperation today so we can provide answers to our leadership. Thanks. r/DB

Dennis Biddick
Chief of Staff
DASN Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis dennis.biddick@navy.mil
(703) 602-6500
(703) 602-6550 (fax)

Draft Deliberative Document - For Discussion Purposes Only - Do Not Release Under FOIA

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:38 AM
To: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Barrett, Joe, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Tickle, Harold, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Epstein, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Furlow, Clarenton, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Official Motion - 193-4A (2)

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

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:34 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: Official Motion - 193-4A (2)

Agree. Dan. Pls pass to chris to stop real time posting of motions. David

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC <James.Hanna@wso.whs.mil>
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC <David.Hague@wso.whs.mil>
CC: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Dan.Cowhig@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Thu Aug 25 09:29:01 2005
Subject: RE: Official Motion - 193-4A (2)

Website is incorrect. Anser is feeding directly from the hall with no QA. What we sent you was the language as read and amended. Gehman did not second as the website states. New London is also significantly incorrect in that it shows deviations in Criteria 1-4 when what Newton read was deviation in criteria 1 only. Strongly suggest that all motion posting stop immediately. This is a huge problem for at least the Navy team.

Jim

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

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:25 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: Official Motion - 193-4A (2)

Jim. Can you tell me if the website is correct. David. Ps. I understand we may need to make a correction. Thks. David

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC <James.Hanna@wso.whs.mil>
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC <Frank.Cirillo@wso.whs.mil>; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC <David.Hague@wso.whs.mil>; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC <C.Battaglia@wso.whs.mil>
CC: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC <William.Fetzer@wso.whs.mil>
Sent: Thu Aug 25 09:20:54 2005
Subject: Official Motion - 193-4A (2)

This is the motion as read and amended. Underlined is Skinner's amendment. Chairman made the motion and Skinner, Hill, and Newton all seconded. Skinner made the motion to amend and again, multiple seconds...but not Gehman....

Motion Number: 193-4A

Overview: A Motion to Make Additional Recommendation 3, Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, to appear at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill. Realigns Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, VA by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field,

FL, conditioned on prior actions by the State of Florida.

Group: Navy

Full Text

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense failed to recommend the realignment of Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission add to the list of installations to be closed or realigned the recommendation:
 - Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, Florida,
 - if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to enact and enforce legislation to prevent further encroachment of Naval Air Station Oceana by the end of March 2006, to wit:
 - enact State-mandated zoning controls requiring the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to adopt zoning ordinances that require the governing body to follow Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) guidelines in deciding discretionary development applications for property in Noise Level 70 dB Day Night Average Noise Level DNL or greater;
 - enact state and local legislation and ordinances to establish a program to condemn and purchase all the property located within all the Accident Potential Zone One areas for Naval Air Station Oceana as depicted for 1999 AICUZ Pamphlet published by the U.S. Navy and to appropriate and spend \$15 million dollars annually for such purposes and ;
 - codify the 2005 Final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) recommendations;
 - legislate requirements for the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to evaluate undeveloped properties in Noise Zones 70dB DNL or greater for rezoning classifications that would not allow uses incompatible under AICUZ guidelines;
 - establish programs for purchase of development rights of the Inter-facility Traffic Area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress; Enact legislation creating the Oceana/Fentress Advisory Council. at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill, and;
- and if the State of Florida:
 - appropriates sufficient funds to relocate commercial tenants presently located at Cecil Field, Florida,
 - appropriates sufficient funds to secure Public Private Ventures for all the personnel housing required by the Navy at Cecil Field to accomplish this relocation, and;
 - turns over fee simple title to the property comprising the former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, including all infrastructure improvements that presently exist, to the Department of Defense on or before December 31, 2006, if the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia decline from the outset to take the actions required above, or within six months of the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia failing to carry through with any of the actions set out above, whichever is later. The State of Florida may not encumber the title by any restrictions other than a reversionary clause in favor of the State of Florida and short-term tenancies consistent with the phased relocation of the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field.
 - If the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to take the all of the prescribed actions, and the State of Florida meets the conditions established by this recommendation, the units and functions that shall relocate to Cecil Field will include, but are not limited to, all of the Navy F/A-18 Strike Fighter Wings, aviation operations and support schools, maintenance support, training and any other additional support activities the Navy deems necessary and appropriate to support the operations of the Master Jet Base. at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill, and;
 - that the Commission find this additional recommendation is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Additional statement of the Commission:

The BRAC 2005 report language shall state:

□It is the sense of the Commission that the Secretary of Defense deviated from the BRAC criteria by failing to consider NAS OCEANA for closure or realignment. The long standing and steadily worsening encroachment problem around NAS OCEANA, without strong support from State and City governments to eliminate current and arrest future encroachment, will in the long term, create a situation where the military value of NAS OCEANA will be unacceptably degraded. The remedies presented to the Commission thus far have been unconvincing.

It is also the sense of the Commission that the future of Naval Aviation is not Naval Air Station Oceana. The Commission urges the Navy to begin immediately to mitigate the noise encroachment and safety issues associated with flight operations around the Virginia Beach area by transitioning high intensity training evolutions to other bases that are much less encroached such as Navy Outlying Field Whitehouse, Florida or Kingsville, Texas.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to cause a rapid, complete, due diligence review of the offer of the State of Florida to reoccupy the former NAS Cecil Field and to compare this review against any plan to build a new master jet base at any other location. This review is to be completed within six months from the date the BRAC legislation enters into force, and is to be made public to the effected states for comment.

After review of the states comments, which shall be submitted with 120 days after publishing the review, the Secretary of Defense shall forward to the oversight committees of Congress the review, the states comments and his recommendation on the location of the Navy's future Atlantic Fleet Master Jet Base.□

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 10:34 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana

Jim, Website errors FYI.

Please note that no vote is final until the conclusion of the final deliberations session on Saturday

Motion Number: 193-4A

Overview: A Motion to Make Additional Recommendation 3, Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, to appear at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill. Realigns Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, VA by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, FL, conditioned on prior actions by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Florida.

Group: Navy

Full Text

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense failed to recommend the realignment of Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission add to the list of installations to be closed or realigned the recommendation:
 - "Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, Florida,
 - if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to enact and enforce legislation to prevent further encroachment of Naval Air Station Oceana by the end of March 2006, to wit:
 - enact State-mandated zoning controls requiring the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to adopt zoning ordinances that require the governing body to follow Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) guidelines in deciding discretionary development applications for property in Noise Level 70 dB Day Night Average Noise Level DNL or greater;
 - enact state and local legislation and ordinances to establish a program to condemn and purchase all the property located within all the Accident Potential Zone One areas for Naval Air Station Oceana as depicted for 1999 AICUZ Pamphlet published by the U.S. Navy and to appropriate and expend not less than \$15 million dollars annually for such purposes;
 - codify the 2005 Final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) recommendations;
 - legislate requirements for the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to evaluate undeveloped properties in Noise Zones 70dB DNL or greater for rezoning classifications that would not allow uses incompatible under AICUZ guidelines;
 - establish programs for purchase of development rights of the Inter-facility Traffic Area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress; Enact legislation creating the Oceana/Fentress Advisory Council." at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill, and;
 - and if the State of Florida:
 - appropriates sufficient funds to relocate commercial tenants presently located at Cecil Field, Florida,
 - appropriates sufficient funds to secure Public Private Ventures for all the personnel housing required by the Navy at Cecil Field to accomplish this relocation, and;
 - turns over fee simple title to the property comprising the former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, including all infrastructure improvements that presently exist, to the Department of Defense on or before December 31, 2006, if the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia decline from the outset to take the actions required above, or within six months of the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia failing to carry through with any of the actions set out above, whichever is later. The State of Florida may not encumber the title by any restrictions other than a reversionary clause in favor of the State of Florida and short-term tenancies consistent with the phased relocation of the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field.
- If the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to take the all of the prescribed actions, and the State of Florida meets the conditions established by this recommendation. the units and functions that shall

Vote

Session: Wednesday, August 24 (1300-1800)

Result: PASSED

Offered By: Chairman Principi

Seconded By

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 10:58 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Official Motion - 193-4A (2)

All:

In case the "underlined" did not come across - this is the C Skinner piece:

- enact state and local legislation and ordinances to establish a program to condemn and purchase all the property located within all the Accident Potential Zone One areas for Naval Air Station Oceana as depicted for 1999 AICUZ Pamphlet published by the U.S. Navy and to appropriate and spend \$15 million dollars annually for such purposes and ;

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:21 AM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Official Motion - 193-4A (2)

This is the motion as read and amended. Underlined is Skinner's amendment. Chairman made the motion and Skinner, Hill, and Newton all seconded. Skinner made the motion to amend and again, multiple seconds...but not Gehman....

Motion Number: 193-4A

Overview: A Motion to Make Additional Recommendation 3, Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, to appear at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill. Realigns Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, VA by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, FL, conditioned on prior actions by the State of Florida.

Group: Navy

Full Text

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense failed to recommend the realignment of Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission add to the list of installations to be closed or realigned the recommendation:
 - Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, Florida,
 - if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to enact and enforce legislation to prevent further encroachment of Naval Air Station Oceana by the end of March 2006, to wit:
 - enact State-mandated zoning controls requiring the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to adopt zoning ordinances that require the governing body to follow Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) guidelines in deciding discretionary development applications for property in Noise Level 70 dB Day Night Average Noise Level DNL or greater;
 - enact state and local legislation and ordinances to establish a program to condemn and purchase all the property located within all the Accident Potential Zone One areas for

Naval Air Station Oceana as depicted for 1999 AICUZ Pamphlet published by the U.S. Navy and to appropriate and spend \$15 million dollars annually for such purposes and ;

- codify the 2005 Final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) recommendations;
- legislate requirements for the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to evaluate undeveloped properties in Noise Zones 70dB DNL or greater for rezoning classifications that would not allow uses incompatible under AICUZ guidelines;
- establish programs for purchase of development rights of the Inter-facility Traffic Area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress; Enact legislation creating the Oceana/Fentress Advisory Council.□ at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill, and;

- and if the State of Florida:

- appropriates sufficient funds to relocate commercial tenants presently located at Cecil Field, Florida,
- appropriates sufficient funds to secure Public Private Ventures for all the personnel housing required by the Navy at Cecil Field to accomplish this relocation, and;
- turns over fee simple title to the property comprising the former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, including all infrastructure improvements that presently exist, to the Department of Defense on or before December 31, 2006, if the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia decline from the outset to take the actions required above, or within six months of the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia failing to carry through with any of the actions set out above, whichever is later. The State of Florida may not encumber the title by any restrictions other than a reversionary clause in favor of the State of Florida and short-term tenancies consistent with the phased relocation of the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field.
- If the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to take the all of the prescribed actions, and the State of Florida meets the conditions established by this recommendation, the units and functions that shall relocate to Cecil Field will include, but are not limited to, all of the Navy F/A-18 Strike Fighter Wings, aviation operations and support schools, maintenance support, training and any other additional support activities the Navy deems necessary and appropriate to support the operations of the Master Jet Base.□ at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill, and;
- that the Commission find this additional recommendation is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Additional statement of the Commission:

The BRAC 2005 report language shall state:

□It is the sense of the Commission that the Secretary of Defense deviated from the BRAC criteria by failing to consider NAS OCEANA for closure or realignment. The long standing and steadily worsening encroachment problem around NAS OCEANA, without strong support from State and City governments to eliminate current and arrest future encroachment, will in the long term, create a situation where the military value of NAS OCEANA will be unacceptably degraded. The remedies presented to the Commission thus far have been unconvincing.

It is also the sense of the Commission that the future of Naval Aviation is not Naval Air Station Oceana. The Commission urges the Navy to begin immediately to mitigate the noise encroachment and safety issues associated with flight operations around the Virginia Beach area by transitioning high intensity training evolutions to other bases that are much less encroached such as Navy Outlying Field Whitehouse, Florida or Kingsville, Texas.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to cause a rapid, complete, due diligence review of the offer of the State of Florida to reoccupy the former NAS Cecil Field and to compare this review against any plan to build a new master jet base at any other location. This review is to be completed within six months from the date the BRAC legislation enters into force, and is to be made public to the effected states for comment.

After review of the states comments, which shall be submitted with 120 days after publishing the review, the Secretary of Defense shall forward to the oversight committees of Congress the review, the states comments and his recommendation on the location of the Navy's future Atlantic Fleet Master Jet Base.□

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 11:14 AM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Official Motion - 193-4A (2)

I think that we should state "not less than \$15 million" to allow VA to accelerate the buyout if that makes more economic sense.

VR, Bill

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

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 10:58 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Official Motion - 193-4A (2)

All:

In case the "underlined" did not come across - this is the C Skinner piece:

- enact state and local legislation and ordinances to establish a program to condemn and purchase all the property located within all the Accident Potential Zone One areas for Naval Air Station Oceana as depicted for 1999 AICUZ Pamphlet published by the U.S. Navy and to appropriate and spend \$15 million dollars annually for such purposes and ;

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 9:21 AM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Official Motion - 193-4A (2)

This is the motion as read and amended. Underlined is Skinner's amendment. Chairman made the motion and Skinner, Hill, and Newton all seconded. Skinner made the motion to amend and again, multiple seconds...but not Gehman....

Motion Number: 193-4A

Overview: A Motion to Make Additional Recommendation 3, Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia, to appear at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill. Realigns Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, VA by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, FL, conditioned on prior actions by the State of Florida.

Group: Navy

Full Text

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense failed to recommend the realignment of Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission add to the list of installations to be closed or realigned the recommendation:

- [Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, Florida,
- if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to enact and enforce legislation to prevent further encroachment of Naval Air Station Oceana by the end of March 2006, to wit:
 - enact State-mandated zoning controls requiring the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to adopt zoning ordinances that require the governing body to follow Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) guidelines in deciding discretionary development applications for property in Noise Level 70 dB Day Night Average Noise Level DNL or greater;
 - enact state and local legislation and ordinances to establish a program to condemn and purchase all the property located within all the Accident Potential Zone One areas for Naval Air Station Oceana as depicted for 1999 AICUZ Pamphlet published by the U.S. Navy and to appropriate and spend \$15 million dollars annually for such purposes and ;
 - codify the 2005 Final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) recommendations;
 - legislate requirements for the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to evaluate undeveloped properties in Noise Zones 70dB DNL or greater for rezoning classifications that would not allow uses incompatible under AICUZ guidelines;
 - establish programs for purchase of development rights of the Inter-facility Traffic Area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress; Enact legislation creating the Oceana/Fentress Advisory Council.] at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill, and;
- and if the State of Florida:
 - appropriates sufficient funds to relocate commercial tenants presently located at Cecil Field, Florida,
 - appropriates sufficient funds to secure Public Private Ventures for all the personnel housing required by the Navy at Cecil Field to accomplish this relocation, and;
 - turns over fee simple title to the property comprising the former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, including all infrastructure improvements that presently exist, to the Department of Defense on or before December 31, 2006, if the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia decline from the outset to take the actions required above, or within six months of the Commonwealth of Virginia or and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia failing to carry through with any of the actions set out above, whichever is later. The State of Florida may not encumber the title by any restrictions other than a reversionary clause in favor of the State of Florida and short-term tenancies consistent with the phased relocation of the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field.
 - If the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to take the all of the prescribed actions, and the State of Florida meets the conditions established by this recommendation, the units and functions that shall relocate to Cecil Field will include, but are not limited to, all of the Navy F/A-18 Strike Fighter Wings, aviation operations and support schools, maintenance support, training and any other additional support activities the Navy deems necessary and appropriate to support the operations of the Master Jet Base.] at Chapter XI, Section 193 of the Bill, and;
 - that the Commission find this additional recommendation is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Additional statement of the Commission:

The BRAC 2005 report language shall state:

[It is the sense of the Commission that the Secretary of Defense deviated from the BRAC criteria by failing to consider NAS OCEANA for closure or realignment. The long standing and steadily worsening encroachment problem around NAS OCEANA, without strong support from State and City governments to eliminate current and arrest future encroachment, will in the long term, create a situation where the military value of NAS OCEANA will be unacceptably degraded. The remedies presented to the Commission thus far have been unconvincing.

It is also the sense of the Commission that the future of Naval Aviation is not Naval Air Station Oceana. The Commission urges the Navy to begin immediately to mitigate the noise encroachment and safety issues associated with flight operations around the Virginia Beach area by transitioning high intensity training evolutions to other bases that are much less encroached such as Navy Outlying Field Whitehouse, Florida or Kingsville, Texas.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to cause a rapid, complete, due diligence review of the offer of the State of Florida to reoccupy the former NAS Cecil Field and to compare this review against any plan to build a new master jet base at any other location. This review is to be completed within six months from the date the BRAC legislation enters into force, and is to be made public to the effected states for comment.

After review of the states comments, which shall be submitted with 120 days after publishing the review, the Secretary of Defense shall forward to the oversight committees of Congress the review, the states comments and his recommendation on the location of the Navy's future Atlantic Fleet Master Jet Base.□

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, August 25, 2005 12:24 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Tickle, Harold, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Furlow, Clarenton, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Barrett, Joe, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Epstein, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Final Report - Oceana
Attachments: Final Navy Report Recommendations - Oceana.doc

Jim, FYI attached is what we have so far for Oceana. I have adjusted as much boilerplate as I know plus the added cleanup language that you provided earlier.

VR, Bill



Final Navy Report
Recommendati...

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Gingrich, Karl, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2005 1:01 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana to Cecil COBRA w/BOS update

Attachments: MJB OCE-Cecil BOS Update 05.08.07 1441.CBR



MJB OCE-Cecil BOS
Update 05.08...

Karl H. Gingrich

COBRA Analyst
Base Closure & Realignment Commission
703-699-2923
karl.gingrich@wso.whs.mil

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2005 1:17 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana Cleanup language

Attachments: Official Motion - 193-4A V-2.doc; Official Motion - 193-4A.doc; Official Motion - 193-4A V-1.doc

Jim, FYI here are three versions.

-4A: is just adding the \$15M
-4A V 1: is for adding all the cleanup with Fentress and
-4A V-2: deletes Fentress.

ADM Gehman suggested that we use the words buy "property rights of those non-conforming properties" I suggest that we use the words "incompatible use under AICUZ guidelines."

4A V-1 has "incompatible" and V-2 has "non-conforming" but we can easily swap them around.

VR, Bill



Official Motion -
193-4A V-2.d...



Official Motion -
193-4A.doc (...



Official Motion -
193-4A V-1.d...

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2005 1:17 PM
To: Deputy, Carl W. CDR BRAC
Subject: FW: Oceana to Cecil COBRA w/BOS update

Attachments: MJB OCE-Cecil BOS Update 05.08.07 1441.CBR

FYI

From: Gingrich, Karl, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2005 1:01 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana to Cecil COBRA w/BOS update



MJB OCE-Cecil BOS
Update 05.08...

Karl H. Gingrich

COBRA Analyst
Base Closure & Realignment Commission
703-699-2923
karl.gingrich@wso.whs.mil

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2005 1:35 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Oceana Cleanup language

Attachments: Official Motion - 193-4A V-2.doc; Official Motion - 193-4A.doc; Official Motion - 193-4A V-1.doc

Dan, I don't know what version you are on, but here are some versions that a lawyer might be proud of.

VR, Bill

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2005 1:17 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana Cleanup language

Jim, FYI here are three versions.

- 4A: is just adding the \$15M
- 4A V 1: is for adding all the cleanup with Fentress and
- 4A V-2: deletes Fentress.

ADM Gehman suggested that we use the words buy "property rights of those non-conforming properties" I suggest that we use the words "incompatible use under AICUZ guidelines."

4A V-1 has "incompatible" and V-2 has "non-conforming" but we can easily swap them around.

VR, Bill



Official Motion -
193-4A V-2.d...



Official Motion -
193-4A.doc (...



Official Motion -
193-4A V-1.d...

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2005 5:41 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana Clean-up Language
Attachments: Motion to change.doc; Official Motion - 193-4A V-1.doc



Motion to
change.doc (34 KB)



Official Motion -
193-4A V-1.d...

Sir, FYI,

I invite your attention to the legal definition of the terms "property" and "development rights of all the property" in paragraph six. I'm not sure of the legal implications of those two phrases, but they may be significant in the case of Oceana.

VR, Bill Fetzer

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2005 9:24 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: 193 add Oceana findings

Attachments: 193FINALfindings Oceana.doc

Bill:

Take a look at this edited version. Note some of the deletions that Chris Yoder made for the reasons below. If you are OK with this version, I'll accept the changes and turn this as final.



193FINALfindings
Oceana.doc (5...

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: Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2005 4:01 PM
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: 193 add Oceana findings

I highlighted some of the material in "findings" that to my eye would give DoD a way out. It's not really "findings" and I'd leave it out.
Chris

From: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2005 4:46 PM
To: Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC
Subject: 193 add Oceana findings

<< File: 193DRAFT findings Oceana.doc >>

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

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2005 10:52 AM
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: 193 add Oceana findings
Attachments: 193FINALfindings Oceana - napoli edit.doc

Andy, I reviewed your edit and it looks good. However, I would note that the paragraphs that you suggest eliminating - the Chairman read into the record on Wednesday during the hearing. They also "untied" DoD's hands to re-look at Cecil Field (since BRAC 93 closed Cecil) as a future MJB - no matter what happens to Oceana during the next 24 months. I will argue to leave paragraphs in.

Counsel is still reviewing the exact bill language to determine how the final outcome should read. Please be patient today as we sort this out.

Note that I made a few corrections that Rumu put in on Saturday afternoon. Some are format typos and some are important rewordings.

VR, Bill



193FINALfindings
Oceana - napo...

From: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2005 9:24 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: 193 add Oceana findings

Bill:

Take a look at this edited version. Note some of the deletions that Chris Yoder made for the reasons below. If you are OK with this version, I'll accept the changes and turn this as final.

<< File: 193FINALfindings Oceana.doc >>

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: Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Sunday, August 28, 2005 4:01 PM
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: 193 add Oceana findings

I highlighted some of the material in "findings" that to my eye would give DoD a way out. It's not really "findings" and I'd leave it out.

Chris

From: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2005 4:46 PM
To: Yoder, Charles, WSO-BRAC
Subject: 193 add Oceana findings

<< File: 193DRAFT findings Oceana.doc >>

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

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2005 3:00 PM
To: Reborchick, Margaret, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: FT PICKETT INFORMATION

Attachments: FortPickettCensusNoise.pdf; Fort Pickett NWINoise.pdf; FT PICKETT OLF.doc



FortPickettCensusNoise.pdf (10...



Fort Pickett NWINoise.pdf (317..



FT PICKETT OLF.doc (27 KB)

Marcy,

Please add this email to the BRAC E library.

VR, Bill Fetzer

From: Keys, Richard D CDR FFC (N762) [mailto:Richard.Keys@navy.mil]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2005 6:26 PM
To: william.fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Cc: Anthony, Mark H CIV FFC N44
Subject: FT PICKETT INFORMATION

Sir,

Attached are documents previously generated regarding Ft Pickett as an OLF. I will have to fax a draft of the letter previously sent to Governor Warner. As explained in the EIS, FT Pickett was not within the designated OLF study area. However, because of comments received during the process we did a separate analysis of Ft Pickett using our OLF siting criteria. There have been two variations on the Ft Pickett OLF. There is an existing airfield which was proposed to be expanded (Blackstone AAF). It is joint civil use and also within three miles of the town of Blackstone. Therefore, it did not meet our requirement of low population density and no incompatible (civilian) operations. The latest suggestion was to close down the National Guard live fire training area and build an OLF within the confines of the Ft Pickett boundaries. This is the issue the attached papers address.

In 2002, 1997 Navy personnel used Fort Pickett a total of 161,000 mandays and 333 Navy Reservists use it for 1,041 mandays. Marines totaled 2,500 personnel and 22,340 mandays and Marine Reserves were 865 personnel for 2,212 mandays. Navy use was 3% and USMC was 5% of total annual usage. Navy primary users are specwar units. Marine users are FAST companies, 2nd LAR, and 24 and 26 MEU. Additionally HCS 4 and 6 use it for live fire 7.62, 50 cal, 2.75 rocket, and hellfire. F-14 and F-18 use it for inert bombs. This data is from range scheduling records.

V/R
CDR Keys
FFC N441

757-836-3674
cell 757-646-7068

<<FT PICKETT OLF.doc>> <<Fort Pickett NWNoise.pdf>> <<FortPickettCensusNoise.pdf>>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2005 3:02 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: MFR on Meeting with former Congressman Pickett

Attachments: Memorandum For the Record - Fort Pickett.doc



Memorandum For
the Record - Fo...

MFR Attached

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2005 3:02 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: MFR on Meeting with former Congressman Pickett

Jim, FYI

Attached provided for your records. MFR transcribed from my notes on 21 July 2005.

VR, Bill

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 12:26 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Oceana Language

If you can come up with an answer for me to send..

From: Biddick, Dennis CIV [<mailto:dennis.biddick@navy.mil>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 12:21 PM
To: WSO-BRAC Hanna (E-mail)
Cc: Davis, Anne R. SES DASN(ISA)
Subject: Oceana Language

Jim:

Know you are busy. Left a voice mail yesterday regarding the Commission's Oceana recommendation in regard to technical accuracy versus intent. Language as we have currently seen does not close the fenceline of Oceana, just realigns the current aviation assets. If someone asks, was it the Commissions intent to close the fenceline if Virginia doesn't comply and Florida does? Or is it being left up to the Navy to decide what to do with Oceana property? FYI, the DON analysis also labeled it as a realignment in our evaluations because technically NAS Oceana static data and structure includes Dam Neck. However, we evaluated the information as if the Oceana fenceline would close if we moved the aviation assets. Since we never found a suitable solution, we never had to write a recommendation. r/DB

Dennis Biddick
Chief of Staff
DASN Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis
dennis.biddick@navy.mil
(703) 602-6500
(703) 602-6550 (fax)

Draft Deliberative Document - For Discussion Purposes Only - Do Not Release Under FOIA

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 12:59 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Oceana Language

I spoke to Ed Fairbairn about this earlier today as he was trying to reconcile the Staff COBRA. The answer is that we wanted to leave it up to the Navy since there was a lot of stuff that the IAT left (40% of Oceana) in the \$1.6 B bogey. FACSFAC, FCDSSA and the Site X stuff will need to be reevaluated if VA Beach doesn't comply with the BRAC language.

We (IAT & Commission staff) thought that it was appropriate for the Navy to decide the final size of the fence line, but if Site X Airhead moved to Chambers with a reorganization of the staging requirements, and FACSFAC could be accommodated, then the flight line and runways could be closed and turned over to the VA Beach development authority or whatever emerges to accept authority/responsibility.

Note the language in the last paragraph of the proposed Recommendation:

"If the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia and Chesapeake, Virginia fail to take all of the prescribed actions, and the State of Florida meets the conditions established by this recommendation, the units and functions that shall relocate to Cecil Field will include, but are not limited to, all of the Navy F/A-18 Strike Fighter Wings, aviation operations and support schools, maintenance support, training and any other additional support activities the Navy deems necessary and appropriate to support the operations of the Master Jet Base."

The idea was to enable the Navy to look at the VR (737's at NAS Norfolk) assets and the Cherry Point (Navy Super Hornet) assets and see what else needed to be moved to Cecil within the aviation force structure.

VR, Bill

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 12:26 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Oceana Language

If you can come up with an answer for me to send..

From: Biddick, Dennis CIV [<mailto:dennis.biddick@navy.mil>]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 12:21 PM
To: WSO-BRAC Hanna (E-mail)
Cc: Davis, Anne R. SES DASN(ISA)
Subject: Oceana Language

Jim:

Know you are busy. Left a voice mail yesterday regarding the Commission's Oceana recommendation in regard to technical accuracy versus intent. Language as we have currently seen does not close the fenceline of Oceana, just realigns the current aviation assets. If someone asks, was it the Commissions intent to close the fenceline if Virginia doesn't comply and Florida does? Or is it being left up to the Navy to decide what to do with Oceana property? FYI, the DON analysis also labeled it as a realignment in our evaluations because technically NAS Oceana static data and structure includes Dam Neck. However, we evaluated the information as if the Oceana fenceline would close if we moved the aviation assets. Since we never found a suitable solution, we never had to write a recommendation. r/DB

Dennis Biddick
Chief of Staff
DASN Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis
dennis.biddick@navy.mil
(703) 602-6500
(703) 602-6550 (fax)

Draft Deliberative Document - For Discussion Purposes Only - Do Not Release Under FOIA

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 4:42 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana

Attachments: Official Motion - 193-4A V-1.doc

Dan: Bill and I worked hard on updating and proofing the changes made to the Oceana amendment, attached. Please see that it appears in your draft of the bill which shows an earlier version. Let me know if you have questions! Thanks, Rumu



Official Motion -
193-4A V-1.d...

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

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Reborchick, Margaret, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 4:50 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: FT PICKETT INFORMATION

Will do. Thanks.

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, August 29, 2005 3:00 PM
To: Reborchick, Margaret, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: FT PICKETT INFORMATION

Marcy,

Please add this email to the BRAC E library.

VR, Bill Fetzer

From: Keys, Richard D CDR FFC (N762) [mailto:Richard.Keys@navy.mil]
Sent: Friday, July 22, 2005 6:26 PM
To: william.fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Cc: Anthony, Mark H CIV FFC N44
Subject: FT PICKETT INFORMATION

Sir,

Attached are documents previously generated regarding Ft Pickett as an OLF. I will have to fax a draft of the letter previously sent to Governor Warner. As explained in the EIS, FT Pickett was not within the designated OLF study area. However, because of comments received during the process we did a separate analysis of Ft Pickett using our OLF siting criteria. There have been two variations on the Ft Pickett OLF. There is an existing airfield which was proposed to be expanded (Blackstone AAF). It is joint civil use and also within three miles of the town of Blackstone. Therefore, it did not meet our requirement of low population density and no incompatible (civilian) operations. The latest suggestion was to close down the National Guard live fire training area and build an OLF within the confines of the Ft Pickett boundaries. This is the issue the attached papers address.

In 2002, 1997 Navy personnel used Fort Pickett a total of 161,000 mandays and 333 Navy Reservists use it for 1,041 mandays. Marines totaled 2,500 personnel and 22,340 mandays and Marine Reserves were 865 personnel for 2,212 mandays. Navy use was 3% and USMC was 5% of total annual usage. Navy primary users are specwar units. Marine users are FAST companies, 2nd LAR, and 24 and 26 MEU. Additionally HCS 4 and 6 use it for live fire 7.62, 50 cal, 2.75 rocket, and hellfire. F-14 and F-18 use it for inert bombs. This data is from range scheduling records.

V/R
CDR Keys
FFC N441
757-836-3674
cell 757-646-7068

<<FT PICKETT OLF.doc>> <<Fort Pickett NWNoise.pdf>> <<FortPickettCensusNoise.pdf>>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Walpole, Arch [Arch.Walpole@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 5:01 PM
To: William.Fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Cc: Gordy, Thomas
Subject: perfected language

Attachments: Arch Walpole.vcf



Arch Walpole.vcf
(620 B)

Bill,

I guess you would tell me not to be so obvious if I were to tell you we still don't have the Commission's perfected language regarding NAS Oceana.

Can you safely tell me when we (the collective royal "we") can expect to have it available?

Thanks,

And Vr,

Arch

Arch Walpole

Field Representative and

Military Liaison

4772 Euclid Road

Virginia Beach, VA 23462

Office: 757/497-6859

Cell: 202/281-8820

Thelma D. Drake

Member of Congress

Virginia, Second District

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 5:50 PM
To: 'Walpole, Arch'; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Gordy, Thomas
Subject: RE: perfected language

The legal beagles are still working on it (and the other 200 bills). I promise that as soon as they get it finished, and release it to me, I will forward to you.

Fetz

From: Walpole, Arch [mailto:Arch.Walpole@mail.house.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 5:01 PM
To: William.Fetzer@wso.whs.mil
Cc: Gordy, Thomas
Subject: perfected language

Bill,

I guess you would tell me not to be so obvious if I were to tell you we still don't have the Commission's perfected language regarding NAS Oceana.

Can you safely tell me when we (the collective royal "we") can expect to have it available?

Thanks,

And Vr,

Arch

Arch Walpole

Field Representative and
Military Liaison
4772 Euclid Road
Virginia Beach, VA 23462

Office: 757/497-6859

Cell: 202/281-8820

Thelma D. Drake
Member of Congress
Virginia, Second District

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 5:58 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Oceana Clean-up Language

Attachments: Motion to change.doc; Official Motion - 193-4A V-1.doc

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, August 26, 2005 5:41 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana Clean-up Language



Motion to
change.doc (34 KB)



Official Motion -
193-4A V-1.d...

Sir, FYI,

I invite your attention to the legal definition of the terms "property" and "development rights of all the property" in paragraph six. I'm not sure of the legal implications of those two phrases, but they may be significant in the case of Oceana.

VR, Bill Fetzer

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 8:09 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: OCEANA

Attachments: Oceana.doc

This is the Oceana recommendation built from the transcript with three deletions for clarity. With the sensitivity of this recommendation, we best leave it alone. We are waiting to hear from GAO about the role they have been assigned. Their input may require another change, but we might also deal with their concerns in the report language.

David



Oceana.doc (40 KB)

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 8:24 AM
To: Cole, Christopher, CTR, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: OCEANA

Attachments: Oceana.doc

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 8:09 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: OCEANA

This is the Oceana recommendation built from the transcript with three deletions for clarity. With the sensitivity of this recommendation, we best leave it alone. We are waiting to hear from GAO about the role they have been assigned. Their input may require another change, but we might also deal with their concerns in the report language.

David



Oceana.doc (40 KB)

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 9:21 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cole, Christopher, CTR, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: OCEANA

Attachments: 31 AUG Basic Bill - Oceana.doc

Dan, Two corrections included as discussed (plus one typo fixed).

Bill



31 AUG Basic Bill -
Oceana.doc...

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 8:24 AM
To: Cole, Christopher, CTR, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: OCEANA

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 8:09 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: OCEANA

This is the Oceana recommendation built from the transcript with three deletions for clarity. With the sensitivity of this recommendation, we best leave it alone. We are waiting to hear from GAO about the role they have been assigned. Their input may require another change, but we might also deal with their concerns in the report language.

David

<< File: Oceana.doc >>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 9:32 AM
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Ocean COBRAS

Oceana Cobra - Staff generated

OTC: \$ 410.37 M
Annual Recurring Savings: \$ 17.10 M (Savings)
NPV: \$ 33.39 M (Cost)
Payback Period: 18 Years

From: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 9:26 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Ocean COBRAS

Just email me those, and any other COBRA # you have, and I'll make sure they get entered.

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

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 11:11 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cole, Christopher, CTR, WSO-BRAC; Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: OCEANA

As discussed with Charlie/Bill/Frank a few minutes ago - other than the one or two technical corrections Charlie allowed, (Bill please see Dan with that issue), the Bill as derived from the transcript will stand. Bill is to insert the Commission intent (to include the condemnation/ outlying field/etc.) into the Commission Findings piece as report language only - but, allowably, as strong report language.

Frank

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 9:21 AM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cole, Christopher, CTR, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: OCEANA

Dan, Two corrections included as discussed (plus one typo fixed).

Bill

<< File: 31 AUG Basic Bill - Oceana.doc >>

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 8:24 AM
To: Cole, Christopher, CTR, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: OCEANA

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2005 8:09 PM
To: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: OCEANA

This is the Oceana recommendation built from the transcript with three deletions for clarity. With the sensitivity of this recommendation, we best leave it alone. We are waiting to hear from GAO about the role they have been assigned. Their input may require another change, but we might also deal with their concerns in the report language.

David

<< File: Oceana.doc >>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV; WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 11:48 AM
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana Report Recommendation

Andy,

Below is the latest version of the Report Recommendation for entry into Oceana 193. It is based on the latest bill language from Dan. I'm not sure about the punctuation, but this is a little long, and some strategic punctuation might make it less cumbersome.

I am still working on the Findings Section to include the sense of the commission regarding the clarifications that were removed from the recommendation in order to reflect the public transcript.

Bill Fetzer

COMMISSION RECOMMENDATIONS

The Commission finds that when the Secretary of Defense failed to recommend the realignment of Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia Beach, Virginia, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, and the Force Structure Plan; that the Commission add to the list of installations to be closed or realigned the recommendation: Realign Naval Air Station Oceana, Virginia by relocating the East Coast Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, Florida, if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, fail to enact and enforce legislation to prevent further encroachment of Naval Air Station Oceana by March 31, 2006, to wit: enact state-mandated zoning controls requiring the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to adopt zoning ordinances that require the governing body to follow Air Installation Compatibility Use Zone (AICUZ) guidelines in deciding discretionary development applications for property in noise levels 70 dB day-night, average noise level DNL or greater; enact state and local legislation and ordinance to establish a program to condemn and purchase all the incompatible use property located within the Accident Potential Zone 1 areas for Naval Air Station Oceana, as depicted for 1999 AICUZ pamphlet published by the U.S. Navy and to fund and expend no less than \$15 million annually in furtherance of the aforementioned program; codify the 2005 final Hampton Roads Joint Land Use Study recommendations; legislate requirements for the cities of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake to evaluate undeveloped properties in noise zones 70 DB DNL or greater for rezoning classification that would not allow uses incompatible under AICUZ guidelines; establish programs for purchase of development rights of the inter-facility traffic area between NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress; enact legislation creating the Oceana-Fentress Advisory Council. It shall be deemed that the actions prescribed to be taken by the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the Cities of Virginia Beach, and Chesapeake respectively, by the end of March 2006 have not been taken in their entirety, unless the General Accountability Office certifies in writing to the President and oversight committees of Congress by June 1, 2006; and,

if the State of Florida appropriates sufficient funds to relocate commercial tenants presently located at Cecil Field, Florida, appropriates sufficient funds to secure public-private ventures for all the personnel housing required by the Navy at Cecil Field to accomplish this relocation and turns over fee simple title to the property comprising the former Naval Air Station Cecil Field, including all infrastructure improvements that presently exist, to the Department on or before December 31, 2006, if the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal government of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, decline from the outset to take the actions required above or within 6 months of the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, failing to carry through with any of the actions set out above, whichever is later. The State of Florida may not encumber the title by any restrictions other than a reversionary clause in favor of the state of Florida and short-term tenancies consistent with the relocation of the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field. It shall be deemed that the actions prescribed to be taken by the State of Florida and the City of Jacksonville respectively by the end of 31 December 2006 have not been taken in their entirety unless the Government Accountability Office certifies in writing to the President and oversight committees of Congress by June 1, 2007. If the Commonwealth of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach, Virginia, and Chesapeake, Virginia, fail to take all of the prescribed actions and the State of Florida meets the conditions established by this recommendation, the units and functions that shall relocate to Cecil Field will include but are not limited to all of the Navy F/A-18 strike fighter wings, aviation operations and support schools, maintenance support, training, and any other additional support activities the Navy deems necessary and appropriate to support the operations of the Master Jet Base.

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 12:03 PM
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana Report - Community Concerns & Findings

Andy,

Below update reflects the direction from the Front office regarding using the Findings to reflect the Commission's strong intent that could not be "technically" inserted into the Final Recommendation.

The first two paragraphs are my insertion to cover the aforementioned issues and the last two paragraphs are verbatim from the transcript read by the CHMN on 24 AUG.

I also clarified the Community Concerns from the Commissioner's audit yesterday wrt breaking out the \$266 M Florida investment.

Please advise if any of this changes within the next few hours.

VR, Bill Fetzer

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

The Virginia Beach, Virginia community places high value on the military's contribution to the community and fears the loss of over 11,000 direct jobs would devastate the local economy. The state has invested significant resources in improved roads around the base and moving schools out of the Accident Prevention Zones. They acknowledged noise complaints by a small, but vocal, minority of residents but pointed out that planning commissions are developing new community planning overlays to limit encroachment and reduce development in the Accident Potential Zones. They argued funds needed to implement the Commission's consideration to relocate the Master Jet Base to Cecil Field, Florida could be better spent on the Navy's more pressing needs. They believe the Navy has no better or affordable alternative than remaining at NAS Oceana and managing encroachment.

The Jacksonville, Florida community offered to return all of the former NAS Cecil Field property, improved and unencumbered - free and clear. Local governments are prepared to absorb and support the approximately 11,000 personnel that would be associated with the relocation of the Navy's Atlantic Fleet Master Jet Base to Cecil Field. The community has invested \$133 million to upgrade Cecil Field's infrastructure and has secured \$130 million in funding for a high speed access road from Cecil Field to Interstate Highway 10. All required base conversion activities, including a new or updated Environmental Impact Statement, can be completed in time to allow the Navy to establish and occupy a new Master Jet Base within the BRAC timeframe.

COMMISSION FINDINGS

The Commission found that significant residential and commercial encroachment had continued around NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress for many years and was exacerbated when the 1995 BRAC Commission redirected F-18 aircraft and supporting assets from MCAS Cherry Point, NC and MCAS Beaufort, NC to NAS Oceana to take advantage of the excess capacity at NAS Oceana. It was the sense of the Commission that the encroachment issues were having a detrimental affect on the operations and training of the Navy's Atlantic Fleet Strike Fighter Wings and on the safety and welfare of the citizens of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake, Virginia. Consequently, the future for NAS Oceana as a Master Jet Base was severely limited, whereas Jacksonville, Florida had taken effective and positive measures to protect the Air Installation Compatibility Use Zones (AICUZ) around Cecil Field, FL.

The intent of the Commission is to ensure that the State of Virginia and the municipal governments of Virginia Beach and Chesapeake take immediate and positive steps to halt the encroaching developments that are pending before them now and in the future, and also to roll back the encroachment that has already occurred in the Accident Potential Zones (APZ) around NAS Oceana and NALF Fentress, particularly in the APZ-1 areas. The Commission also considers that the more severe encroachment problems were created by the state and local governments by not considering the Navy's repeated objections to incompatible residential and commercial developments under the AICUZ guidelines. Consequently, the funds to halt and reverse the encroachment should not come from federal funds, but rather state and local funding sources.

It is also the sense of the Commission that the Secretary of Defense deviated from the BRAC criteria by failing to consider NAS Oceana for closure or realignment. The longstanding and steadily worsening encroachment problem around NAS Oceana, without strong support from state and city governments to eliminate current and arrest future encroachment, will in the long term create a situation where the military value of NAS Oceana will be unacceptable degraded. The remedies presented to the Commission thus far have been unconvincing. It is also the sense of the Commission that the future of naval aviation is not Naval Air Station Oceana. The Commission urges the Navy to begin immediately to mitigate the noise encroachment and safety issues associated with flight operations around the Virginia Beach area by transitioning high-density training evolutions to other bases that are much less encroached, such as Naval Outlying Field Whitehouse, Florida, or Kingsville, Texas.

The Secretary of Defense is directed to cause a rapid, complete due diligence review of the offer of the state of Florida to reoccupy the former NAS Cecil Field and to compare this review against any plan to build a new master jet base at any other location. This review is to be completed within 6 months from the date that the BRAC legislation enters into force and is to be made public to the affected states for comment. After review of the states' comments, which shall be submitted within 120 days after publishing the review, the Secretary of Defense shall forward to the oversight committees of Congress the review, the state comments, and his recommendation on the location of the Navy's future Atlantic Fleet master jet base.

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 2:45 PM
To: 'Walpole, Arch'; Gordy, Thomas; 'lsuit@cox.net'
Subject: BRAC Report

Attachments: Uncertified Final Delib 24 Aug PM.doc; Uncertified Final Delib 26 Aug Late PM.doc

Tom & Arch & Terrie,

FYI the BRAC Hearing transcripts (initial bill on 24 AUG starting on page 10 and the amendment on 26 AUG - starting on page 55) regarding Oceana will most likely be the core substance of the final BRAC recommendation. I recommend that you read it carefully to see what the actual words are. Caveat: The final report is still going through legal and admin review, so other things can happen. Note that the condemn and purchase "all the property" was amended to all the "incompatible property" under AICUZ guidelines.

The "Uncertified Transcripts" are on the website, but I copied them below for you.

VR, Bill



Uncertified Final
Delib 24 Aug...



Uncertified Final
Delib 26 Aug...

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 2:53 PM
To: 'rjnatter@natterllc.com'; 'Daniel McCarthy'; 'pam.dana@myflorida.com'
Subject: NAS Oceana Recommendations

Attachments: Uncertified Final Delib 24 Aug PM.doc; Uncertified Final Delib 26 Aug Late PM.doc

To all:

FYI the BRAC Hearing transcripts (initial bill on 24 AUG starting on page 10 and the amendment on 26 AUG - starting on page 55) regarding Oceana will most likely be the core substance of the final BRAC recommendation. I recommend that you read it carefully to see what the actual words are. Caveat: The final report is still going through legal and admin review, so other things can happen. Note that the condemn and purchase "all the property" was amended to all the "incompatible property" under AICUZ guidelines. The GAO certification clause was added by the Friday night amendment.

The "Uncertified Transcripts" are on the website, but I copied them below for you.

The BRAC findings will describe the stronger intent of the Commission - expanding on Fentress and other areas of concern that were not read into the public record.

Please call me if you have any questions.

VR, Bill



Uncertified Final
Delib 24 Aug...



Uncertified Final
Delib 26 Aug...

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2005 8:06 AM
To: 'Terrie Suit'
Subject: RE: BRAC Report

Terrie,

Nothing is releasable yet, until the final report goes to the President on Thursday. But, the final deliberations testimony (Wed PM and FRI evening sessions combined along with the publicly discussed amendments) will be the main body of the Commission recommendation. Nothing is in there that was not made public in Commissioner's voting or comments. Call me if you have any specific concerns, and I'll give you what I can.

Bill

From: Terrie Suit [mailto:tlsuit@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, September 05, 2005 5:12 PM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: BRAC Report

Bill,

Any final order yet?

Terrie Suit

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

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
To: 'Walpole, Arch' ; Gordy, Thomas ; 'tlsuit@cox.net'
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 2:45 PM
Subject: BRAC Report

Tom & Arch & Terrie,

FYI the BRAC Hearing transcripts (initial bill on 24 AUG starting on page 10 and the amendment on 26 AUG - starting on page 55) regarding Oceana will most likely be the core substance of the final BRAC recommendation. I recommend that you read it carefully to see what the actual words are. Caveat: The final report is still going through legal and admin review, so other things can happen. Note that the condemn and purchase "all the property" was amended to all the "incompatible property" under AICUZ guidelines.

The "Uncertified Transcripts" are on the website, but I copied them below for you.

VR, Bill

<<Uncertified Final Delib 24 Aug PM.doc>> <<Uncertified Final Delib 26 Aug Late PM.doc>>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2005 9:38 AM
To: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Metz' Statement

Attachments: Adm METZ' Sworn Statement.doc

Jim, FYI. I pulled ADM Metz' statement off the internet services and filed the attached document in the archives.



Adm METZ' Sworn
Statement.doc ...

VR, Bill

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2005 9:52 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Metz' Statement

Looks Good. You were too nice, in my opinion. If this has to be exact (for the record) the spelling of my last name is "Aarnio"

Thanks,

Jim

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2005 9:38 AM
To: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Metz' Statement

Jim, FYI. I pulled ADM Metz' statement off the internet services and filed the attached document in the archives.

VR, Bill << File: Adm METZ' Sworn Statement.doc >>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2005 10:33 AM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Oceana Press

Attachments: VA CODEL Issues.doc

Jim,

FYI. It appears that the actual facts that we found regarding Oceana and Cecil are not sufficient grounds to counter the incorrect, uncertified data that VA official and their less than candid witnesses presented to the Commission. Are we the staff that the Governor is complaining about? I would love to sit down with his folks and go over the facts with them, but



VA CODEL
Issues.doc (40 KB)

they would probably not believe that either.

Bill

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2005 10:35 AM
To: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Metz' Statement

Sorry Jim, - that was a typo. I even looked up the spelling beforehand to be sure, and still screwed it up. It has been corrected.

Bill

From: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2005 9:52 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Metz' Statement

Looks Good. You were too nice, in my opinion. If this has to be exact (for the record) the spelling of my last name is "Aarnio"

Thanks,

Jim

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2005 9:38 AM
To: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Metz' Statement

Jim, FYI. I pulled ADM Metz' statement off the internet services and filed the attached document in the archives.

VR, Bill << File: Adm METZ' Sworn Statement.doc >>

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2005 12:24 PM
To: 'Keeley, Thomas CAPT NAS Oceana VA'
Subject: FW: BRAC Report

Attachments: Uncertified Final Delib 26 Aug Late PM.doc; Uncertified Final Delib 26 Aug Late PM.doc;
Uncertified Final Delib 24 Aug PM.doc

Tom, FYI.

Unless the edited copy that I reviewed and forwarded last Friday was changed by counsel, my comments are still germane. Both WED and FRI transcripts are provided. Note that I sent them to the CODEL folks last week. You can forward these also to Skip Nobel and Mark Anthony.

I would take the City's quibbling about not buying out the clear zones as a sign that they are not serious about the encroachment issues and that Oceana will be a prime, highlighted candidate for the next BRAC - if there ever is another BRAC. I apologize for not recognizing that Oceana had Clear Zone encroachment. I would have recommended that the Commissioners include those zones in with the APZ-1 buyouts.

VR, Bill

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 2:45 PM
To: 'Walpole, Arch'; Gordy, Thomas; 'tlsuit@cox.net'
Subject: BRAC Report

Tom & Arch & Terrie,

FYI the BRAC Hearing transcripts (initial bill on 24 AUG starting on page 10 and the amendment on 26 AUG - starting on page 55) regarding Oceana will most likely be the core



Uncertified Final
Delib 26 Aug...

substance of the final BRA recommendation. I recommend that you read it carefully to see what the actual words are. Caveat: The final report is still going through legal and admin review, so other things can happen. Note that the condemn and purchase "all the property" was amended to all the "incompatible property" under AICUZ guidelines.

The "Uncertified Transcripts" are on the website, but I copied them below for y o u.



Uncertified Final
Delib 26 Aug...



Uncertified Final
Delib 24 Aug...

VR, Bill

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Tuesday, September 06, 2005 1:26 PM
To: 'Zobel, William C CIV COMNAVREG MIDLANT ,Executive Director'; 'mark.anthony@navy.mil'
Subject: FW: BRAC Report

Attachments: Uncertified Final Delib 24 Aug PM.doc; Uncertified Final Delib 26 Aug Late PM.doc

Skip/Mark,

FYI, I sent the below email to Tom Keeley earlier.

Unless the edited copy that I reviewed and forwarded last Friday was changed by counsel, my comments are still germane. Both WED and FRI transcripts are provided. Note that I sent them to the CODEL folks last week.

VR, Bill

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 2:45 PM
To: 'Walpole, Arch'; Gordy, Thomas; 'tsuit@cox.net'
Subject: BRAC Report

Tom & Arch & Terrie,

FYI the BRAC Hearing transcripts (initial bill on 24 AUG starting on page 10 and the amendment on 26 AUG - starting on page 55) regarding Oceana will most likely be the core substance of the final BRAC recommendation. I recommend that you read it carefully to see what the actual words are. Caveat: The final report is still going through legal and admin review, so other things can happen. Note that the condemn and purchase "all the property" was amended to all the "incompatible property" under AICUZ guidelines.

The "Uncertified Transcripts" are on the website, but I copied them below for you.

VR, Bill



Uncertified Final
Delib 24 Aug...



Uncertified Final
Delib 26 Aug...

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 10:20 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Email for the Record on Clearinghouse Qs WWF 17 & 18

Note:

To whom it may concern. Clearing House Questions WWF#17 (LSO Testimony) & WWF#18 (Geographically Constrained Mission) were not sent due to time late issues.

VR, Bill Fetzer

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 4:18 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents
Attachments: RE: Sen Warner Statement at BRAC Commission Hearing 7 July 05

Thanks David - we will be postured to support. I did a word search through all my e-mails regarding OSD Clearinghouse info and related data and only found this e-mail which was merely a forward from me to Pete P regarding Sen Warner's statement on July 7th.

Jim: be prepared to get with Bill, Mike and Nat to reconstruct what else might be in the pot. If you have any other key words regarding the field I can search again.

Frank



RE: Sen Warner
Statement at BR...

Below are the excerpts:

Naval Air Station Oceana is the United States Navy's Master Jet Base on the East Coast, with the primary mission of training and deploying strike-fighter squadrons. NAS Oceana has one 12,000 foot runway and three 8,000 foot runways. An outlying landing field under construction in North Carolina will be shared with the two squadrons of F/A-18's at NAS Cherry Point, North Carolina, allowing for more efficient use of training resources. NAS Oceana's proximity to Norfolk Naval Station allows quick surface transport of men and material necessary to load aboard the aircraft carriers to which the airwings are assigned, supporting the Navy's ability to surge forces forward quickly under its Fleet Response Plan. The aircraft are then launched from nearby NAS Oceana and can recover aboard the aircraft carrier as soon as it clears the Chesapeake Bay.

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 3:38 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents
Importance: High

Frank, Another matter to keep our Navy folks occupied. David

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 3:32 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents
Importance: High

Gentlepersons -

The Washington County NC litigants have served a document request on the Navy for all communications between DON and the Commission regarding the proposed OLF site in NC. The Navy GC will be sending it over shortlike.

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

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Niemeyer, Lucian (Armed Services) [Lucian_Niemeyer@armed-services.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 9:00 PM
To: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; BRAC Bill Fetzer
Cc: Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Thanks...

Jim/Bill: Can we get the COBRA run or other cost analysis the Commission used to arrive at a payback period of 18 years and the other estimated amounts for the potential move of the Master Jet base from Oceana on page 107 of the report? Need it as soon as possible. Thanks - L

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

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC [mailto:James.Hanna@wso.whs.mil]
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2005 4:11 PM
To: Niemeyer, Lucian (Armed Services)
Subject: RE: Thanks...

Lucian, never a problem. We want to make sure that they feel they are heard.

Jim

From: Niemeyer, Lucian (Armed Services) [mailto:Lucian_Niemeyer@armed-services.senate.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 14, 2005 2:16 PM
To: BRAC Bill Fetzer; james.hanna@wso.whs.mil
Cc: Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Thanks...

Jim/Bill: For taking your time to sit with the Virginia Beach folks. We appreciate the opportunity to provide the most current data and will forward the info you requested within the next 24 hours.

Lucian Niemeyer

Committee on Armed Services

United States Senate

(202) 224-8636

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2005 7:21 AM
To: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents

Importance: High

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 3:32 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents
Importance: High

Gentlepersons -

The Washington County NC litigants have served a document request on the Navy for all communications between DON and the Commission regarding the proposed OLF site in NC. The Navy GC will be sending it over shortlike.

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

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2005 7:22 AM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents

Right□wasn't really a topic of investigation. Only shows up as a mention a couple of places...

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 4:18 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents

Thanks David - we will be postured to support. I did a word search through all my e-mails regarding OSD Clearinghouse info and related data and only found this e-mail which was merely a forward from me to Pete P regarding Sen Warner's statement on July 7th.

Jim: be prepared to get with Bill, Mike and Nat to reconstruct what else might be in the pot. If you have any other key words regarding the field I can search again. .

Frank

<< Message: RE: Sen Warner Statement at BRAC Commission Hearing 7 July 05 >> Below are the excerpts:
Naval Air Station Oceana is the United States Navy's Master Jet Base on the East Coast, with the primary mission of training and deploying strike-fighter squadrons. NAS Oceana has one 12,000 foot runway and three 8,000 foot runways. An outlying landing field under construction in North Carolina will be shared with the two squadrons of F/A-18's at NAS Cherry Point, North Carolina, allowing for more efficient use of training resources. NAS Oceana's proximity to Norfolk Naval Station allows quick surface transport of men and material necessary to load aboard the aircraft carriers to which the airwings are assigned, supporting the Navy's ability to surge forces forward quickly under its Fleet Response Plan. The aircraft are then launched from nearby NAS Oceana and can recover aboard the aircraft carrier as soon as it clears the Chesapeake Bay.

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 3:38 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents
Importance: High

Frank, Another matter to keep our Navy folks occupied. David

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 3:32 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents
Importance: High

Gentlepersons -

The Washington County NC litigants have served a document request on the Navy for all

communications between DON and the Commission regarding the proposed OLF site in NC. The Navy GC will be sending it over shortly.

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

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2005 11:59 AM
To: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: SASC "Ex Parte" Commission Review

Nat, Please send me the original "EX-party!" tasker.

From: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2005 11:50 AM
To: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Aarnio, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Abrell, Timothy, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Avenick, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Barrett, Joe, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Beauchamp, Arthur, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Bieri, Elizabeth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Breitschopf, Justin, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Butler, Aaron, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Buzzell, Ashley, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Carroll, Ray, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Combs, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cruz, Tanya, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dean, Ryan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Delaney, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Delgado, George, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Dinsick, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Durso, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Epstein, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Farrington, Lester, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Felix, Kevin, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Flinn, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Furlow, Clarenton, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Gingrich, Karl, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hall, Craig, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hood, Wesley, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; MacGregor, Timothy, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Mandzia, Lesia, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Manuel, Donald, CTR, WSO-BRAC; McDaniel, Brian, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McRee, Bradley, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Mills, Valerie, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Oborn, Tyler, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Pantelides, Thomas, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Plack, Philip, CIV, 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; Tickle, Harold, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Tran, Duke, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Turner, Colleen, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Wasleski, Marilyn, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: SASC "Ex Parte" Commission Review
Importance: High

Staff,

The Senate Armed Services Committee is still seeking some select documents and records for their review of the Commission.

A document outlining the requested materials has been provided to each TL and the AA's have extra copies for each analyst.

These materials are specifically Letters, memos, emails, information/ background papers, briefing slides and meeting memos from specific civilian and DoD officials listed in the document described above.

Please write your name and respective team name on each of your documents and submit them, through coordination with your Team Leader to Nat by COB Wednesday 9/14/05.

If you have any questions please see Frank or Bob.

NBS

Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Monday, September 12, 2005 12:11 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents

Attachments: Fight Over Navy OLF Highlights Hurdles To DoD Facility Expansions.doc; Free Republic - Negative OLF reaction.doc; Oceana - NEPA - NC Issues.ppt

Gentlemen,

I did a word search on my "H" and "C" Drives for documents related to the "Washington County" and "OLF" and turned up three documents that I downloaded from the internet. Two MS Word documents (downloaded 19 Jul and 20 Aug 2005) are related to lawsuits discussing the pros and cons of the OLF. The other document is a Power Point presentation (downloaded 18 July 05) by Dan Cecchini (Lant Fleet NAFEC - NEPA Support Dept Head) that discussed the Washington County OLF as it related to the Super Hornet FEIS.

VR, Bill Fetzer



Fight Over Navy
OLF Highlights...



Free Republic
-Negative OLF re...



Oceana - NEPA -
NC Issues.ppt ...

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 4:18 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Fetzer, William, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Kessler, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents

Thanks David - we will be postured to support. I did a word search through all my e-mails regarding OSD Clearinghouse info and related data and only found this e-mail which was merely a forward form me to Pete P regarding Sen Warner's statement on July 7th.

Jim: be prepared to get with Bill, Mike and Nat to reconstruct what else might be in the pot. If you have any other key words regarding the field I can search again.

Frank

<< Message: RE: Sen Warner Statement at BRAC Commission Hearing 7 July 05 >>

Below are the excerpts:

Naval Air Station Oceana is the United States Navy's Master Jet Base on the East Coast, with the primary mission of training and deploying strike-fighter squadrons. NAS Oceana has one 12,000 foot runway and three 8,000 foot runways. An outlying landing field under construction in North Carolina will be shared with the two squadrons of F/A-18's at NAS Cherry Point, North Carolina, allowing for more efficient use of training resources. NAS Oceana's proximity to Norfolk Naval Station allows quick surface transport of men and material necessary to load aboard the aircraft carriers to which the airwings are assigned, supporting the Navy's ability to surge forces forward quickly under its Fleet Response Plan. The aircraft are then launched from nearby NAS Oceana and can recover aboard the aircraft carrier as soon as it clears the Chesapeake Bay.

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 3:38 PM

To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents
Importance: High

Frank, Another matter to keep our Navy folks occupied. David

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 08, 2005 3:32 PM
To: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hanna, James, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Sarkar, Rumu, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Hold onto those NC OLF site-related documents
Importance: High

Gentlepersons -

The Washington County NC litigants have served a document request on the Navy for all communications between DON and the Commission regarding the proposed OLF site in NC. The Navy GC will be sending it over shortlike.

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