DCN: 12123

May 2005

For press release

The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission established by Public Law 101-510 has built a solid reputation for fair, objective, and factual review and analysis of those bases recommended by the Secretary of Defense for closure or realignment based on the selection criteria, force-structure plan, and infrastructure inventory. It is the duty and responsibility of the Commission's staff for the 2005 process to uphold those standards and to continue in the open and independent environment.

This handbook provides examples, guidelines, policies, and procedures to assist the Commission staff in understanding the breadth and depth of their responsibilities during the course of the review and analysis process. The volume of work to be performed in such a short period of time dictates that each analyst must operate with limited supervision and be an integral component of our overall process. The in-depth review and independent analysis become the final factual basis for decisions and, if challenged in court, the back-up information used in defense of whatever lawsuits may be initiated.

This is not meant to alarm you but to make you aware of the importance and seriousness of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission's work. The final decisions of the Commission represent a foundation for tomorrow's defense infrastructure; however, they could be devastating to many communities. Therefore, our work must be as thorough and accurate as humanly possible.

Our analysis and oversight are greatly enhanced by the concerned communities most affected by the closures and realignments. We encourage their involvement in the process, which actually broadens and strengthens our own analysis. In fact, we consider the communities' work to validate or present factual information about the bases as an extension of our staff's work. Fort his reason, it is critical that all Commission staff members understand and support the openness and thoroughness of the review and analysis process.

Our finished products and back-up documentation are an open book for all to see. Let's uphold the high standards set by the review and analysis work of the 1991, 1993, and 1995 Commissions.

Charles Battaglia
Executive Director

DCN: 12123

7:30 mtg. on Mon. (2+4), then 3.

Accurate Word - MD, call office. $200 500 or 200 line. 202-225-5315 on desk in front. Staff fund

**Staff. 2005. "BRAC Chairman Responds to Questions about Process."** ***Norwich (CT) Bulletin*** **(April 17): A4.**

* 301-870-2313. FX: 301-753-1340.

Anthony Principi sat down with Norwich Bulletin Political Reporter Ray Hackett for his first interview since being sworn in as chairman of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. The interview took place at the Pfizer Washington, D.C., offices where Principi serves as corporate vice president of Governmental Affairs. Here is the full interview.

**Question:** How many people have tried to talk with you since the president announced your nomination to be the BRAC chairman?

**Principi:** Quite a few. (laughs) I got a visit from the governor of Oklahoma. The governor of Indiana is coming to visit me next week. I've met with many senators and congressmen. I talked with Gov. Bush of Florida, who called to congratulate me on my appointment. So, there's been quite a few.

But this is so important to our nation, to our national security and to the communities that could be impacted. And I'm very sensitive to that. I've committed from the very beginning, that I want this to be a very open, fair, transparent and bipartisan commission. And I intend to adhere to those principals.

**Q:** Would you encourage other commission members to do the same, to meet with local leaders?

**Principi:** I would leave that up to each of the commissioners to decide for themselves. Right now, I've been sworn in but they haven't, so that may affect how they feel about that, whether at this stage in the process if they'd like to talk with interested parties.

I think, most importantly, that it is a chance to listen and learn. An opportunity in these pre-list days, to have an appreciation for some of the issues they'll be facing when the list comes out. None of us know what might be on the list. Obviously, none of us want to make any commitments, nor should we make any commitments on one course of action or another. That would be totally inappropriate.

I really trust the judgment of the other commissioners on how they'd like to proceed.

**Q:** Have you met with the other commissioners?

**Principi:** I've talked with them briefly on the phone, introducing myself. Some of them I know, others I know about. I told them I'm looking forward to working them and to feel free to call me anytime if they have any questions.

**Q:** It's been more than a month since you were nominated. How far have you gotten in planning for the work that awaits you next month?

**Principi:** It's been very difficult at the outset. This is the first BRAC Commission without any core staff. All of the other commissions had a core staff of about 15 people that were in existence, up and running, computers were lit, the lights were on. I guess after the '95 BRAC they thought that was the end of all BRACs (laughing) and so the staff disappeared.

So we've been playing catch up, really. But it's coming together now. I've appointed an executive director, Charles Battaglia, who I've known for many years and who I trust implicitly. He's now in the process of interviewing prospective staff members. We have office space, getting the computers in. So, we're beginning to pick up some speed here. I'm confident that we'll be ready to go by our first organizational meeting May 2.

**Q:** The Groton Submarine Base was targeted for closure in the 1991 BRAC. Local leaders were able to convince that commission to remove the base from the list. Does that make it more or less likely to be targeted again this year given that this BRAC is expected to be the biggest round of base closings yet?

**Principi: I don't know, because I don't know.** I don't believe because it was on the '91 list that that will be a factor on whether it will be on the 2005 list.

**We, the commission, will have to live and work with the list we receive from the Department of Defense, and insure that the decisions made by the secretary of defense conform to the force structure plan, which is an important component of our work.**

**And secondly, to ensure that the criteria, that is set out in law, the four military value criteria and the four other criteria, have been met in making those decisions.**

**I see us as an independent check on the power of the secretary of defense to close military bases, to realign military bases. We'll do a very, very comprehensive review and analysis of the data, the justification for the decisions. If the secretary substantially deviated from those criteria and the force structure plan, the commission has the option to make a change.**

**Q:** Assuming the Pentagon did a thorough analysis in developing its list of recommended closings, **how much weight will be given to the original list by the commission?**

**Principi: We need to look at that data. We need to ensure the data supports the decision. That the data is correct. That the data is current. That's really the role of the commission. It's not to make policy.**

The commission is not a policy-making body. **The commission is this independent check.** And to ensure that, we will have a very, very capable staff who have been through the process on previous BRACs. We're going to be bringing back very talented men and women who understand this process. And they will be charged to look at all of this data, and make sure there is a correlation to, and is supportable of, the decisions.

Obviously, you want to give some deference that they're sending over a list. It's our job to ensure that everything is correct. I wouldn't necessarily say it carries weight. Obviously, it's their decisions based on their analysis. And now we just need to review it carefully.

**Q:** In order for a community to make an argument to remove a base on the list, it will need access to the data the Pentagon has collected – information that is not being released to local communities now. When will local communities get access to that information?

**Principi:** I'm hesitant to give you a definitive answer because **we're very early in the process.** But philosophically, I believe it is important for the communities to have the information. To weigh as much information as possible so that they can review it, and that they have the opportunity to present their perspective, their viewpoint on the data.

Whether any of this is classified by nature of the military relationship, those issues need to be taken into consideration. But this commissioner, and I certainly want to confer with my fellow commissioners, believes that it is important that more data rather than less data be available to the people, to the local and state leaders in communities. That they have an opportunity to review it.

**I think that's important to demonstrate that we're not trying to politicize this. It is an open process. I don't want there to be any cynicism.** Whatever decisions are ultimately made that might impact a community, I want them to feel that this chairman and this commission treated every community **fairly. And** that they had the **opportunity to** make the case. Because I think it's important that it be **done right.** And it can't be done right if people don't have the **information to know** how these decisions were arrived at.

Having said that, **I'm hesitant to say without knowing exactly when we'll get the data, or the format that we'll get the data. Will it be available to be put on the Web so people can review it? Or will it be a room** like this filled with documents? We don't know. We haven't been told.

**Q:** But it's your position that the information be shared as quickly as possible once it becomes available?

**Principi: I want to share as much as possible with the communities. That's my position going in.**

**Q:** This commission, unlike past commissions, has more ex-military members. Does that make it easier for the commission to do its work?

**Principi:** I think it bodes well for the commission, and the work of the commission. These are men and women of extraordinary, extraordinary experience and talent. They're committed to our nation and our security. I believe they will do what's right.

I think we have a good blend of people who understand the nature of the process in Washington. People who understand the military, who speak that language. People who can really look at issues, look at the data carefully because they've seen it before. So I think it bodes well for our work and the decisions we'll have to make. These are really fine people.

**Q:** In 1993, you worked as the minority staff director for the Senate Armed Services Committee, and was involved, to a small degree, in the 1993 BRAC. What lessons did you learn from that experience that you will bring to this round of base closings?

**Principi:** What I learned was, how important this process is to a community. I remember attending a meeting South Carolina, either at a high school or college auditorium, I can't remember. You couldn't find a seat.

So these issues are important to communities and I guess I have a sensitivity to that. First and foremost, national security has to be the most important criteria. I feel very, very strongly about that. But we cannot divorce ourselves from the economic impact on the community, or the environmental issues. I have an appreciation for them, and they will be part of our deliberations as we are mandated to do. But this chairman certainly feels very strongly about it.

**Q:** As secretary of Veterans Affairs you faced a similar challenge in realigning the VA system. How helpful will that experience be for you in this role?

**Principi:** I learned a lot from the CARES process. It's not quite an apple-to-apple comparison, but what I faced as secretary, much like Secretary Rumsfeld faces as secretary, is the transformation of health care in my case. The dramatic changes that have taken place over the last 50-60 years in the way health care is delivered, and the demographics of the population. And I felt strongly that every dollar we wasted on an empty building and excess capacity, things that were really not needed to deliver health care, is a dollar that we didn't have to provide for that delivery. It was a dollar that we couldn't use to buy drugs, or couldn't have to buy technology, hire doctors and nurses and build outpatient clinics.

And I guess, in the same sense, you can say the same thing about defense. The threat has changed, the military has changed. And so, we must conform and transform our infrastructure to meet the 21st century threat to our national security. Those are very difficult issues to face.

But I found that if we had any success it was because as secretary I involved my stakeholders. I wanted to make sure the people impacted by my decision were involved in that process. They may not necessarily have agreed with me, but they were part of the process. And when I made the CARES announcement, they stood with me.

And I'm hopeful, although it's not quite the same, that I can do the same thing here by ensuring that the people do have the data, and they do have opportunity to make their voices heard.

**Q:** There have been some questions raised regarding Adm. Harold Gehman's appointment because of his work with the Virginia group working to protect the bases there. Is that a conflict of interest?

**Principi:** It could present a conflict and it will be one of the important issues our general counsel will have to make. His role will be to advise the chairman and commission members on potential conflicts of interest so that we can take appropriate actions. If there is a bonafide conflict of interest, that commissioner will recuse himself, herself, from issues relating to those bases in that area or state.

I'd rather not answer specifically about a hypothetical, but I can assure you we will have a top-notch ethics lawyer who is going to, on a day-to-day basis, monitor our activities very carefully.

There is no quicker way to undermine the integrity and creditability of the commission's work than to have folks involved in a conflict. So, whether it pertains to myself, or to anyone else, we'll do that.

**Q:** In your testimony before the Armed Services Committee you said one of your goals was to keep the process free of political influence. Can you really keep politics out of it?

**Principi:** Part of being an open process is that you need to hear the view of the elected representatives of the people of that state – the mayor, the county supervisor, the governor. That's important. You need to hear their views.

It's when you make a decision based upon political considerations that it becomes a problem. It's one thing to hear from people. It's another thing when you engage in inappropriate behavior. You know what I mean. When someone says 'I'm pretty close to that governor and therefore I'm going to spare his military base.' That is unacceptable. That is really unacceptable.

I don't think any commissioner would do that, because of some political favor or reciprocal quid pro quo, you do this for me and I'll do that for you. We need to be above that kind of politics. And I'm absolutely convinced that every member of this commission, knowing of their backgrounds, that we will be very, very judicious and cautious in how we proceed.

I had a wonderful meeting with Sen. Joe Lieberman, someone, to me, who is one of the great legislators in this country. And I listened to his concerns. (U.S. Rep.) Rob Simmons, and others. So, the process knows no political ideology to me. If someone needs to talk to me, I'm willing to talk, to listen, to learn. And I hope that throughout that process we'll come out with a more informed decision.

**Q:** Have you decided yet on how many regional hearings will be held, and where? And will there will be visits to each of the bases on the list?

**Principi:** I'd like to say first that that is subject to the consensus of the commission. There will be regional hearings, I don't care how long the list is. And they will be in geographic areas to facilitate attendance. You can't hold hearings in every state, every community. In New England, obviously there needs to be at least one, maybe more regional hearings. I will suggest to the commissioners that we break down into panels so that we can cover as much of the country as possible. It's impossible to send all nine to every regional hearing. But I would like to break it down, if the commissioners agree, so that we can have as many as possible.

When will they start? Sooner rather than later, although I'm not sure. I think one of the things we as a commission have to decide is, is it more important to have all the site visits first before the regional hearings. I'm not sure. But obviously it's going to be, I think, in June when we start the regional hearings.

Again, without knowing how extensive this list is, it is my plan, my intent, to have at least one commissioner visit every base on the list. Certainly with major installations, we'll give them more than one commissioner. We get the list in May, mid-May. We'll probably start with some hearings here in Washington, and then probably, shortly thereafter, maybe the last week of May. Begin the field trips, site visits.

**Q:** The process this year is different than past BRACs, in that it requires seven votes to add a base to the list. Is that a good change?

**Principi:** In order to add a base to the list it requires several things. First, the concurrence of at least seven commissioners to add it, just add it to the list. It then requires at least two commissioners to visit that base. And thirdly, it requires a vote of seven to have it on the final list of recommendations to the president. So there are two votes. One to put it on the list and one to keep it on the list.

But you can remove a base. You don't need seven votes.

**Q:** There is a thought that part of the argument to have a base removed would require replacing it with another base. But given the difficulty of getting seven votes to do that, is it a situation where it becomes almost impossible to get a base removed from the list?

**Principi:** Not necessarily. I don't think that it would necessarily be the case that if you take one off the list you have to put another on the list. I think the commission could find that the data supporting that decision just wasn't there and take it off the list, without having to replace it with something else.

Obviously, (the seven votes) ties the hands of the commission somewhat. No question about that. But I also think we need to be careful, careful about adding bases in that if there is ample justification to add a base, that the data supports that, fine. But that also sends tremendous economic shockwaves through a community that perhaps hasn't been prepared. It's not a reason not to do so, but again I think we need to be mindful of the economic cost to the community of our decisions. And that's a factor the statutes tells us we have to take into consideration. It's secondary to military value, but part of our deliberations.

**Q:** How important is the relationship between a military installation and the defense industry complex? For example, the Groton Submarine Base and Electric Boat where you have the research, development, construction and operators all in one place. If the sub base were to close, there is concern that EB would also leave. Should that be part of the consideration?

**Principi:** I'm sure those arguments have been made to Defense Department officials, those unique aspects, the builders of the boats and the operators. I'm sure it's been explained why that's important. I'm sure it's been taken into consideration in the decision-making process at the Pentagon. I further assume if the base in Connecticut is on the list, those arguments will be made again and it will be given consideration. The military value criteria certainly is broad enough, for that reason, to take into consideration some of the unique assets of a military installation.

The question was asked of me if the criteria of military value was too broad. I think not. I think they needed to be a little bit broader than more specific so that we have the ability to look at these types of factors.

**Q:** A lot has been made about "jointness," the ability to host joint service operations. But not every installation lends itself to that, for example, submarine bases. How much of a factor is that?

**Principi:** It is a factor. The ability to engage in joint fighting, training and exercise capabilities is critically important in a modern day defense environment. That clearly is the focus in the Defense Department today. It's clearly a criteria the commission needs to address. A sub base may be far different than a different type of installation that lends itself more to jointness. For example, joint training of undergraduate pilot training where you can train Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps pilots.

Perhaps in some cases, it doesn't lend itself to that. That may be the case in regards to our nuclear submarine capability and where they're located. I think it's something that needs to be looked at. But jointness is very important.

**Q:** Another of the secondary criteria is environmental issues, and the potential cost of cleaning up installations.

**Principi:** Quite honestly, they should be addressed whether you close a military installation or not. You have people living close by. So if you've got environmental contamination at a military base, whether its slated for closure or not, those environmental considerations should be addressed.

But it is important. You have to do some economic modeling to determine what the true costs are. What's the return on investment so to speak. Again, the law is very clear: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, thou shall look at military value first. Shall look at conformance with force structure plan. Thou shalt also take into consideration the environmental issues, cost of remediation. And we shall do that.

It does become a little more difficult to accurately know what the costs will be. But hopefully we will, no, we will have the staff to assess that.

**Q:** You've just taken a new job with Pfizer as vice president of Governmental Affairs here in Washington. How does your appointment as chairman of the BRAC Commission affect that?

**Principi:** First and foremost, I made a commitment to the president to do this right, and I'm going to do this right.

And Pfizer is a great corporate citizen, and they have been very supportive of me in taking on this very important assignment. So it will take time away from my work here for Pfizer, and I am concerned about that because I don't want to let my colleagues at Pfizer down. This is a great corporation and we face some challenging times. But CEO Hank McKinnell believes in corporate citizenry. He's very civic minded and he told me to go for it.

**Q:** When all is said and done, what do you want hear from people?

**Principi:** That Principi did it right. He was fair, he was open. The commission conducted itself with credibility and integrity. And, was sensitive to impact on the communities.

**Q:** You were highly regarded for your work with the Department of Veterans Affairs. Are you concerned how you will be regarded by some in places were bases get shut down?

**Principi:** No, I'm not worried about it. Sometimes you have to step up to the plate and take on the tough jobs. Not that the VA wasn't tough, but you have to do it. I think people respect you for the way you conduct yourself.

Our role is a little more constrained than what people might believe. We're not putting bases on a list. For the most part, we're receiving a list of bases proposed for closure or to be realigned. Our job is to ensure that the secretary of defense did not substantially deviate from what the law tells him what he can do. So, we can't just pick and choose. We have to be sure that the words "substantially deviate" hasn't been met. And that's a burden that we have to deal with it. We have to meet that standard.

**Q:** There isn't a lot of time before the commission has to file its final recommendations in September. Do you have the time it will take to do this?

**Principi:** It's a sprint. We need to get on our track shoes and forget about sleep for about three and a half months. It's enough time, but it is going to require a lot of work. A lot of long days, but we'll get through it. A lot will depend upon assembling a real top notch staff. I can't stress the importance of getting the right people. This has to be a really smooth-humming machine, everyone working together, pulling together. The commissioners have some difficult decisions to make, and the staff has some heavy lifting to do.

*

Good Morning,

I'm Anthony J. Principi, Chairman of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission, or BRAC. I'm pleased to welcome you to the Commission's first hearing.

In 1780, Abigail Adams, writing to her son John Quincy Adams noted that: "It is not in the still calm of life, or in the repose of a pacific station, that great challenges are formed.....Great necessities call out great virtues"

In accepting the call to service on the 2005 BRAC, the members of this Commission ensured that, for the next few months, our lives will be neither calm nor still, our repose dynamic rather than pacific. We will, of necessity, call out great virtues.

Two weeks from yesterday, the Secretary of Defense will release to the world his proposal to restructuring the base infrastructure of America's armed forces. And our nation: the President, the Congress, the American people, and most importantly, the men and women who defend our freedoms and opportunities will turn to the men and women who embody this Commission to rise to the challenges embodied in those recommendations.

I have been through the process before.

First as a staffer for the Senate Armed Services Committee during one of the earlier BRAC rounds.

And, a year ago, as Secretary of Veterans Affairs when VA identified the means to transform its' medical infrastructure, designed for medicine as it was practiced after World Wars I and II, into a system to provide 21st century veterans with 21st century medicine.

From experience, I can assure you that members of the Commission will face daunting challenges over the next few months:

challenges to our intellects as we grapple with difficult and complex material.

challenges to our energy as we complete an enormous and enormously difficult task in a very short period of time.....

challenges to our personal lives as we travel throughout our land to meet our obligation to provide communities and people with direct input into our deliberations and decisions....

challenges to our emotions as we face our fellow citizens knowing that our decisions will profoundly affect their lives and the future of their communities,

challenges to our self-discipline as we set aside concerns of partisanship and parochialism to debate, decide, and record our findings based only on our assessment of the Defense Department's recommendations against the criteria established by the Congress.

These challenges cloak the burden of great responsibility.

The Congress and the President look to this Commission to provide an unbiased assessment and clear-eyed reality check of DoD's proposals for restructuring the base infrastructure supporting our Armed Forces.

It goes without saying that the ultimate defense of our 229 year experiment in democracy lies in the men and women who wear the

uniform of our Armed Forces..... and that while the resources our Nation commits to our defense are great, those resources *are* limited. In war there are no prizes for second place and our servicemembers can't ensure a first if our Nation doesn't make the most of the limited resources committed to our defense.

Every dollar consumed in redundant, unnecessary, obsolete, inappropriately designed or located infrastructure is a dollar not available to provide the training that might save a Marine's life, purchase the munitions to win a soldier's firefight, or fund the advances necessary to ensure continued dominance of the air or the seas.

At the same time however, decisions on bases are not exercises in sterile cost-accounting.

Without people, uniformed and civilian, bases are nothing but lifeless concrete, asphalt and steel. It is people, not structures or acreage, who bring our bases to life. And those people have human needs, aspirations, and fears.

Open communication with the people in each region.

The words "closure" and "realignment" are easy to write on paper, but they have profound effects on communities ..... and the people who bring those communities to life. The ripples of the proposals the Secretary of Defense will soon present to our Nation, and to us, will be tsunamis in the communities they hit.

The Congress, in authorizing the 2005 BRAC recognized the necessity for cost-effective operation of the Armed Services.

The Congress, in establishing this Commission and in setting forth the standards against which we are charged to measure DoD's proposals, also ensured these decisions would not made in a vacuum ..... and that DoD's proposals, and their rationale and supporting data, would be subject to independent, objective analysis and assessment.

The members of this Commission accepted the challenge, and necessity, of providing that assessment. From that necessity we are pledged to call forth great virtues.

I committed to the Congress, to the President, and to the American people, that our deliberations and decisions would be based on the criteria set forth in statute and devoid of politics,

that we would address any conflicts of interest we may have,

that we would be open, independent, fair and equitable,

that we would ensure a voice for the people affected by DoD's proposals through both site visits and public hearings,

and that we would seek a consensus in our decisions by integrating the views of all members of the Commission.

And, perhaps most challenging of all, that we would adhere to the rigid timeline for completing our deliberations and provide our report to the President by September 8, just over four months from now.

To meet that obligation we will conduct hearings and visit bases and communities into mid-July and can expect to be marking up our report in mid to late August. We *will* present our report to the President by September 8.

Our Commissioners are exceptional, our staff dedicated and able.

But we will need assistance if we are to succeed. This morning's hearing, drawing on the expertise and experience of Dan Else of the Congressional Research Service and Barry Holman of the Government Accountability Office will provide a critical and necessary first step in obtaining that assistance. We look for this morning's witnesses to provide us with a review of the legislation

under which we work, the criteria set forth in law for our deliberations, the lessons learned in previous BRACs, and the issues we can expect to face in 2005.

Before we hear their testimony however I am honored to first introduce and to then swear in the members of the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission.

DCN: 12123

# Schedule of BRAC Commissioners for the Week of May 15, 2005

Sunday, May 15, 2005

Commissioners commence arriving and remain overnight at Hyatt Regency Washington, 400 New Jersey Ave NW, Washington, D.C., 202-737-1234.

Monday, May 16, 2005

1:00 PM Transportation of Commissioners to the Senate Hart Building departs

1:30 PM Hearing at US Senate (Senate Hart 216)
Presentation of Department of Defense BRAC Recommendations and Methodology
Witnesses: Panel One: Secretary of Defense
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff
Panel Two: DoD Officials on Methodology

----- PM Transportation back to the Hyatt

RON: Hyatt Regency Washington, 400 New Jersey Ave NW, Washington, D.C., 202-737-1234

Tuesday, May 17, 2005

9:00 AM Transportation of Commissioners to the Senate Dirksen Building departs

9:30 AM Hearing at the US Senate (Senate Dirksen G50)
Presentation of Recommendations and Methodology – Air Force
Witnesses: Secretary of the Air Force
Chief of Staff
Designated Dept of the Air Force Officials

12:30 AM Lunch as arranged

1:30 PM Hearing at the US Senate (Senate Hart 216)
Presentation of Recommendations and Methodology – Navy
Witnesses: Secretary of the Navy
Chief of Naval Operations
Commandant, Marine Corps
Designated Dept of the Navy and Marine Corps Officials

---- PM Transportation back to the Hyatt

RON: Hyatt Regency Washington, 400 New Jersey Ave NW, Washington, D.C., 202-737-1234

Wednesday, May 18, 2005

9:00 AM Transportation of Commissioners to the Dirksen Building departs

9:30 AM Hearing at the US Senate (Senate Dirksen 106)

DCN: 12123

Presentation of Recommendations and
Methodology – Army
Witnesses: Secretary of the Army
Chief of Staff
Designated Dept of the Army Officials

12:30 PM Lunch as arranged

1:30 PM Hearing at the US Senate (Senate Dirksen 106)
Presentation of Recommendations and
Methodology – DoD's Joint Cross Service Groups
Witnesses: Designated Dept of Defense Officials

----- PM Transportation back to the Hyatt

RON: Hyatt Regency Washington, 400 New Jersey Ave NW, Washington, D.C., 202-737-1234

Thursday, May 19, 2005

9:00 AM Transportation of Commissioners to the Hart Building departs

9:30 AM Hearing at the US Senate (Senate Hart 216)
Presentation of Recommendations and
Methodology – DoD's Joint Cross Service Groups
Witnesses: Designated Dept of Defense Officials

**Following the hearing, there may be an open administrative session during which the base visits plan will be finalized. During the week, staff will be consulting with each of you on this matter.**

---- AM Transportation back to the Hyatt

Discussion Points

Mission-Oriented Management
- What are the goals?
- What is the mission?

Defend the press
Educate the public

Press Strategy
- General Discussion
- Press Management / Messaging
- Rapid Response

Individual opinions
not necessarily representative
of the BRAC process.

Organization
- Internal Structure and Staffing
- Division of Responsibilities
- Outside PR Firm?
- Nature of the Press

Media Training
- Preparation
- Murder Boards
- On Camera / Off Camera

Clipping Service

Correspondence Management

Press Tracking / Clippings
- Daily Press Briefs
- Criticoms / Responses
- Summary Reports

Correspondence Management
- General Public Mail
- Public Official Mail
- Criticoms via Post
- Systems / IT
- Summary Reports

Legislative Affairs

Phone Call Management
- General Inquiries
- Public Official Inquiries
- Criticoms
- Daily Talking Points / Messaging
- Summary Reports

Press Events / Distribution
- Press Conferences
- Ad Hoc Announcements
- Backgrounders
- Daily Message Distribution
- E-Mail?
- Daily Conference Call?

DCN: 12123

— BRAC Commission

- Public relations firm
  - provide weekly report by Region on correspondence received, and the basic items covered, such as:

    Jobs 1000 Goodfellow AFB

    Environment 200

- The BRAC Commission should have final approval authority on all letters prepared to be sent to any inquiring about BRAC.
  - my guess is that about 8 to 10 basic letters should cover over 90% of the inquiries
    - Don't have letter that encourage pen pals
- The majority of the correspondence should be responded to with a short "thank you for your interest" letter indicating that the information will be brought to the attention of the Commission.
- The way it is brought to the attention of the Commission is through the weekly report

## McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk

**From:** Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 04, 2005 5:38 PM
**To:** McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk
**Subject:** RE: Planning Meeting for Base Visits and Regional Hearings

Rob, here is your press guidance:

Until the Commission has had an opportunity to review the list and to hear the testimony of Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld on May 16, it will not comment on the recommendations. Immediately following the May 16 hearing, there will a media availability at which time the Chairman and the Commissioners will respond to queries.

I would like you to prep a release acknowledging that the Commission has received the Secretary's recommendations and that the Chairman has directed the staff to analyze the report and to prepare the Commissioners for the May 16 hearing. Prep a quote for the Chairman to be included based on his opening statement of the May 3rd hearing in which he stated his goals etc. That statement will be your Bible

-----Original Message-----
From: McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2005 2:59 PM
To: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Planning Meeting for Base Visits and Regional Hearings

Done Also, we need to start organizing a plan for a press avail with the commission as a whole prior to the 16th. And, Possibly just the Chairman on Tuesday or which ever day the list is released to confirm that the list was received etc..We can set that up right here at this building or maybe even one of the committee rooms..In addition, I would like to start drafting a press release for confirmation that the list has been received..Is this ok to get started on? Christine, Jenn and I are working on the 16th details as well..and will start drafting that press release as well..

Thanks,
Robert

---

From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2005 2:26 PM
To: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk; McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Planning Meeting for Base Visits and Regional Hearings

There will be a meeting for senior leadership on Friday May 6 at 11 am to formulate a process, timetable and responsibilities for base visits and regional hearings once the list hits the street next week.

Large Conference Room - pls reserve

Rob, pls notify Jenn and Christine Hill.

FROM: SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//PA-PO//

DTG 0311202320Z
SUBJ: Public Affairs Guidance (PAG) - Transformation through Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC 2005)

UNCLASSIFIED//
Note for addressees-please retransmit to your subordinate commands.
1. REFERENCES. Ref. A: SECDEF MSG, DTG 131700Z FEB 03, SUBJ: Public Affairs Guidance (PAG) - Transformation through Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC 2005); Ref. B: P.L. 101-510, as amended; Ref. C: Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) memo on transformation through BRAC, 15 Nov 02. Ref. A. is DoD PAG on BRAC 2005; Ref. B. is the legislation authorizing a BRAC round in 2005. Ref C. is SECDEF's initial directions on BRAC 2005.

2. PURPOSE: This message provides updated PAG for BRAC 2005 and supercedes Ref A.
3. BACKGROUND: The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 authorized DoD to pursue one BRAC round in 2005. SECDEF's 15 Nov 02 memo initiated the complex analysis and decision process that will involve virtually all levels of DoD management, from installation through major command and component/agency headquarters to OSD. All bases will be considered and treated equally. All bases can expect to respond to a comprehensive series of data calls. Ultimately, the SECDEF'S realignment and closure recommendations will be reviewed publicly by an independent commission, the President and Congress.

3.1. Because of the potential impact upon DoD components and local communities, BRAC is a subject of intense interest to all stakeholders. As a one-time authority, realignment and closure decisions will support transformation of DoD. To provide SECDEF, the commission and the President with the optimal set of recommendations, the analytical work and subsequent deliberations must occur free from opinions, internal or external, based on non-certified data and speculation. Accordingly, DoD personnel may not participate, in their official capacities, in activities of any organization that has as its purpose, either directly or indirectly, insulating bases from realignment or closure. Invitations to participate in such organizations should be discussed with appropriate ethics counselors.

4. PUBLIC AFFAIRS POSTURE: Active. Base Realignments And Closures are contentious and controversial. Commanders and their public affairs officers must be prepared to respond to questions and objectively communicate the details of the BRAC process to the public.

5. STATEMENT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. (QUOTE) The Department Of Defense has

received Congressional authorization for a Base Realignment And Closure round in 2005. BRAC is a means to achieve several goals: eliminate excess infrastructure; reshape our military; pursue jointness; optimize military readiness; and realize significant savings in support of transforming the Department of Defense.

At a minimum, BRAC 2005 must eliminate excess physical capacity, the operation, sustainment and recapitalization of which diverts scarce resources from defense capability. However, BRAC 2005 can make an even more profound contribution to transforming the department by rationalizing our infrastructure with defense strategy. BRAC 2005 should be the means by which we reconfigure our current infrastructure into one in which operational capacity maximizes both warfighting capability and efficiency. By creating joint organizational and basing solutions, we will facilitate multi-service missions, reduce waste, save money, and free up resources to recruit quality people, modernize equipment and infrastructure, and develop the capabilities needed to meet 21st Century threats.

What is the end goal of BRAC process?

The Secretary of Defense has directed that the BRAC 2005 process for analyzing DoD installations begin immediately. After gathering information and completing a comprehensive analysis, the Secretary will submit recommendations for realigning or closing bases by May 16, 2005, as required by law. (END QUOTE)

6. Q&As: The following Q&As are provided for response to query only. Questions that cannot be answered within the scope of this guidance will be taken without comment and forwarded with proposed answers to OASD(PA).

Q1: Should communities perceive military construction (MILCON) as an indicator of whether their installations will be realigned or closed?
A1: The presence or absence of funding for military construction is not an indication of military service intentions or future recommendations to the SECDEF under BRAC. The Department funds its military construction based on its current highest priority requirements recognizing that it may make investments in installations that are ultimately selected for closure or realignment.

Q2: Will encroachment issues at military bases factor into the decision-making process?
A2: In accordance with the requirements of the BRAC statute, the department will base all of its recommendations upon approved selection criteria that reflect military value as the primary consideration. The law further requires that the selection criteria address the ability of both existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions and personnel. To the extent that encroachment limits an installation in fulfilling its mission requirements, it will be factored

into military value. The proposed selection criteria must be made available for public review not later than Dec 31, 2003, and finalized by Feb 16, 2004.

Q3: There have been concerns and questions about environmental costs. Will environmental costs be factors in recommending a base for realignment or closure?
A3: In accordance with the requirements of the BRAC statute, the department will base all its recommendations upon approved selection criteria that reflect military value as the primary consideration. The law further requires that the selection criteria address the impact of costs related to environmental restoration as well as waste management and environmental compliance. The proposed selection criteria must be made available for public review not later than Dec 31, 2003 and finalized by Feb 16, 2004.

Q4: What were the closure results of the last four rounds of BRAC (88, 91, 93 AND 95) from the total available to the number selected for BRAC action?
A4: The four prior rounds of BRAC resulted in recommendations to close 97 out of 495 major domestic installations. BRAC 88 - closed 16 major installations; BRAC 91 - closed 26 major installations; BRAC 93 - closed 28 major installations; and BRAC 95 - closed 27 major installations.

Q5: How much has the DoD saved through the previous rounds of closures and realignments?
A5: The four previous rounds produced net savings (cost avoidance) of approximately $16.7 Billion through 2001 and approximately $6.5 Billion annually thereafter. Independent studies have repeatedly verified that savings from BRAC far exceeded costs.

Q6: How much excess capacity does the DoD currently have?
A6: The Department will not know its current excess capacity until the completion of BRAC process. In April 1998, The Department completed a report for Congress that estimated that it retained approximately 20-25% in excess capacity across the department.

Q7: When will the department complete the BRAC analysis and make its recommendations available to the public?
A7: The National Defense Authorization Act for FY02 established the following milestones for the 2005 BRAC round: publish proposed selection criteria for a 30 day comment period by December 31, 2003; publish final selection criteria by February 16, 2004; and submit a report to Congress with the FY05 budget justification along with a comprehensive installation inventory and force structure plan. By May 16, 2005, the Secretary of Defense will forward the recommendations for closure and realignment to the BRAC commission, at which time the information will be available to the public. The BRAC commission must forward its report to the President by

September 8, 2005. The President will have until September 23, 2005, to accept or reject the recommendations on an all or nothing basis and forward the recommendations to Congress. Once the President forwards the recommendations to Congress, Congress will have 45 legislative days to enact a joint resolution rejecting all the recommendations or they become binding on the department.

Q8: Where will funds come from to perform the BRAC analysis/evaluations?
A8: BRAC analysis and evaluations are performed within available resources. They are currently funded by Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds.

Q9: Will near-term future new force-structure bed downs be incorporated into the BRAC 2005 process?
A9: Where the BRAC timeline can accommodate operational imperatives, new force structure bed downs will be incorporated in the BRAC process. Using the BRAC process offers the opportunity to make the most efficient and effective use of the capacity and capabilities of the department.

Q10: If a base is approved for closure or realignment, how long will it take?
A10: Under the BRAC law, actions to close or realign a base must be initiated within two years of the date the President transmits the BRAC commission's recommendations report to Congress, and must be completed within six years of that same date.

Q11: Can bases/communities get an assessment of how they "scored" during the "95 BRAC"?
A11: How an installation "scored" in a previous BRAC round is not indication of how it might "score" during the 2005 BRAC round. In accordance with the BRAC statute, when considering installations for closure or realignment, the department must consider all military installations equally, without regard to whether the installation has been previously considered or proposed for closure or realignment by the department. However, for those interested in historical information, the Office of the Secretary of Defense maintains the documentation used by the previous BRAC Commissions. The records are located at 1745 Jefferson Davis Highway, Crystal Square 4, Suite 105, Arlington, VA. The information is open to the public; however, we ask that individuals call the office, 703-602-3207, before arriving to ensure a government representative is present. There is a copier available.

Q12: How will "jointness" be assessed during this next BRAC?
A12: The BRAC law requires that closure and realignment recommendations be based on published selection criteria that must make military value the primary consideration. The law further provides that military value must include impacts on joint warfighting, readiness and training.

In his November 15, 2002, memorandum, the SECDEF established the goals and priorities for the 2005 BRAC round. A primary objective of BRAC 2005, in addition to realigning our base structure to meet our post-cold war force structure, is to examine and implement opportunities for greater jointness. To reinforce the idea that we should be looking across traditional lines to examine the potential for jointness, the Secretary established an internal BRAC 2005 decision making body that is joint at every level. The Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC), chaired by the Deputy Secretary, and composed of the secretaries of the military departments and their chiefs of services, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and under secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) (USD(AT&L)), will be the policy making and oversight body for the entire BRAC 2005. The subordinate Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG), chaired by the USD(AT&L) and composed of the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the military department assistant secretaries for installations and environment, the service vice chiefs, and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment) (DUSD(I&E)), will oversee joint cross-service analyses of common business oriented functions and ensure the integration of that process with the military department and defense agency specific analyses of all other functions.

Q13: How can communities be involved in BRAC to enhance their support to the base population/mission and their prospects during the BRAC 2005 round?
A13: The Defense Base Closure And Realignment Commission will solicit community input once it has received the Secretary of Defense's base closure and realignment recommendations in May 2005.

Q14: If the final decision is to close or realign the base, with whom will community leaders work in the transition of the base from its current mission to civilian use?
A14: Although an enormously complex undertaking, involving the Department of Defense, other federal agencies, and state and local governments, each military department will have a central point of contact at the closing activity to assist in coordinating the involvement of the various organizations. Additionally, DoD's Office Of Economic Adjustment is chartered to assist local communities with planning for the reuse of closing and realigning installations and in that capacity will provide individual community assistance.

Q15: How will property be disposed of or sold?
A15: The BRAC statute provides the department with a variety of mechanisms for disposing of property at closed or realigned military installations. While we cannot speculate on which mechanism might be used at any given installation, in previous rounds of BRAC, federal real property was made available by public benefit conveyances for airport, education, and homeless

assistance; federal transfers to Native American tribes; economic development conveyances to local redevelopment authorities; and public sales, just to name a few.

Q16: How will you decide reuse of the base?
A16: The Department of Defense does not decide the reuse of former military installations. Once the property is declared surplus to the needs of the federal government, it is the job of the local community, through its designated local redevelopment authority, to plan for the reuse of the surplus property.

Q17: Our base has some environmental contamination. Will the DoD clean it up?
A17: DoD has a continuing obligation to perform environmental cleanup at all of its installations, regardless of whether a base is identified for closure or realignment.

Q18: During the time cleanup is taking place-several years in many cases * will the base property be vacant and unused until all the cleanup is completed?
A18: In previous rounds, from the time of the base's selection for closure, several options were available for property to be used until it was disposed so that communities could begin using base facilities promptly and economic redevelopment could occur. Consistent with public health and safety, once a contractual arrangement was in place, property could be leased or, in certain circumstances, deeded while the property was being environmentally prepared for transfer.

Q19: What comment do you have for communities impacted by closure?
A19: Communities affected by closure and realignment decisions in the last four rounds of BRAC have successfully transitioned to productive economic development. We are committed to working with BRAC 05 communities to duplicate that success.

Q20. There are websites on the internet that indicate that a list of potential base closures already exists. Does DoD maintain a list of bases it wants to close?
A20: No, the department does not maintain a list of bases it wants to close. The BRAC analytical process will not result in departmental closure and realignment recommendations until May 2005.

Q21. How will the realignment of military forces and bases overseas impact BRAC 2005 efforts?
A21. On March 20, 2003, the Secretary directed the development of a comprehensive and integrated presence and basing strategy looking out 10 years. Results of that effort, including rationalizing areas of potential

excesses and identifying the utility of overseas installations, should be available to inform the BRAC 2005 process.

Q22. What is BRAC?
A22. "BRAC" is an acronym that stands for Base Realignment And Closure. It is the process DoD has previously used to reorganize its base structure to more efficiently and effectively support our forces, increase operational readiness and facilitate new ways of doing business. We anticipate that BRAC 2005 will build upon processes used in previous rounds.

Q23. How does BRAC work?
A23. The process is governed by law; specifically, The Defense Base Closure And Realignment Act of 1990.

The process begins with a threat assessment of the future national security environment, followed by the development of a force structure plan and basing requirements to meet these threats.

DoD then applies published selection criteria to determine which installations to recommend for realignment and closure. The Secretary of Defense will publish a report containing the realignment and closure recommendations, forwarding supporting documentation to an independent commission appointed by the president, in consultation with congressional leadership.

The commission has the authority to change the Department's recommendations, if it determines that a recommendation deviated from the force structure plan and/or selection criteria. The commission will hold regional meetings to solicit public input prior to making its recommendations. History has shown that the use of an independent commission and public meetings make the process as open and fair as possible.

The commission forwards its recommendations to the President for review and approval, who then forwards the recommendations to Congress.

Congress has 45 legislative days to act on the commission report on an all-or-none basis. After that time, the commission's realignment and closure recommendations become law. Implementation must start within two years, and actions must be complete within six years.

Q24. What is transformation?
A24. Transformation is shaping the changing nature of military competition and cooperation through new combinations of concepts, capabilities, people and organizations that exploit our nation's advantages, protect our asymmetric vulnerabilities, and sustain our strategic position, which helps maintain peace and stability in the world.

Q25. Why is DoD transforming?
A25. Over time, the defense strategy calls for the transformation of the U.S. defense establishment. Transformation is at the heart of this strategy. To transform DoD, we need to change its culture in many important areas. Our budgeting, acquisition, personnel, and management systems must be able to operate in a world that changes rapidly. Without change, the current defense program will only become more expensive in the future, and DoD will forfeit many of the opportunities available today.

Q26. How is BRAC transformational?
A26. BRAC provides a singular opportunity to reshape our infrastructure to optimize military readiness. The 2005 BRAC process will help find innovative ways to consolidate, realign, or find alternative uses for current facilities to ensure that the U.S. continues to field the best-prepared and best-equipped military in the world.

BRAC will also enable the U.S. military to better match facilities to forces, meet the threats and challenges of a new century, and make the wisest use of limited defense dollars.

Q27. How many bases and installations will be closed?
A27. It's too early to say, but there are no specific numbers or "targets." Using specific selection criteria that emphasize military value, DoD must complete a comprehensive review before it can determine which installations should be realigned or closed. In 2005, an independent commission will review the Secretary of Defense's recommendations, hold public hearings, visit various sites, and ultimately send its recommendations to the President.

Q28. How much has been saved through previous BRAC rounds?
A28. The four previous BRAC rounds have eliminated approximately 20 percent of DoD's capacity that existed in 1988 and, through 2001, produced net savings of approximately $16.7 Billion, which includes the cost of environmental clean-up. Recurring savings beyond 2001 are approximately $6.6 Billion annually. In independent studies conducted over previous years, both the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office have consistently supported the department's view that realigning and closing unneeded military installations produces savings that far exceed costs.

Q29. What's the timeline for this BRAC round?
A29. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 established the following milestones for the 2005 BRAC round: publish proposed selection criteria for a 30-day comment period by Dec. 31, 2003; publish final selection criteria by Feb. 16, 2004; submit a report to

congress with the FY 2005 budget justification on the following points: a force structure plan, based on an assessment of probable threats to the national security over the next 20 years; the probable end strength levels and military force units needed to meet those threats; the anticipated levels of available funding; a comprehensive inventory of military installations worldwide; a description of infrastructure necessary to support the force structure; discussion of excess capacity categories; economic analysis of the effect of realignments and closures to reduce excess infrastructure; and SECDEF certification of the need for BRAC, and that annual net savings would result by 2011.

SECDEF forwards recommendations for realignments and closures to the BRAC commission by May 16, 2005; the commission forwards its report on the recommendations to the President by Sept. 8, 2005. The President will have until Sept. 23, 2005 to accept or reject the recommendations in their entirety. If accepted, Congress will have 45 legislative days to act on the recommendations.

Q30. Which bases will be looked at in this round?
A30. All military installations within the continental United States and its territories (under the control of the federal government) will be examined as part of this process. This includes labs, medical, training, guard, reserve, air stations, leased facilities, etc.

Q31. Isn't BRAC just another example of budget priorities driving national security planning?
A31. Absolutely not. The legislation is quite clear that military value is the primary consideration. The Secretary's guidance to the military departments emphasizes that BRAC 2005 will make a profound contribution to transforming the department by bringing our infrastructure in line with defense strategy.

Q32. How will the commission be selected, and who will serve?
A32. The BRAC legislation specifies the selection process for commissioners. The President is required to consult with the congressional leadership on nominations to serve on the commission.

Q33. How have local communities affected by base closures fared overall?
A33. Base Realignments And Closures CAUSE near-term social and economic disruption. However, there are many success stories from previous closures.

For example, at Charleston Naval Base, S.C., the local community, assisted by DoD, was able to create approximately 4,500 new jobs. Approximately 90 private, state and federal entities are currently reusing the former naval base.

Since the closure of Mather Air Force Base, Calif., more than 54 leases have been generated at the new Mather Field Complex. Its prime location and one of the country's longest runways have made it an active air cargo hub for California's central valley and the Sacramento region. Additionally, the former base now employs nearly 3,700 personnel with its high-technical businesses, manufacturing operations, educational centers, government agencies, and recreational facilities.

At the former Fort Devens, Mass., more than 3,000 new jobs have been generated and 2.7 million square feet of new construction has occurred, with 68 different employers on site, redevelopment ranges from small business incubators to the Gillette Corp., which occupies a large warehouse/distribution center and manufacturing plant.

A base closure can actually be an economic opportunity, especially when all elements of a community work together.

Q34. Will local commanders and others in their official capacities be available to help us in our task forces or other efforts to influence BRAC decisions with regard to our base?
A34. DoD officials may attend meetings in a liaison or representational capacity with state and local officials, or other organizations that may seek to develop plans or programs to improve the ability of installations to discharge their national security and defense missions. DoD officials may not manage or control such organizations or efforts.

In their official capacity, DoD personnel may not participate in the activities of any organization that has as its purpose, either directly or indirectly, insulating DoD bases from closure or realignment. This guidance is aimed at ensuring the fairness and rigor of the BRAC process.

Q35. Is the list of closures and realignments on the g2mil.com website the official position of the Department Of Defense?
A35. No. It is a privately operated website with no ties to or support from DoD.

7. TALKING POINTS:

7.1. Both Congress and DoD recognize military value must be the primary consideration in reducing or restructuring U.S. military bases.
7.2. The 2005 BRAC process will help find innovative ways to consolidate, realign, or find alternative uses for current facilities.
7.3. All military installations will be reviewed, and all recommendations will be based on approved, published selection criteria and a future force structure plan.
7.4. Through the BRAC process, we will ensure that the United States continues to field the best prepared and best equipped military in the world.

DCN: 12123

UNCLAS
PRECEDENCE TO: ROUTINE DTG: 312136Z MAR 05
PRECEDENCE CC: ROUTINE
TYPE: DMS SIGNED/ENCRYPTED
FROM PLA: SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//PA-PO//
FROM D/N: C:US,O:U.S. Government,OU:DoD,OU:OSD,OU:ORGANIZATIONS, L:WASHINGTON DC,OU:ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(uc),OU:DOD PRESS OFFICE(uc)

SUBJECT: Public Affairs Guidance BRAC 2005

UNCLASSIFIED//

*1. References.*
1.1. SECDEF MSG, DTG 052323Z JAN 04, SUBJ: Supplemental (PAG) - Transformation through Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC 2005). This message specifically addressed matters related to the BRAC 2005 data call announced on 6 January 2004.
1.2. SECDEF MSG, DTG 202320Z NOV 03, SUBJ: Public Affairs Guidance (PAG) - Transformation through Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC 2005)
1.3. Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L) memo Policy Memorandum Two BRAC 2005 Military Value Principles
1.4. Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L) memo Policy Memorandum One BRAC 2005 Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures
1.5. Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) memo on transformation through BRAC, 15 Nov 02. This is SECDEF's initial direction on BRAC 2005.
1.6. BRAC 2205 Final Selection Criteria; published in the Federal Register 12 February 2004, Vol. 69, No. 29, pages 6948-6952.
1.7. Authorizing Legislation; Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 as Amended Through FY05 Authorization Act Sections 2901-2914.

*2. Background and Purpose.* This message provides updated PAG for BRAC 2005 and supercedes Refs 1.1 and 1.2. Additional guidance will be provided as required.
2.1. The National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2002 authorized DoD to pursue one BRAC round in 2005. Ref 1.4. initiated the complex analysis and decision process that will involve virtually all levels of DoD management, from installation through major command and component/agency headquarters to OSD. All bases are being considered and will be treated equally. Ultimately, the independent BRAC Commission, the President, and Congress will review the SECDEF S realignment and closure recommendations publicly.
2.2. Because of the impact on the military departments and local communities, BRAC is a subject of intense interest to all stakeholders. As a one-time authority, realignment and closure decisions of BRAC 2005 will support DoD transformation. Analytical work and subsequent deliberations must occur free from opinions, internal or external, based on non-certified data and speculation in

order to provide the SECDEF, the commission, and the President with the optimal set of recommendations. Accordingly, DoD personnel may not participate, in their official capacities, in activities of any organization that has as its purpose, either directly or indirectly, insulating bases from realignment or closure. Invitations to participate in such organizations should be discussed with appropriate ethics counselors.

*3. Public Affairs Policy:* Active. Base Realignments and Closures can be contentious and controversial for internal and external audiences. Commanders and their public affairs officers must be prepared to respond to questions and objectively communicate the details of the BRAC process to the public.

3.1. Media Coverage. It is important to note that media events or media coverage of elected officials visits to bases and installations is not authorized. If elected officials request tours and briefings from installation commands, it must be done within the limits defined in paragraph 3.4. below. However, press conferences, media availabilities or traveling media are not authorized on installations.

3.2. Media Opportunities. Local PAOs may suggest appropriate off-base opportunities vs. holding events on DoD property. Each installation shall ensure that service and DoD restrictions regarding potential media coverage of security and force protection measures at gates or entry points are enforced.

3.3. Community Queries. Local communities have an extraordinary interest in the BRAC process and, consistent with the Department's need for internal deliberation, should receive timely access to data that can be made public as the BRAC analytical process unfolds. Timely and consistent information from all DoD elements will minimize confusion and foster trust. PAOs may continue to release the same type and amount of information on their installations as they currently do, but may not release, in whole or in part, data calls/information requested under BRAC. It is important to note that local commanders are not in a position to evaluate the entire mission requirements and cross-service implications of their individual functions as they may affect DoD. Furthermore, local commanders are not in a position to answer questions requiring them to speculate and/or discuss BRAC issues that are subject to internal DoD deliberation. While information normally provided to the public may continue to be provided, even if it is the subject of a BRAC data call, its relationship to BRAC is not releasable.

3.4. Participation In Official Capacity. DoD personnel may not participate in activities of any organization that has as its purpose, either directly or indirectly, insulating bases from realignment or closure. This guidance is aimed at ensuring the fairness and rigor of the BRAC deliberative process. Invitations to participate in such organizations should be discussed with appropriate ethics counselors. In a liaison or representational role, DoD officials may attend meetings with state and local officials, or other organizations that may seek to develop plans or programs to improve the ability of installations to discharge their national security and defense missions. DoD officials may not manage or control such organizations or efforts.

3.5. Many influential former officials and retired general/flag officers will be involved with many organizations attempting to insulate bases from realignment or closure. They are allowed to participate in this manner and regardless of their participation, the organizations are not allowed any greater or lesser information/access.

***4. Key Messages and Talking Points:***

4.1. Key Messages:

4.1.1. BRAC 2005 will allow DoD to realign our base structure to meet our post-Cold War force structure.

4.1.2. A primary objective of BRAC 2005 is to examine and implement opportunities for greater joint activity.

4.1.3. We are confident that the BRAC 2005 recommendations will advance transformation, combat effectiveness, and the efficient use of the taxpayer s money.

4.2. Key Talking Points:

4.2.1. Military value ~~must~~ will be the primary consideration for the Commission in ~~reducing or~~ seeking which military facilities will be closed ~~restructuring U.S. military bases.~~

4.2.2. The 2005 BRAC process will help find innovative ways to consolidate, realign, or find alternative uses for current facilities.

4.2.3. All military installations are being reviewed, and all recommendations will be based on approved, published selection criteria and a future force structure plan.

4.2.4. The BRAC 2005 process will ensure that the United States continues to have the best-trained and equipped military in the world.

4.2.5. BRAC 2005 will enable the U.S. military to match facilities to forces, meet the threats and challenges of a new century, and make the wisest use of limited defense dollars.

4.2.6. BRAC 2005 will facilitate multi-service missions by creating joint organizational and basing solutions that will not only reduce waste but maximize military effectiveness.

4.2.7. Consolidating facilities will save billions, allowing the department to focus funds on maintaining and modernizing facilities needed to better support our forces, recruit quality personnel, modernize equipment and infrastructure, and develop the capabilities needed to meet 21st Century threats.

***5. Contingency and Public Statements:***

5.1. Contingency Statement. Not applicable at this time.

5.2. Public Statement.

5.2.1. The Department Of Defense has received Congressional authorization for a Base Realignment And Closure round in 2005. BRAC is a means to achieve several important goals: eliminate excess infrastructure; reshape our military; pursue jointness; optimize military readiness; and realize significant savings in support of transforming the Department of Defense.

5.2.2. At a minimum, BRAC 2005 must eliminate excess physical capacity, the operation, sustainment and recapitalization of which diverts scarce resources

capacity v. capability.

from defense capability. However, BRAC 2005 can make an even more profound contribution to transforming the Department by more closely aligning our infrastructure with defense strategy BRAC 2005 should be the means by which we reconfigure our current infrastructure into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency. By creating joint organizational and basing solutions, we will facilitate multi-service missions, reduce waste, save money, and free up resources to recruit quality people, modernize equipment and infrastructure, and develop the capabilities needed to meet 21st Century threats.

5.2.3. After gathering information and completing a comprehensive analysis, the Secretary will submit recommendations for realigning or closing bases by May 16, 2005, as required by law.

The BRAC Commission will objectively review the DoD recommendations independently and make final recommendations for the President and Congress.

*6. Questions and Answers*:

6.1. General.

Q1. What is BRAC?

A1. "BRAC" is an acronym that stands for Base Realignment And Closure. It is the congressionally authorized process DoD has previously used to reorganize its base structure to more efficiently and effectively support our forces, increase operational readiness and facilitate new ways of doing business. ~~It is important to note that the original legislation actually states that the title of the process is Base Closure and Realignment.~~

Q2. How does BRAC work?

A2. The process begins with a threat assessment of the future national security environment, followed by the development of a force structure plan and basing requirements to meet these threats. DoD then applies published selection criteria to determine which installations to recommend for realignment and closure. The Secretary of Defense will publish a report containing the realignment and closure recommendations, forwarding supporting documentation to an independent commission appointed by the president, in consultation with congressional leadership.

Q3. Which bases will be looked at in this round?

A3. All military installations within the United States and its territories (under the control of the U.S. federal government) will be examined as part of this process. This includes labs, medical, training, guard, reserve, air stations, leased facilities, etc.

Q4. Is BRAC just another example of budget priorities driving national security planning?

A4. Absolutely not. The legislation is quite clear that military value is the primary consideration. The Secretary's guidance to the military departments emphasizes that BRAC 2005 will make a profound contribution to transforming the department by bringing our infrastructure in line with defense strategy.

Q5. Will local commanders and others in their official capacities be available to help task forces or other efforts to influence BRAC decisions with regard to our base?
A5. DoD officials may attend meetings in a liaison or representational capacity with state and local officials, or other organizations that may seek to develop plans or programs to improve the ability of installations to discharge their national security and defense missions. DoD officials may not manage or control such organizations or efforts. (See paragraph 3.4 for additional clarification.)

Q6. There are websites on the Internet that indicate that a list of potential base closures already exists. Is there a final list of DoD installations slated for realignment or closure. (Specifically, do lists posted on websites such as g2mil.com represent the official position of the Department Of Defense?)
A6. No. The DoD official recommendation will not be posted until May 2005, and then it will be posted on the Defense Department s official site. www.defenselink.mil

Q7. Does DoD maintain a list of bases it wants to close?
A7. No, the department does not maintain a list of bases it wants to close. The BRAC analytical process will not result in departmental closure and realignment recommendations until May 2005.

Q8. Will encroachment issues at military bases factor into the decision-making process?
A8. In accordance with the requirements of the BRAC statute, the department will base all of its recommendations upon approved selection criteria that reflect military value as the primary consideration. The law further requires that the selection criteria address the ability of both existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions and personnel. To the extent that encroachment limits an installation in fulfilling its mission requirements, it will be factored into military value. The proposed selection criteria were published in the Federal Register in February 2004. (Ref. 1.6.)

Q9. Will environmental costs be factors in recommending a base for realignment or closure?
A9. In accordance with the requirements of the BRAC statute, the department will base all its recommendations upon approved selection criteria that reflect military value as the primary consideration. The law further requires that the selection criteria address the impact of costs related to environmental restoration as well as waste management and environmental compliance.

Q10. Where do funds come from to perform the BRAC analysis/evaluations?
A10. BRAC analysis and evaluations are performed within available resources. They are currently funded by Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds.



DCN: 12123

Q11. Will near-term future new force-structure changes be incorporated into the BRAC 2005 process?
A11. Where the BRAC timeline can accommodate operational imperatives, new force structure bed downs will be incorporated in the BRAC process. Using the BRAC process offers the opportunity to make the most efficient and effective use of the capacity and capabilities of the department.

Q12. How will "jointness" be assessed during BRAC2005?
A12. The BRAC law requires that closure and realignment recommendations be based on published selection criteria that must make military value the primary consideration. The law further provides that military value must include impacts on joint war fighting, readiness and training.

Q13. Are there any specific priorities for BRAC 2005?
A13. In his November 15, 2002, memorandum, the SECDEF established the goals and priorities for the 2005 BRAC round. A primary objective of BRAC 2005, in addition to realigning our base structure to meet our post-cold war force structure, is to examine and implement opportunities for greater jointness. To reinforce the idea that we should be looking across traditional lines to examine the potential for jointness, the Secretary established an internal BRAC 2005 decision making body that is joint at every level.

Q14. How will the realignment of military forces and bases overseas impact BRAC 2005 efforts?
A14. On March 20, 2003, the Secretary directed the development of a comprehensive and integrated presence and basing strategy looking out 10 years. Results of that effort, including rationalizing areas of potential excesses and identifying the utility of overseas installations will be included in the analytical portions of the BRAC 2005 process.

Q15. The Secretary of Defense has placed emphasis on transforming the Department of Defense. What is transformation?
A15. Transformation is shaping the changing nature of military competition and cooperation through new combinations of concepts, capabilities, people and organizations that exploit our nation's advantages, protect our asymmetric vulnerabilities, and sustain our strategic position, which helps maintain peace and stability in the world.

Q16. Why is DoD transforming?
A16. Over time, the defense strategy calls for the transformation of the U.S. defense establishment. Transformation is at the heart of this strategy. To transform DoD, we need to change its culture in many important areas. Our budgeting, acquisition, personnel, and management systems must be able to operate in a world that changes rapidly. Without change, the current defense program will only become more expensive in the future, and DoD will forfeit many of the opportunities available today.

Q17. How is BRAC transformational?
A17. BRAC provides a singular opportunity to reshape our infrastructure to optimize military readiness. The 2005 BRAC process will help find innovative ways to consolidate, realign, or find alternative uses for current facilities to ensure that the U.S. continues to field the best-prepared and best-equipped military in the world. BRAC 2005 will also enable the U.S. military to better match facilities to forces, meet the threats and challenges of a new century, and make the wisest use of limited defense dollars.

Q18. How many bases and installations will be closed?
A18. There are no specific numbers or "targets." Using specific selection criteria that emphasize military value, DoD must complete a comprehensive review before it can determine which installations should be realigned or closed. The commission will review the Secretary of Defense's recommendations, hold public hearings, visit various sites, and ultimately send its recommendations to the President.

Q19. Should communities perceive military construction (MILCON) as an indicator of whether their installations will be realigned or closed?
A19. The presence or absence of funding for military construction is not an indication of military service intentions or future recommendations to the SECDEF under BRAC. The Department funds its military construction based on its current highest priority requirements recognizing that it may make investments in installations that are ultimately selected for closure or realignment.

Q20. How much excess capacity does the DoD currently have?
A20. The March 2004 DoD Report Required by Section 2912 of the Defense Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended through the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 estimates that the Department possesses, in aggregate, 24 percent excess installation capacity. Moreover, in preparing the list of realignment and closure recommendations in May 2005, the Department will conduct a thorough review of its existing infrastructure in accordance with the law and DoD BRAC 2005 guiding procedures, ensuring that all military installations are treated equally and evaluated on their continuting military value to our nation.

6.2. Key Groups and People.

Q21. What is the BRAC 2005 Commission?
A21. The commission is an independent commission; responsible for reviewing the Secretary s recommendations for BRAC 2005. BRAC legislation specified the selection process for commissioners. The President was required to consult with the congressional leadership on nominations to serve on the commission.

Q22. Who was selected as the Chairman of the BRAC 2005 Commission?
A22. Anthony J. Principi has been nominated by the President to serve as the chairman of the commission. Secretary Principi has had a distinguished career in the public and private sectors and recently served as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. He is a 1967 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., saw active duty aboard the destroyer USS Joseph P. Kennedy, and later commanded a River Patrol Unit in Vietnam's Mekong Delta. Mr. Principi earned his law degree from Seton Hall University in 1975 and was assigned to the Navy's Judge Advocate General Corps in San Diego, Calif. In 1980, he was transferred to Washington as a legislative counsel for the Department of the Navy.

Q23. Who are the members of the BRAC 2005 Commission?
A23. On March 15th, 2005 President George W. Bush announced the nomination of eight individuals to be Members of the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission:
James H. Bilbray of Nevada, Philip Coyle of California, Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.) of Virginia, James V. Hansen of Utah, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.) of Florida. Lieutenant General Claude M. Kicklighter, USA (Ret.) of Georgia, Samuel Knox Skinner of Illinois, and Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.) of Texas.

Q24. Who is James H. Bilbray?
A24. Former Congressman Bilbray was a member of the Foreign Affairs, Armed Services and Intelligence Committees. He served in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1955 to 1963.

Q25. Who is Philip Coyle?
A25. Mr. Coyle is a Senior Advisor to the Center for Defense Information. He served as Assistant Secretary of Defense and Director of Operational Test and Evaluation at the Department of Defense.

Q26. Who is Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.)?
A26. Admiral Gehman served on active duty in the U.S. Navy for over 35 years. His last assignment was as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic and as the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Joint Forces Command.

Q27. Who is James V. Hansen?
A27. Former Congressman Hansen was a member of the Armed Services Committee. He served in the U.S. Navy from 1951 to 1955.

Q28. Who is General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.)?
A28. General Hill served in the U.S. Army for 36 years. His last assignment was as Combatant Commander of the U.S. Southern Command.

Q29. Who is Lieutenant General Claude M. Kicklighter, USA (Ret.)?
A29. General Kicklighter is the Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning at the Department of Veterans Affairs. He served in the U.S. Army for nearly 36 years.

Q30. Who is Samuel Knox Skinner?
A30. Mr. Skinner served as Chief of Staff and as Secretary of Transportation for President George H. W. Bush. He served in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1960 to 1968.

Q31. Who is Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)?
A31. General Turner is a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission. She served in the U.S. Air Force for 30 years, most recently as the director of nursing services in the Office of the Air Force Surgeon General at Bolling Air Force Base.

Q32. What authority does the commission have?
A32. The commission has the authority to change the Department's recommendations, if it determines that a recommendation deviated from the force structure plan and/or selection criteria. The commission will hold regional meetings to solicit public input prior to making its recommendations. History has shown that the use of an independent commission and public meetings make the process as open and fair as possible.

Q33. What happens to the commission's recommendations?
A33. The commission forwards its recommendations to the President for review and approval, who then forwards the recommendations to Congress. Congress has 45 legislative days to act on the commission report on an all-or-none basis. After that time, the commission's realignment and closure recommendations become law. Implementation must start within two years, and actions must be complete within six years.

Q34. Who has oversight of the BRAC process within DoD?
A34. The Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC), chaired by the Deputy Secretary, and composed of the secretaries of the military departments and their chiefs of services, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and under secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) (USD(AT&L)) has policy making and oversight body for the entire BRAC 2005.

Q35. Who will assess the joint use aspect of BRAC 2005?
A35. The Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG), chaired by the USD(AT&L) will oversee joint cross-service analyses of common business oriented functions and ensure the integration of that process with the military department and defense agency specific analyses of all other functions. The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the military department assistant secretaries for installations and environment, the service vice chiefs, and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment) (DUSD(I&E)) will form the ISG.

6.3. Timeline, Process, Sequence of Events.

Q36. What is the timeline of events for BRAC 2005?
A36. The National Defense Authorization Act for FY02 established the following milestones for BRAC 2005:
- November 15, 2002; Secretary of Defense memorandum, Subj: Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure
- April 16, 2003; the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics) published a memorandum, Subj: Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC 2005) Policy Memorandum One Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures
- December 23, 2003; DoD published proposed selection criteria for a 30-day comment period (comments were due by 28 January 2004).
- January 6, 2004; DoD announced an initial data call to installation commanders.
- March 23, 2004; DoD submitted report entitled Report Required by Section 2912 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended through the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003
- October 14, 2004; the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics) published a memorandum, Subj: Policy Memorandum Two BRAC 2005 Military Value Principles
- January 4, 2005; the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics) published a memorandum, Subj: 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Selection Criteria
- March 15, 2005; the President submitted the names of his nominations to the BRAC 2005 Commission to Congress.

Q37. What events are upcoming in the BRAC 2005 process?
A37. There are several significant events taking place throughout the remainder of 2005.
- By May 16, 2005; the Secretary of Defense will forward the recommendations for closure and realignment to the independent BRAC commission, at which time the information will be available to the public.
- By September 8, 2005; the BRAC commission must forward its report to the President
- By September 23, 2005; The President will accept or reject the recommendations on an all or nothing basis and forward the recommendations to Congress.
- Once the President forwards the recommendations to Congress, Congress will have 45 legislative days to enact a joint resolution rejecting all the recommendations or they become binding on the department.

6.4. Past BRAC Rounds.

Q38. What were the closure results of the last four rounds of BRAC (88, 91, 93 AND 95) from the total available to the number selected for BRAC action?

A38. The four prior rounds of BRAC resulted in recommendations to close 97 out of 495 major domestic installations. BRAC 88 - closed 16 major installations; BRAC 91 - closed 26 major installations; BRAC 93 - closed 28 major installations; and BRAC 95 - closed 27 major installations.

Q39. How much has been saved through previous BRAC rounds?
A39. The four previous BRAC rounds have eliminated approximately 20 percent of DoD's capacity that existed in 1988 and, through 2001, produced net savings of approximately $16.7 Billion, which includes the cost of environmental clean-up. Recurring savings beyond 2001 are approximately $6.6 Billion annually. In independent studies conducted over previous years, both the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office have consistently supported the department's view that realigning and closing unneeded military installations produces savings that far exceed costs.

Q40. How have local communities affected by base closures fared overall?
A40. Base Realignments and Closures cause near-term social and economic disruption. However, there are many success stories from previous closures. A base closure can actually be an economic opportunity, especially when all elements of a community work together. While each closure or realignment has different consequences and/or results, some recent examples include:
(1) Charleston Naval Base, S.C. -- The local community, assisted by DoD, was able to create approximately 4,500 new jobs. Approximately 90 private, state and federal entities are currently reusing the former naval base.
(2) Mather Air Force Base, Calif. -- More than 54 leases have been generated at the new Mather Field Complex. Its prime location and one of the country's longest runways have made it an active air cargo hub for California's central valley and the Sacramento region. Additionally, the former base now employs nearly 3,700 personnel with its high-technical businesses, manufacturing operations, educational centers, government agencies, and recreational facilities.
(3) Fort Devens, Mass. -- More than 3,000 new jobs have been generated and 2.7 million square feet of new construction has occurred. With 68 different employers on site, redevelopment ranges from small business incubators to the Gillette Corp., which occupies a large warehouse/distribution center and manufacturing plant.

Q41. Can bases/communities get an assessment of how they "scored" during the "95 BRAC?
A41. How an installation "scored" in a previous BRAC round is not indication of how it might "score" during the 2005 BRAC round. In accordance with the BRAC statute, when considering installations for closure or realignment, the department must consider all military installations equally, without regard to whether the installation has been previously considered or proposed for closure or realignment by the department.

Q42. Is the historical information available to the general public?
A42. The Office of the Secretary of Defense maintains the documentation used by the previous BRAC Commissions. While a lot of the information is maintained on DoD websites, the actual records are located at 1745 Jefferson Davis Highway, Crystal Square 4, Suite 105, Arlington, VA. The information is open to the public; however, due to security requirements for building access, we ask that individuals call the office, 703-602-3207, before arriving to ensure a government representative is present. There is a copier available.

6.5. Questions anticipated for post announcement.

Q43. How can communities get involved in BRAC to enhance their support to the base population/mission and their prospects during the BRAC 2005 round?
A43. The Defense Base Closure And Realignment Commission will solicit community input once it has received the Secretary of Defense's base closure and realignment recommendations in May 2005.

Q44. If a base is approved for closure or realignment, how long will it take?
A44. Under the BRAC law, actions to close or realign a base must be initiated within two years of the date the President transmits the BRAC commission's recommendations report to Congress, and must be completed within six years of that same date.

Q45. What comment do you have for communities impacted by closure?
A45. Communities affected by closure and realignment decisions in the last four rounds of BRAC have successfully transitioned to productive economic development. We are committed to working with BRAC 05 communities to duplicate that success.

Q46. During the time cleanup is taking place -- several years in many cases -- will the base property be vacant and unused until all the cleanup is completed?
A46. In previous rounds, from the time of the base's selection for closure, several options were available for property to be used until it was disposed so that communities could begin using base facilities promptly and economic redevelopment could occur. Consistent with public health and safety, once a contractual arrangement was in place, property could be leased or, in certain circumstances, deeded while the property was being environmentally prepared for transfer.

7. Miscellaneous Information.

7.1. Command Relationships.
7.1.1. OASD(PA) has developed this BRAC 2005 PAG in coordination with DUSD (I&E). Local commanders and their PAOs are encouraged to respond to questions within the scope of this PAG. Questions that cannot be answered

within the scope of this guidance will be taken without comment and forwarded with proposed answers to OASD(PA).

7.1.2. To protect the integrity of the BRAC 2005 process and to ensure that consistent and accurate information is provided, OSD, the military departments, and participating defense agencies will respond to community and Congressional inquiries with information that has been approved for public release. Unauthorized discussion, dissemination of information or speculation regarding BRAC matters by DoD personnel and contractors is prohibited.

7.1.3. The Office of Economic Assistance is Department of Defense's primary source for assisting communities that are adversely impacted by Defense program changes, including base closures or realignments, base expansions, and contract or program cancellations. To assist affected communities, OEA manages and directs the Defense Economic Adjustment Program, and coordinates the involvement of other Federal Agencies.

7.2. Media Information Centers. Not applicable.

7.3. Media Coverage. See paragraph 3.1. above.

7.4. Media Opportunities. See paragraph 3.2. above.

7.5 DoD National Media Pool. Not applicable.

7.6. Internal Media and Audiovisual Coverage. It is imperative that commanders and PAOs at all levels maximize internal communications opportunities to keep personnel informed about the BRAC 2005 process. OSD Public Affairs will support this effort through utilization of The Pentagon Channel (on line at www.thepentagonchannel.mil ) and the American Forces Press Service.

7.7. Online Information Sources. Public information about the current BRAC process and past experience with prior BRAC rounds is available through several key DoD web sites

7.7.1. The primary BRAC 2005 website is located at www.defenselink.mil/brac . Contents include the text of the current Defense Base Closure Act, the reports of the Secretaries of Defense and the Defense Base Closure And Realignment Commissions in prior BRAC rounds, General Accounting Office reports on the status of bases realigned and closed in prior rounds, and information on assistance available to communities with bases that have been realigned or closed. DoD personnel are encouraged to refer the media, community representatives, and other interested parties to this public web site for further information about what has happened in prior rounds and the process for BRAC 2005. Additional public information related to BRAC 2005 will become available and posted to the website as the process proceeds.

7.7.2. A second important website is maintained by DoD s Office of Economic Assistance, or DoD OEA. That site is located at www.oea.gov . This site is particularly useful for local communities.

8. Points of Contact. Please note that this information is not intended for media referrals. Individuals needing to refer a member of the media to the following organizations shall contact the POC first, and determine the recommended public/media contact information. OASD/PA POC is Mr. Glenn Flood, cmcl 703-695-6294, DSN 225-6294, email glenn.flood@osd.mil ; Army Public Affairs POC is MAJ Desiree Wineland, 703.899.3774, desiree.wineland@hqda.army.mil ,

Navy Public Affairs POC is LT Christine Ventresca, 703.697.5342. email christine.ventresca@navy.mil ; Air Force Public Affairs POC is Ms. Shirley Curry, 703.693.9091, Shirley.curry@pentagon.af.mil ; Marine Corps Public Affairs POC is Major Nathaniel Fahy, 703.614.6092, FahyNG@hq.usmc.mil .

End.

==========
==
ORIGINAL TO RECIPIENTS:
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:OSD,OU:ADDRESS LISTS,CN:AL 8777(UC)
[AIG 8777]
ORIGINAL CC RECIPIENTS:
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:OSD,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:WASHINGTON DC,OU:ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(UC)
[SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//PA//]
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:OSD,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:WASHINGTON DC,OU:ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(UC),OU:DOD PRESS OFFICE(UC)
[SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//PA-PO//]
PROFILED DISSEMINEES:
PTC WASHINGTON DC @ OSDNTS(UC) (TO)
DMSFORMAR@PTSC.PENTAGON.MIL (CC)
AUTODINATL.DUSDENVS@OSD.MIL (CC)
DMS.PA.V3@OSD.MIL (CC)
GENERALPROFILES@OSD.MIL (CC)
DA ID: 1526132
MTSID: c=US;a=DMS;p=GOV+DMS+NIPR;l=AVTAYZ05-050331213836Z-41547
SIGNED BY: /C=US/O=U.S. Government/OU=DoD/OU=OSD/OU=ORGANIZATIONS/L=WASHINGTON DC/OU=ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(uc)/OU=DOD PRESS OFFICE(uc) *** VALIDATED ***
ENCRYPTED BY: /C=US/O=U.S. Government/OU=DoD/OU=OSD/OU=ORGANIZATIONS/L=WASHINGTON DC/OU=ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(uc)/OU=DOD PRESS OFFICE(uc) *** VALIDATED ***
MESSAGE TYPE: OTHERORG
OTHER TO RECIPIENTS:
AIG 8777 @ AL 8777(uc)
UNCLAS
-- AIG8777-L is the e-mail counterpart to the AIG 8777 message group
-- Send feedback/comments/questions to AIG8777-L-request@DTIC.MIL

DCN: 12123

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION,
TECHNOLOGY
AND LOGISTICS

JAN 4 2005

MEMORANDUM FOR INFRASTRUCTURE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEMBERS
INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING GROUP MEMBERS
JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUP CHAIRMAN

Subject: 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Selection Criteria

The Ronald Reagan National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2005, Public Law 108-375, amended the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, Public Law 101-510, to specify the selection criteria. Specifically, the amendment revised the criteria previously published by the Secretary of Defense by adding the word "surge" to criterion three. The amendment also revised the wording, but not the meaning, of criteria one and seven, to avoid the use of the possessive.

The Department shall use the attached 2005 Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Selection Criteria, along with the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory, to make recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States, as defined in the base closure statute. This direction supersedes any previous direction regarding selection criteria for the BRAC 2005 process. The 2005 BRAC Commission will also use these criteria in their review of the Department of Defense's final recommendations.

Michael W. Wynne
Acting USD (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics)
Chairman, Infrastructure Steering Group

Attachment:
As stated

**Final Selection Criteria**
**Department of Defense Base Closure and Realignment**

In selecting military installations for closure or realignment, the Department of Defense, giving priority consideration tot military value (the first four criteria below), will consider:

*Military Value*

1. The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the total force of the Department of Defense, including the impact on joint warfighting, training, and readiness.

2. The availability and condition of land, facilities, and associated airspace (including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions) at both existing and potential receiving locations.

3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, surge, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations and training.

4. The cost of operations and the manpower implications.

***Other Considerations***

5. The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.

6. The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.

7. The ability of the infrastructure of both the existing and potential receiving communities to support forces, missions, and personnel.

8. The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities.

DCN:


THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

3010 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-3010

ACQUISITION, TECHNOLOGY AND LOGISTICS


OCT 14 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR SECRETARIES OF THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS
CHAIRMEN, JOINT CROSS-SERVICE GROUPS

SUBJECT: Policy Memorandum Two--BRAC 2005 Military Value Principles

The Department has determined that the most appropriate way to ensure that military value is the primary consideration in making closure and realignment recommendations is to determine military value through the exercise of military judgment built upon a quantitative analytical foundation. The quantitative analytical foundation is built by the Joint Cross-Service Groups and Military Departments applying the BRAC selection criteria to rank the facilities for which they have responsibility. The exercise of military judgment occurs through the application of principles. Limited in number and written broadly, the principles enumerate the essential elements of military judgment. The Military Departments and the Joint Cross-Service Groups shall use the attached principles when applying military judgment in their deliberative processes.

Primary consideration = mil. value, ensured by quantitative analytical foundation of judgement.

Michael W. Wynne
Acting USD (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics)
Chairman, Infrastructure Steering Group

Attachment:
As Stated

# BRAC Principles

**Recruit and Train:** The Department must attract, develop, and retain active, reserve, civilian, and contractor personnel who are highly skilled and educated and have access to effective, diverse, and sustainable training space in order to ensure current and future readiness, to support advances in technology, and to respond to anticipated developments in joint and service doctrine and tactics.

**Quality of Life:** The Department must provide a quality of life, including quality of work place that supports recruitment, learning, and training, and enhances retention.

**Organize:** The Department needs force structure sized, composed, and located to match the demands of the National Military Strategy, effectively and efficiently supported by properly aligned headquarters and other DoD organizations, and that takes advantage of opportunities for joint basing.

**Equip:** The Department needs research, development, acquisition, test, and evaluation capabilities that efficiently and effectively place superior technology in the hands of the warfighter to meet current and future threats and facilitate knowledge-enabled and net-centric warfare.

**Supply, Service, and Maintain:** The Department needs access to logistical and industrial infrastructure capabilities optimally integrated into a skilled and cost efficient national industrial base that provides agile and responsive global support to operational forces.

**Deploy & Employ (Operational):** The Department needs secure installations that are optimally located for mission accomplishment (including homeland defense), that support power projection, rapid deployable capabilities, and expeditionary force needs for reach-back capability, that sustain the capability to mobilize and surge, and that ensure strategic redundancy.

**Intelligence:** The Department needs intelligence capabilities to support the National Military Strategy by delivering predictive analysis, warning of impending crises, providing persistent surveillance of our most critical targets, and achieving horizontal integration of networks and databases.

DCN: 12123

Audrey - DoD Talking Points and Qs & As. (See pp. 3-24). Jim 5/9

UNCLAS
PRECEDENCE TO: ROUTINE DTG: 312136Z MAR 05
PRECEDENCE CC: ROUTINE
TYPE: DMS SIGNED/ENCRYPTED
FROM PLA: SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//PA-PO//
FROM D/N: C:US,O:U.S. Government,OU:DoD,OU:OSD,OU:ORGANIZATIONS, L:WASHINGTON DC,OU:ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(uc),OU:DOD PRESS OFFICE(uc)

## SUBJECT: Public Affairs Guidance BRAC 2005

UNCLASSIFIED//

*1. References.*
1.1. SECDEF MSG, DTG 052323Z JAN 04, SUBJ: Supplemental (PAG) - Transformation through Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC 2005). This message specifically addressed matters related to the BRAC 2005 data call announced on 6 January 2004.
1.2. SECDEF MSG, DTG 202320Z NOV 03, SUBJ: Public Affairs Guidance (PAG) - Transformation through Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC 2005)
1.3. Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L) memo Policy Memorandum Two BRAC 2005 Military Value Principles
1.4. Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L) memo Policy Memorandum One BRAC 2005 Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures
1.5. Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) memo on transformation through BRAC, 15 Nov 02. This is SECDEF's initial direction on BRAC 2005.
1.6. BRAC 2205 Final Selection Criteria; published in the Federal Register 12 February 2004, Vol. 69. No. 29, pages 6948-6952.
1.7. Authorizing Legislation; Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 as Amended Through FY05 Authorization Act Sections 2901-2914.

*2. Background and Purpose.* This message provides updated PAG for BRAC 2005 and supercedes Refs 1.1 and 1.2. Additional guidance will be provided as required.
2.1. The National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2002 authorized DoD to pursue one BRAC round in 2005. Ref 1.4. initiated the complex analysis and decision process that will involve virtually all levels of DoD management, from installation through major command and component/agency headquarters to OSD. All bases are being considered and will be treated equally. Ultimately, the independent BRAC Commission, the President, and Congress will review the SECDEF S realignment and closure recommendations publicly.
2.2. Because of the impact on the military departments and local communities, BRAC is a subject of intense interest to all stakeholders. As a one-time authority, realignment and closure decisions of BRAC 2005 will support DoD transformation. Analytical work and subsequent deliberations must occur free from opinions, internal or external, based on non-certified data and speculation in

order to provide the SECDEF, the commission, and the President with the optimal set of recommendations. Accordingly, DoD personnel may not participate, in their official capacities, in activities of any organization that has as its purpose, either directly or indirectly, insulating bases from realignment or closure. Invitations to participate in such organizations should be discussed with appropriate ethics counselors.

*3. Public Affairs Policy:* Active. Base Realignments and Closures can be contentious and controversial for internal and external audiences. Commanders and their public affairs officers must be prepared to respond to questions and objectively communicate the details of the BRAC process to the public.

3.1. Media Coverage. It is important to note that media events or media coverage of elected officials visits to bases and installations is not authorized. If elected officials request tours and briefings from installation commands, it must be done within the limits defined in paragraph 3.4. below. However, press conferences, media availabilities or traveling media are not authorized on installations.

3.2. Media Opportunities. Local PAOs may suggest appropriate off-base opportunities vs. holding events on DoD property. Each installation shall ensure that service and DoD restrictions regarding potential media coverage of security and force protection measures at gates or entry points are enforced.

3.3. Community Queries. Local communities have an extraordinary interest in the BRAC process and, consistent with the Department's need for internal deliberation, should receive timely access to data that can be made public as the BRAC analytical process unfolds. Timely and consistent information from all DoD elements will minimize confusion and foster trust. PAOs may continue to release the same type and amount of information on their installations as they currently do, but may not release, in whole or in part, data calls/information requested under BRAC. It is important to note that local commanders are not in a position to evaluate the entire mission requirements and cross-service implications of their individual functions as they may affect DoD. Furthermore, local commanders are not in a position to answer questions requiring them to speculate and/or discuss BRAC issues that are subject to internal DoD deliberation. While information normally provided to the public may continue to be provided, even if it is the subject of a BRAC data call, its relationship to BRAC is not releasable.

3.4. Participation In Official Capacity. DoD personnel may not participate in activities of any organization that has as its purpose, either directly or indirectly, insulating bases from realignment or closure. This guidance is aimed at ensuring the fairness and rigor of the BRAC deliberative process. Invitations to participate in such organizations should be discussed with appropriate ethics counselors. In a liaison or representational role, DoD officials may attend meetings with state and local officials, or other organizations that may seek to develop plans or programs to improve the ability of installations to discharge their national security and defense missions. DoD officials may not manage or control such organizations or efforts.

3.5. Many influential former officials and retired general/flag officers will be involved with many organizations attempting to insulate bases from realignment or closure. They are allowed to participate in this manner and regardless of their participation, the organizations are not allowed any greater or lesser information/access.

***4. Key Messages and Talking Points:***

4.1. Key Messages:

4.1.1. BRAC 2005 will allow DoD to realign our base structure to meet our post-Cold War force structure.

4.1.2. A primary objective of BRAC 2005 is to examine and implement opportunities for greater joint activity.

4.1.3. We are confident that the BRAC 2005 recommendations will advance transformation, combat effectiveness, and the efficient use of the taxpayer s money.

4.2. Key Talking Points:

4.2.1. Military value ~~must~~ will be the primary consideration for the Commission in ~~reducing or~~ deciding which military facilities will be closed or restructured ~~U.S. military bases.~~

4.2.2. The 2005 BRAC process will help find innovative ways to consolidate, realign, or find alternative uses for current facilities.

4.2.3. All military installations are being reviewed, and all recommendations will be based on approved, published selection criteria and a future force structure plan.

4.2.4. The BRAC 2005 process will ensure that the United States continues to have the best-trained and equipped military in the world.

4.2.5. BRAC 2005 will enable the U.S. military to match facilities to forces, meet the threats and challenges of a new century, and make the wisest use of limited defense dollars.

4.2.6. BRAC 2005 will facilitate multi-service missions by creating joint organizational and basing solutions that will not only reduce waste but maximize military effectiveness.

4.2.7. Consolidating facilities will save billions, allowing the department to focus funds on maintaining and modernizing facilities needed to better support our forces, recruit quality personnel, modernize equipment and infrastructure, and develop the capabilities needed to meet 21st Century threats.

***5. Contingency and Public Statements***:

5.1. Contingency Statement. Not applicable at this time.

5.2. Public Statement.

5.2.1. The Department Of Defense has received Congressional authorization for a Base Realignment And Closure round in 2005. BRAC is a means to achieve several important goals: eliminate excess infrastructure; reshape our military; pursue jointness; optimize military readiness; and realize significant savings in support of transforming the Department of Defense.

5.2.2. At a minimum, BRAC 2005 must eliminate excess physical capacity, the operation, sustainment and recapitalization of which diverts scarce resources

from defense capability. However, BRAC 2005 can make an even more profound contribution to transforming the Department by more closely aligning our infrastructure with defense strategy. BRAC 2005 should be the means by which we reconfigure our current infrastructure into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency. By creating joint organizational and basing solutions, we will facilitate multi-service missions, reduce waste, save money, and free up resources to recruit quality people, modernize equipment and infrastructure, and develop the capabilities needed to meet 21st Century threats.

5.2.3. After gathering information and completing a comprehensive analysis, the Secretary will submit recommendations for realigning or closing bases by May 16, 2005, as required by law.

The BRAC Commission will objectively review the DoD recommendations independently and make final recommendations for the President and Congress.

*6. Questions and Answers*:

6.1. General.

Q1. What is BRAC?

A1. "BRAC" is an acronym that stands for Base Realignment And Closure. It is the congressionally authorized process DoD has previously used to reorganize its base structure to more efficiently and effectively support our forces, increase operational readiness and facilitate new ways of doing business. ~~It is important to note that the original legislation actually states that the title of the process is Base Closure and Realignment.~~

Q2. How does BRAC work?

A2. The process begins with a threat assessment of the future national security environment, followed by the development of a force structure plan and basing requirements to meet these threats. DoD then applies published selection criteria to determine which installations to recommend for realignment and closure. The Secretary of Defense will publish a report containing the realignment and closure recommendations, forwarding supporting documentation to an independent commission appointed by the president, in consultation with congressional leadership.

Q3. Which bases will be looked at in this round?

A3. All military installations within the United States and its territories (under the control of the U.S. federal government) will be examined as part of this process. This includes labs, medical, training, guard, reserve, air stations, leased facilities, etc.

Q4. Is BRAC just another example of budget priorities driving national security planning?

A4. Absolutely not. The legislation is quite clear that military value is the primary consideration. The Secretary's guidance to the military departments emphasizes that BRAC 2005 will make a profound contribution to transforming the department by bringing our infrastructure in line with defense strategy.

Q5. Will local commanders and others in their official capacities be available to help task forces or other efforts to influence BRAC decisions with regard to our base?
A5. DoD officials may attend meetings in a liaison or representational capacity with state and local officials, or other organizations that may seek to develop plans or programs to improve the ability of installations to discharge their national security and defense missions. DoD officials may not manage or control such organizations or efforts. (See paragraph 3.4 for additional clarification.)

Q6. There are websites on the Internet that indicate that a list of potential base closures already exists. Is there a final list of DoD installations slated for realignment or closure. (Specifically, do lists posted on websites such as g2mil.com represent the official position of the Department Of Defense?)
A6. No. The DoD official recommendation will not be posted until May 2005, and then it will be posted on the Defense Department s official site. www.defenselink.mil

Q7. Does DoD maintain a list of bases it wants to close?
A7. No, the department does not maintain a list of bases it wants to close. The BRAC analytical process will not result in departmental closure and realignment recommendations until May 2005.

Q8. Will encroachment issues at military bases factor into the decision-making process?
A8. In accordance with the requirements of the BRAC statute, the department will base all of its recommendations upon approved selection criteria that reflect military value as the primary consideration. The law further requires that the selection criteria address the ability of both existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions and personnel. To the extent that encroachment limits an installation in fulfilling its mission requirements, it will be factored into military value. The proposed selection criteria were published in the Federal Register in February 2004. (Ref. 1.6.)

Q9. Will environmental costs be factors in recommending a base for realignment or closure?
A9. In accordance with the requirements of the BRAC statute, the department will base all its recommendations upon approved selection criteria that reflect military value as the primary consideration. The law further requires that the selection criteria address the impact of costs related to environmental restoration as well as waste management and environmental compliance.

Q10. Where do funds come from to perform the BRAC analysis/evaluations?
A10. BRAC analysis and evaluations are performed within available resources. They are currently funded by Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds.

Q11. Will near-term future new force-structure changes be incorporated into the BRAC 2005 process?
A11. Where the BRAC timeline can accommodate operational imperatives, new force structure bed downs will be incorporated in the BRAC process. Using the BRAC process offers the opportunity to make the most efficient and effective use of the capacity and capabilities of the department.

Q12. How will "jointness" be assessed during BRAC2005?
A12. The BRAC law requires that closure and realignment recommendations be based on published selection criteria that must make military value the primary consideration. The law further provides that military value must include impacts on joint war fighting, readiness and training.

Q13. Are there any specific priorities for BRAC 2005?
A13. In his November 15, 2002, memorandum, the SECDEF established the goals and priorities for the 2005 BRAC round. A primary objective of BRAC 2005, in addition to realigning our base structure to meet our post-cold war force structure, is to examine and implement opportunities for greater jointness. To reinforce the idea that we should be looking across traditional lines to examine the potential for jointness, the Secretary established an internal BRAC 2005 decision making body that is joint at every level.

Q14. How will the realignment of military forces and bases overseas impact BRAC 2005 efforts?
A14. On March 20, 2003, the Secretary directed the development of a comprehensive and integrated presence and basing strategy looking out 10 years. Results of that effort, including rationalizing areas of potential excesses and identifying the utility of overseas installations will be included in the analytical portions of the BRAC 2005 process.

Q15. The Secretary of Defense has placed emphasis on transforming the Department of Defense. What is transformation?
A15. Transformation is shaping the changing nature of military competition and cooperation through new combinations of concepts, capabilities, people and organizations that exploit our nation's advantages, protect our asymmetric vulnerabilities, and sustain our strategic position, which helps maintain peace and stability in the world.

Q16. Why is DoD transforming?
A16. Over time, the defense strategy calls for the transformation of the U.S. defense establishment. Transformation is at the heart of this strategy. To transform DoD, we need to change its culture in many important areas. Our budgeting, acquisition, personnel, and management systems must be able to operate in a world that changes rapidly. Without change, the current defense program will only become more expensive in the future, and DoD will forfeit many of the opportunities available today.

Q17. How is BRAC transformational?
A17. BRAC provides a singular opportunity to reshape our infrastructure to optimize military readiness. The 2005 BRAC process will help find innovative ways to consolidate, realign, or find alternative uses for current facilities to ensure that the U.S. continues to field the best-prepared and best-equipped military in the world. BRAC 2005 will also enable the U.S. military to better match facilities to forces, meet the threats and challenges of a new century, and make the wisest use of limited defense dollars.

Q18. How many bases and installations will be closed?
A18. There are no specific numbers or "targets." Using specific selection criteria that emphasize military value, DoD must complete a comprehensive review before it can determine which installations should be realigned or closed. The commission will review the Secretary of Defense's recommendations, hold public hearings, visit various sites, and ultimately send its recommendations to the President.

Q19. Should communities perceive military construction (MILCON) as an indicator of whether their installations will be realigned or closed?
A19. The presence or absence of funding for military construction is not an indication of military service intentions or future recommendations to the SECDEF under BRAC. The Department funds its military construction based on its current highest priority requirements recognizing that it may make investments in installations that are ultimately selected for closure or realignment.

Q20. How much excess capacity does the DoD currently have?
A20. The March 2004 DoD Report Required by Section 2912 of the Defense Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended through the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003 estimates that the Department possesses, in aggregate, 24 percent excess installation capacity. Moreover, in preparing the list of realignment and closure recommendations in May 2005, the Department will conduct a thorough review of its existing infrastructure in accordance with the law and DoD BRAC 2005 guiding procedures, ensuring that all military installations are treated equally and evaluated on their continuting military value to our nation.

6.2. Key Groups and People.

Q21. What is the BRAC 2005 Commission?
A21. The commission is an independent commission; responsible for reviewing the Secretary s recommendations for BRAC 2005. BRAC legislation specified the selection process for commissioners. The President was required to consult with the congressional leadership on nominations to serve on the commission.

Q22. Who was selected as the Chairman of the BRAC 2005 Commission?
A22. Anthony J. Principi has been nominated by the President to serve as the chairman of the commission. Secretary Principi has had a distinguished career in the public and private sectors and recently served as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. He is a 1967 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., saw active duty aboard the destroyer USS Joseph P. Kennedy, and later commanded a River Patrol Unit in Vietnam's Mekong Delta. Mr. Principi earned his law degree from Seton Hall University in 1975 and was assigned to the Navy's Judge Advocate General Corps in San Diego, Calif. In 1980, he was transferred to Washington as a legislative counsel for the Department of the Navy.

Q23. Who are the members of the BRAC 2005 Commission?
A23. On March 15th, 2005 President George W. Bush announced the nomination of eight individuals to be Members of the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission:
James H. Bilbray of Nevada, Philip Coyle of California, Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.) of Virginia, James V. Hansen of Utah, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.) of Florida. Lieutenant General Claude M. Kicklighter, USA (Ret.) of Georgia, Samuel Knox Skinner of Illinois, and Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.) of Texas.

Q24. Who is James H. Bilbray?
A24. Former Congressman Bilbray was a member of the Foreign Affairs, Armed Services and Intelligence Committees. He served in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1955 to 1963.

Q25. Who is Philip Coyle?
A25. Mr. Coyle is a Senior Advisor to the Center for Defense Information. He served as Assistant Secretary of Defense and Director of Operational Test and Evaluation at the Department of Defense.

Q26. Who is Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.)?
A26. Admiral Gehman served on active duty in the U.S. Navy for over 35 years. His last assignment was as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic and as the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Joint Forces Command.

Q27. Who is James V. Hansen?
A27. Former Congressman Hansen was a member of the Armed Services Committee. He served in the U.S. Navy from 1951 to 1955.

Q28. Who is General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.)?
A28. General Hill served in the U.S. Army for 36 years. His last assignment was as Combatant Commander of the U.S. Southern Command.

Commissioners

Q29. Who is Lieutenant General Claude M. Kicklighter, USA (Ret.)?
A29. General Kicklighter is the Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning at the Department of Veterans Affairs. He served in the U.S. Army for nearly 36 years.

Q30. Who is Samuel Knox Skinner?
A30. Mr. Skinner served as Chief of Staff and as Secretary of Transportation for President George H. W. Bush. He served in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1960 to 1968.

Q31. Who is Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)?
A31. General Turner is a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission. She served in the U.S. Air Force for 30 years, most recently as the director of nursing services in the Office of the Air Force Surgeon General at Bolling Air Force Base.

Q32. What authority does the commission have?
A32. The commission has the authority to change the Department's recommendations, if it determines that a recommendation deviated from the force structure plan and/or selection criteria. The commission will hold regional meetings to solicit public input prior to making its recommendations. History has shown that the use of an independent commission and public meetings make the process as open and fair as possible.

Q33. What happens to the commission's recommendations?
A33. The commission forwards its recommendations to the President for review and approval, who then forwards the recommendations to Congress. Congress has 45 legislative days to act on the commission report on an all-or-none basis. After that time, the commission's realignment and closure recommendations become law. Implementation must start within two years, and actions must be complete within six years.

Q34. Who has oversight of the BRAC process within DoD?
A34. The Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC), chaired by the Deputy Secretary, and composed of the secretaries of the military departments and their chiefs of services, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and under secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) (USD(AT&L)) has policy making and oversight body for the entire BRAC 2005.

Q35. Who will assess the joint use aspect of BRAC 2005?
A35. The Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG), chaired by the USD(AT&L) will oversee joint cross-service analyses of common business oriented functions and ensure the integration of that process with the military department and defense agency specific analyses of all other functions. The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the military department assistant secretaries for installations and environment, the service vice chiefs, and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment) (DUSD(I&E)) will form the ISG.

6.3. Timeline, Process, Sequence of Events.

Q36. What is the timeline of events for BRAC 2005?
A36. The National Defense Authorization Act for FY02 established the following milestones for BRAC 2005:

- November 15, 2002; Secretary of Defense memorandum, Subj: Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure
- April 16, 2003; the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics) published a memorandum, Subj: Transformation Through Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC 2005) Policy Memorandum One Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures
- December 23, 2003; DoD published proposed selection criteria for a 30-day comment period (comments were due by 28 January 2004).
- January 6, 2004; DoD announced an initial data call to installation commanders.
- March 23, 2004; DoD submitted report entitled Report Required by Section 2912 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended through the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003
- October 14, 2004; the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics) published a memorandum, Subj: Policy Memorandum Two BRAC 2005 Military Value Principles
- January 4, 2005; the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology & Logistics) published a memorandum, Subj: 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Selection Criteria
- March 15, 2005; the President submitted the names of his nominations to the BRAC 2005 Commission to Congress.

Q37. What events are upcoming in the BRAC 2005 process?
A37. There are several significant events taking place throughout the remainder of 2005.

timeline

- By May 16, 2005; the Secretary of Defense will forward the recommendations for closure and realignment to the independent BRAC commission, at which time the information will be available to the public.
- By September 8, 2005; the BRAC commission must forward its report to the President
- By September 23, 2005; The President will accept or reject the recommendations on an all or nothing basis and forward the recommendations to Congress.
- Once the President forwards the recommendations to Congress, Congress will have 45 legislative days to enact a joint resolution rejecting all the recommendations or they become binding on the department.

6.4. Past BRAC Rounds.

Q38. What were the closure results of the last four rounds of BRAC (88, 91, 93 AND 95) from the total available to the number selected for BRAC action?

A38. The four prior rounds of BRAC resulted in recommendations to close 97 out of 495 major domestic installations. BRAC 88 - closed 16 major installations; BRAC 91 - closed 26 major installations; BRAC 93 - closed 28 major installations; and BRAC 95 - closed 27 major installations.

Q39. How much has been saved through previous BRAC rounds?
A39. The four previous BRAC rounds have eliminated approximately 20 percent of DoD's capacity that existed in 1988 and, through 2001, produced net savings of approximately $16.7 Billion, which includes the cost of environmental clean-up. Recurring savings beyond 2001 are approximately $6.6 Billion annually. In independent studies conducted over previous years, both the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office have consistently supported the department's view that realigning and closing unneeded military installations produces savings that far exceed costs.

Q40. How have local communities affected by base closures fared overall?
A40. Base Realignments and Closures cause near-term social and economic disruption. However, there are many success stories from previous closures. A base closure can actually be an economic opportunity, especially when all elements of a community work together. While each closure or realignment has different consequences and/or results, some recent examples include:
(1) Charleston Naval Base, S.C. -- The local community, assisted by DoD, was able to create approximately 4,500 new jobs. Approximately 90 private, state and federal entities are currently reusing the former naval base.
(2) Mather Air Force Base, Calif. -- More than 54 leases have been generated at the new Mather Field Complex. Its prime location and one of the country's longest runways have made it an active air cargo hub for California's central valley and the Sacramento region. Additionally, the former base now employs nearly 3,700 personnel with its high-technical businesses, manufacturing operations, educational centers, government agencies, and recreational facilities.
(3) Fort Devens, Mass. -- More than 3,000 new jobs have been generated and 2.7 million square feet of new construction has occurred. With 68 different employers on site, redevelopment ranges from small business incubators to the Gillette Corp., which occupies a large warehouse/distribution center and manufacturing plant.

Q41. Can bases/communities get an assessment of how they "scored" during the "95 BRAC?
A41. How an installation "scored" in a previous BRAC round is not indication of how it might "score" during the 2005 BRAC round. In accordance with the BRAC statute, when considering installations for closure or realignment, the department must consider all military installations equally, without regard to whether the installation has been previously considered or proposed for closure or realignment by the department.

Q42. Is the historical information available to the general public?
A42. The Office of the Secretary of Defense maintains the documentation used by the previous BRAC Commissions. While a lot of the information is maintained on DoD websites, the actual records are located at 1745 Jefferson Davis Highway, Crystal Square 4, Suite 105, Arlington, VA. The information is open to the public; however, due to security requirements for building access, we ask that individuals call the office, 703-602-3207, before arriving to ensure a government representative is present. There is a copier available.

6.5. Questions anticipated for post announcement.

Q43. How can communities get involved in BRAC to enhance their support to the base population/mission and their prospects during the BRAC 2005 round?
A43. The Defense Base Closure And Realignment Commission will solicit community input once it has received the Secretary of Defense's base closure and realignment recommendations in May 2005.

Q44. If a base is approved for closure or realignment, how long will it take?
A44. Under the BRAC law, actions to close or realign a base must be initiated within two years of the date the President transmits the BRAC commission's recommendations report to Congress, and must be completed within six years of that same date.

Q45. What comment do you have for communities impacted by closure?
A45. Communities affected by closure and realignment decisions in the last four rounds of BRAC have successfully transitioned to productive economic development. We are committed to working with BRAC 05 communities to duplicate that success.

Q46. During the time cleanup is taking place -- several years in many cases -- will the base property be vacant and unused until all the cleanup is completed?
A46. In previous rounds, from the time of the base's selection for closure, several options were available for property to be used until it was disposed so that communities could begin using base facilities promptly and economic redevelopment could occur. Consistent with public health and safety, once a contractual arrangement was in place, property could be leased or, in certain circumstances, deeded while the property was being environmentally prepared for transfer.

7. Miscellaneous Information.

7.1. Command Relationships.
7.1.1. OASD(PA) has developed this BRAC 2005 PAG in coordination with DUSD (I&E). Local commanders and their PAOs are encouraged to respond to questions within the scope of this PAG. Questions that cannot be answered

within the scope of this guidance will be taken without comment and forwarded with proposed answers to OASD(PA).

7.1.2. To protect the integrity of the BRAC 2005 process and to ensure that consistent and accurate information is provided, OSD, the military departments, and participating defense agencies will respond to community and Congressional inquiries with information that has been approved for public release. Unauthorized discussion, dissemination of information or speculation regarding BRAC matters by DoD personnel and contractors is prohibited.

7.1.3. The Office of Economic Assistance is Department of Defense's primary source for assisting communities that are adversely impacted by Defense program changes, including base closures or realignments, base expansions, and contract or program cancellations. To assist affected communities, OEA manages and directs the Defense Economic Adjustment Program, and coordinates the involvement of other Federal Agencies.

7.2. Media Information Centers. Not applicable.

7.3. Media Coverage. See paragraph 3.1. above.

7.4. Media Opportunities. See paragraph 3.2. above.

7.5 DoD National Media Pool. Not applicable.

7.6. Internal Media and Audiovisual Coverage. It is imperative that commanders and PAOs at all levels maximize internal communications opportunities to keep personnel informed about the BRAC 2005 process. OSD Public Affairs will support this effort through utilization of The Pentagon Channel (on line at www.thepentagonchannel.mil ) and the American Forces Press Service.

7.7. Online Information Sources. Public information about the current BRAC process and past experience with prior BRAC rounds is available through several key DoD web sites

7.7.1. The primary BRAC 2005 website is located at www.defenselink.mil/brac . Contents include the text of the current Defense Base Closure Act, the reports of the Secretaries of Defense and the Defense Base Closure And Realignment Commissions in prior BRAC rounds, General Accounting Office reports on the status of bases realigned and closed in prior rounds, and information on assistance available to communities with bases that have been realigned or closed. DoD personnel are encouraged to refer the media, community representatives, and other interested parties to this public web site for further information about what has happened in prior rounds and the process for BRAC 2005. Additional public information related to BRAC 2005 will become available and posted to the website as the process proceeds.

7.7.2. A second important website is maintained by DoD s Office of Economic Assistance, or DoD OEA. That site is located at www.oea.gov . This site is particularly useful for local communities.

8. Points of Contact. Please note that this information is not intended for media referrals. Individuals needing to refer a member of the media to the following organizations shall contact the POC first, and determine the recommended public/media contact information. OASD/PA POC is Mr. Glenn Flood, cmcl 703-695-6294, DSN 225-6294, email glenn.flood@osd.mil ; Army Public Affairs POC is MAJ Desiree Wineland, 703.899.3774, desiree.wineland@hqda.army.mil ,

Navy Public Affairs POC is LT Christine Ventresca, 703.697.5342. email christine.ventresca@navy.mil ; Air Force Public Affairs POC is Ms. Shirley Curry, 703.693.9091, Shirley.curry@pentagon.af.mil ; Marine Corps Public Affairs POC is Major Nathaniel Fahy, 703.614.6092, FahyNG@hq.usmc.mil .

End.

==========
==
ORIGINAL TO RECIPIENTS:
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:OSD,OU:ADDRESS LISTS,CN:AL 8777(UC)
[AIG 8777]
ORIGINAL CC RECIPIENTS:
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:OSD,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:WASHINGTON DC,OU:ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(UC)
[SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//PA//]
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:OSD,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:WASHINGTON DC,OU:ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(UC),OU:DOD PRESS OFFICE(UC)
[SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//PA-PO//]
PROFILED DISSEMINEES:
PTC WASHINGTON DC @ OSDNTS(UC) (TO)
DMSFORMAR@PTSC.PENTAGON.MIL (CC)
AUTODINATL.DUSDENVS@OSD.MIL (CC)
DMS.PA.V3@OSD.MIL (CC)
GENERALPROFILES@OSD.MIL (CC)
DA ID: 1526132
MTSID: c=US;a=DMS;p=GOV+DMS+NIPR;l=AVTAYZ05-050331213836Z-41547
SIGNED BY: /C=US/O=U.S. Government/OU=DoD/OU=OSD/OU=ORGANIZATIONS/L=WASHINGTON DC/OU=ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(uc)/OU=DOD PRESS OFFICE(uc) *** VALIDATED ***
ENCRYPTED BY: /C=US/O=U.S. Government/OU=DoD/OU=OSD/OU=ORGANIZATIONS/L=WASHINGTON DC/OU=ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(uc)/OU=DOD PRESS OFFICE(uc) *** VALIDATED ***
MESSAGE TYPE: OTHERORG
OTHER TO RECIPIENTS:
AIG 8777 @ AL 8777(uc)
UNCLAS
-- AIG8777-L is the e-mail counterpart to the AIG 8777 message group
-- Send feedback/comments/questions to AIG8777-L-request@DTIC.MIL

FROM: SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//PA-PO//

DTG 0311202320Z
SUBJ: Public Affairs Guidance (PAG) - Transformation through Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC 2005)

UNCLASSIFIED//
Note for addressees-please retransmit to your subordinate commands.
1. REFERENCES. Ref. A: SECDEF MSG, DTG 131700Z FEB 03, SUBJ: Public Affairs Guidance (PAG) - Transformation through Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC 2005); Ref. B: P.L. 101-510, as amended; Ref. C: Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) memo on transformation through BRAC, 15 Nov 02. Ref. A. is DoD PAG on BRAC 2005; Ref. B. is the legislation authorizing a BRAC round in 2005. Ref C. is SECDEF's initial directions on BRAC 2005.

2. PURPOSE: This message provides updated PAG for BRAC 2005 and supercedes Ref A.
3. BACKGROUND: The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 authorized DoD to pursue one BRAC round in 2005. SECDEF's 15 Nov 02 memo initiated the complex analysis and decision process that will involve virtually all levels of DoD management, from installation through major command and component/agency headquarters to OSD. All bases will be considered and treated equally. All bases can expect to respond to a comprehensive series of data calls. Ultimately, the SECDEF'S realignment and closure recommendations will be reviewed publicly by an independent commission, the President and Congress.

3.1. Because of the potential impact upon DoD components and local communities, BRAC is a subject of intense interest to all stakeholders. As a one-time authority, realignment and closure decisions will support transformation of DoD. To provide SECDEF, the commission and the President with the optimal set of recommendations, the analytical work and subsequent deliberations must occur free from opinions, internal or external, based on non-certified data and speculation. Accordingly, DoD personnel may not participate, in their official capacities, in activities of any organization that has as its purpose, either directly or indirectly, insulating bases from realignment or closure. Invitations to participate in such organizations should be discussed with appropriate ethics counselors.

4. PUBLIC AFFAIRS POSTURE: Active. Base Realignments And Closures are contentious and controversial. Commanders and their public affairs officers must be prepared to respond to questions and objectively communicate the details of the BRAC process to the public.

5. STATEMENT FOR PUBLIC RELEASE. (QUOTE) The Department Of Defense has

received Congressional authorization for a Base Realignment And Closure round in 2005. BRAC is a means to achieve several goals: eliminate excess infrastructure; reshape our military; pursue jointness; optimize military readiness; and realize significant savings in support of transforming the Department of Defense.

What is the end goal of BRAC process?

At a minimum, BRAC 2005 must eliminate excess physical capacity, the operation, sustainment and recapitalization of which diverts scarce resources from defense capability. However, BRAC 2005 can make an even more profound contribution to transforming the department by rationalizing our infrastructure with defense strategy. BRAC 2005 should be the means by which we reconfigure our current infrastructure into one in which operational capacity maximizes both warfighting capability and efficiency. By creating joint organizational and basing solutions, we will facilitate multi-service missions, reduce waste, save money, and free up resources to recruit quality people, modernize equipment and infrastructure, and develop the capabilities needed to meet 21st Century threats.

The Secretary of Defense has directed that the BRAC 2005 process for analyzing DoD installations begin immediately. After gathering information and completing a comprehensive analysis, the Secretary will submit recommendations for realigning or closing bases by May 16, 2005, as required by law. (END QUOTE)

6. Q&As: The following Q&As are provided for response to query only. Questions that cannot be answered within the scope of this guidance will be taken without comment and forwarded with proposed answers to OASD(PA).

Q1: Should communities perceive military construction (MILCON) as an indicator of whether their installations will be realigned or closed?
A1: The presence or absence of funding for military construction is not an indication of military service intentions or future recommendations to the SECDEF under BRAC. The Department funds its military construction based on its current highest priority requirements recognizing that it may make investments in installations that are ultimately selected for closure or realignment.

Q2: Will encroachment issues at military bases factor into the decision-making process?
A2: In accordance with the requirements of the BRAC statute, the department will base all of its recommendations upon approved selection criteria that reflect military value as the primary consideration. The law further requires that the selection criteria address the ability of both existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions and personnel. To the extent that encroachment limits an installation in fulfilling its mission requirements, it will be factored

into military value. The proposed selection criteria must be made available for public review not later than Dec 31, 2003, and finalized by Feb 16, 2004.

Q3: There have been concerns and questions about environmental costs. Will environmental costs be factors in recommending a base for realignment or closure?
A3: In accordance with the requirements of the BRAC statute, the department will base all its recommendations upon approved selection criteria that reflect military value as the primary consideration. The law further requires that the selection criteria address the impact of costs related to environmental restoration as well as waste management and environmental compliance. The proposed selection criteria must be made available for public review not later than Dec 31, 2003 and finalized by Feb 16, 2004.

Q4: What were the closure results of the last four rounds of BRAC (88, 91, 93 AND 95) from the total available to the number selected for BRAC action?
A4: The four prior rounds of BRAC resulted in recommendations to close 97 out of 495 major domestic installations. BRAC 88 - closed 16 major installations; BRAC 91 - closed 26 major installations; BRAC 93 - closed 28 major installations; and BRAC 95 - closed 27 major installations.

Q5: How much has the DoD saved through the previous rounds of closures and realignments?
A5: The four previous rounds produced net savings (cost avoidance) of approximately $16.7 Billion through 2001 and approximately $6.5 Billion annually thereafter. Independent studies have repeatedly verified that savings from BRAC far exceeded costs.

Q6: How much excess capacity does the DoD currently have?
A6: The Department will not know its current excess capacity until the completion of BRAC process. In April 1998, The Department completed a report for Congress that estimated that it retained approximately 20-25% in excess capacity across the department.

Q7: When will the department complete the BRAC analysis and make its recommendations available to the public?
A7: The National Defense Authorization Act for FY02 established the following milestones for the 2005 BRAC round: publish proposed selection criteria for a 30 day comment period by December 31, 2003; publish final selection criteria by February 16, 2004; and submit a report to Congress with the FY05 budget justification along with a comprehensive installation inventory and force structure plan. By May 16, 2005, the Secretary of Defense will forward the recommendations for closure and realignment to the BRAC commission, at which time the information will be available to the public. The BRAC commission must forward its report to the President by

September 8, 2005. The President will have until September 23, 2005, to accept or reject the recommendations on an all or nothing basis and forward the recommendations to Congress. Once the President forwards the recommendations to Congress, Congress will have 45 legislative days to enact a joint resolution rejecting all the recommendations or they become binding on the department.

Q8: Where will funds come from to perform the BRAC analysis/evaluations?
A8: BRAC analysis and evaluations are performed within available resources. They are currently funded by Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds.

Q9: Will near-term future new force-structure bed downs be incorporated into the BRAC 2005 process?
A9: Where the BRAC timeline can accommodate operational imperatives, new force structure bed downs will be incorporated in the BRAC process. Using the BRAC process offers the opportunity to make the most efficient and effective use of the capacity and capabilities of the department.

Q10: If a base is approved for closure or realignment, how long will it take?
A10: Under the BRAC law, actions to close or realign a base must be initiated within two years of the date the President transmits the BRAC commission's recommendations report to Congress, and must be completed within six years of that same date.

Q11: Can bases/communities get an assessment of how they "scored" during the "95 BRAC"?
A11: How an installation "scored" in a previous BRAC round is not indication of how it might "score" during the 2005 BRAC round. In accordance with the BRAC statute, when considering installations for closure or realignment, the department must consider all military installations equally, without regard to whether the installation has been previously considered or proposed for closure or realignment by the department. However, for those interested in historical information, the Office of the Secretary of Defense maintains the documentation used by the previous BRAC Commissions. The records are located at 1745 Jefferson Davis Highway, Crystal Square 4, Suite 105, Arlington, VA. The information is open to the public; however, we ask that individuals call the office, 703-602-3207, before arriving to ensure a government representative is present. There is a copier available.

Q12: How will "jointness" be assessed during this next BRAC?
A12: The BRAC law requires that closure and realignment recommendations be based on published selection criteria that must make military value the primary consideration. The law further provides that military value must include impacts on joint warfighting, readiness and training.

In his November 15, 2002, memorandum, the SECDEF established the goals and priorities for the 2005 BRAC round. A primary objective of BRAC 2005, in addition to realigning our base structure to meet our post-cold war force structure, is to examine and implement opportunities for greater jointness. To reinforce the idea that we should be looking across traditional lines to examine the potential for jointness, the Secretary established an internal BRAC 2005 decision making body that is joint at every level. The Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC), chaired by the Deputy Secretary, and composed of the secretaries of the military departments and their chiefs of services, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and under secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) (USD(AT&L)), will be the policy making and oversight body for the entire BRAC 2005. The subordinate Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG), chaired by the USD(AT&L) and composed of the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the military department assistant secretaries for installations and environment, the service vice chiefs, and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment) (DUSD(I&E)), will oversee joint cross-service analyses of common business oriented functions and ensure the integration of that process with the military department and defense agency specific analyses of all other functions.

Q13: How can communities be involved in BRAC to enhance their support to the base population/mission and their prospects during the BRAC 2005 round?
A13: The Defense Base Closure And Realignment Commission will solicit community input once it has received the Secretary of Defense's base closure and realignment recommendations in May 2005.

Q14: If the final decision is to close or realign the base, with whom will community leaders work in the transition of the base from its current mission to civilian use?
A14: Although an enormously complex undertaking, involving the Department of Defense, other federal agencies, and state and local governments, each military department will have a central point of contact at the closing activity to assist in coordinating the involvement of the various organizations. Additionally, DoD's Office Of Economic Adjustment is chartered to assist local communities with planning for the reuse of closing and realigning installations and in that capacity will provide individual community assistance.

Q15: How will property be disposed of or sold?
A15: The BRAC statute provides the department with a variety of mechanisms for disposing of property at closed or realigned military installations. While we cannot speculate on which mechanism might be used at any given installation, in previous rounds of BRAC, federal real property was made available by public benefit conveyances for airport, education, and homeless

assistance; federal transfers to Native American tribes; economic development conveyances to local redevelopment authorities; and public sales, just to name a few.

Q16: How will you decide reuse of the base?
A16: The Department of Defense does not decide the reuse of former military installations. Once the property is declared surplus to the needs of the federal government, it is the job of the local community, through its designated local redevelopment authority, to plan for the reuse of the surplus property.

Q17: Our base has some environmental contamination. Will the DoD clean it up?
A17: DoD has a continuing obligation to perform environmental cleanup at all of its installations, regardless of whether a base is identified for closure or realignment.

Q18: During the time cleanup is taking place-several years in many cases * will the base property be vacant and unused until all the cleanup is completed?
A18: In previous rounds, from the time of the base's selection for closure, several options were available for property to be used until it was disposed so that communities could begin using base facilities promptly and economic redevelopment could occur. Consistent with public health and safety, once a contractual arrangement was in place, property could be leased or, in certain circumstances, deeded while the property was being environmentally prepared for transfer.

Q19: What comment do you have for communities impacted by closure?
A19: Communities affected by closure and realignment decisions in the last four rounds of BRAC have successfully transitioned to productive economic development. We are committed to working with BRAC 05 communities to duplicate that success.

Q20. There are websites on the internet that indicate that a list of potential base closures already exists. Does DoD maintain a list of bases it wants to close?
A20: No, the department does not maintain a list of bases it wants to close. The BRAC analytical process will not result in departmental closure and realignment recommendations until May 2005.

Q21. How will the realignment of military forces and bases overseas impact BRAC 2005 efforts?
A21. On March 20, 2003, the Secretary directed the development of a comprehensive and integrated presence and basing strategy looking out 10 years. Results of that effort, including rationalizing areas of potential

excesses and identifying the utility of overseas installations, should be available to inform the BRAC 2005 process.

Q22. What is BRAC?
A22. "BRAC" is an acronym that stands for Base Realignment And Closure. It is the process DoD has previously used to reorganize its base structure to more efficiently and effectively support our forces, increase operational readiness and facilitate new ways of doing business. We anticipate that BRAC 2005 will build upon processes used in previous rounds.

Q23. How does BRAC work?
A23. The process is governed by law; specifically, The Defense Base Closure And Realignment Act of 1990.

The process begins with a threat assessment of the future national security environment, followed by the development of a force structure plan and basing requirements to meet these threats.

DoD then applies published selection criteria to determine which installations to recommend for realignment and closure. The Secretary of Defense will publish a report containing the realignment and closure-recommendations, forwarding supporting documentation to an independent commission appointed by the president, in consultation with congressional leadership.

The commission has the authority to change the Department's recommendations, if it determines that a recommendation deviated from the force structure plan and/or selection criteria. The commission will hold regional meetings to solicit public input prior to making its recommendations. History has shown that the use of an independent commission and public meetings make the process as open and fair as possible.

The commission forwards its recommendations to the President for review and approval, who then forwards the recommendations to Congress.

Congress has 45 legislative days to act on the commission report on an all-or-none basis. After that time, the commission's realignment and closure recommendations become law. Implementation must start within two years, and actions must be complete within six years.

Q24. What is transformation?
A24. Transformation is shaping the changing nature of military competition and cooperation through new combinations of concepts, capabilities, people and organizations that exploit our nation's advantages, protect our asymmetric vulnerabilities, and sustain our strategic position, which helps maintain peace and stability in the world.

good definition

Q25. Why is DoD transforming?
A25. Over time, the defense strategy calls for the transformation of the U.S. defense establishment. Transformation is at the heart of this strategy. To transform DoD, we need to change its culture in many important areas. Our budgeting, acquisition, personnel, and management systems must be able to operate in a world that changes rapidly. Without change, the current defense program will only become more expensive in the future, and DoD will forfeit many of the opportunities available today.

Q26. How is BRAC transformational?
A26. BRAC provides a singular opportunity to reshape our infrastructure to optimize military readiness. The 2005 BRAC process will help find innovative ways to consolidate, realign, or find alternative uses for current facilities to ensure that the U.S. continues to field the best-prepared and best-equipped military in the world.

BRAC will also enable the U.S. military to better match facilities to forces, meet the threats and challenges of a new century, and make the wisest use of limited defense dollars.

Q27. How many bases and installations will be closed?
A27. It's too early to say, but there are no specific numbers or "targets." Using specific selection criteria that emphasize military value, DoD must complete a comprehensive review before it can determine which installations should be realigned or closed. In 2005, an independent commission will review the Secretary of Defense's recommendations, hold public hearings, visit various sites, and ultimately send its recommendations to the President.

Q28. How much has been saved through previous BRAC rounds?
A28. The four previous BRAC rounds have eliminated approximately 20 percent of DoD's capacity that existed in 1988 and, through 2001, produced net savings of approximately $16.7 Billion, which includes the cost of environmental clean-up. Recurring savings beyond 2001 are approximately $6.6 Billion annually. In independent studies conducted over previous years, both the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office have consistently supported the department's view that realigning and closing unneeded military installations produces savings that far exceed costs.

But was this savings already been required back into the budget?

Q29. What's the timeline for this BRAC round?
A29. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2002 established the following milestones for the 2005 BRAC round: publish proposed selection criteria for a 30-day comment period by Dec. 31, 2003; publish final selection criteria by Feb. 16, 2004; submit a report to

timeline

congress with the FY 2005 budget justification on the following points: a force structure plan, based on an assessment of probable threats to the national security over the next 20 years; the probable end strength levels and military force units needed to meet those threats; the anticipated levels of available funding; a comprehensive inventory of military installations worldwide; a description of infrastructure necessary to support the force structure; discussion of excess capacity categories; economic analysis of the effect of realignments and closures to reduce excess infrastructure; and SECDEF certification of the need for BRAC, and that annual net savings would result by 2011.

Timeline

SECDEF forwards recommendations for realignments and closures to the BRAC commission by May 16, 2005; the commission forwards its report on the recommendations to the President by Sept. 8, 2005. The President will have until Sept. 23, 2005 to accept or reject the recommendations in their entirety. If accepted, Congress will have 45 legislative days to act on the recommendations.

Q30. Which bases will be looked at in this round?
A30. All military installations within the continental United States and its territories (under the control of the federal government) will be examined as part of this process. This includes labs, medical, training, guard, reserve, air stations, leased facilities, etc.

Q31. Isn't BRAC just another example of budget priorities driving national security planning?
A31. Absolutely not. The legislation is quite clear that military value is the primary consideration. The Secretary's guidance to the military departments emphasizes that BRAC 2005 will make a profound contribution to transforming the department by bringing our infrastructure in line with defense strategy.

CORE MESSAGE.

Q32. How will the commission be selected, and who will serve?
A32. The BRAC legislation specifies the selection process for commissioners. The President is required to consult with the congressional leadership on nominations to serve on the commission.

GOES BACK TO CONGRESS.

Q33. How have local communities affected by base closures fared overall?
A33. Base Realignments And Closures CAUSE near-term social and economic disruption. However, there are many success stories from previous closures.

For example, at Charleston Naval Base, S.C., the local community, assisted by DoD, was able to create approximately 4,500 new jobs. Approximately 90 private, state and federal entities are currently reusing the former naval base.

Since the closure of Mather Air Force Base, Calif., more than 54 leases have been generated at the new Mather Field Complex. Its prime location and one of the country's longest runways have made it an active air cargo hub for California's central valley and the Sacramento region. Additionally, the former base now employs nearly 3,700 personnel with its high-technical businesses, manufacturing operations, educational centers, government agencies, and recreational facilities.

At the former Fort Devens, Mass., more than 3,000 new jobs have been generated and 2.7 million square feet of new construction has occurred. with 68 different employers on site, redevelopment ranges from small business incubators to the Gillette Corp., which occupies a large warehouse/distribution center and manufacturing plant.

A base closure can actually be an economic opportunity, especially when all elements of a community work together.

Q34. Will local commanders and others in their official capacities be available to help us in our task forces or other efforts to influence BRAC decisions with regard to our base?
A34. DoD officials may attend meetings in a liaison or representational capacity with state and local officials, or other organizations that may seek to develop plans or programs to improve the ability of installations to discharge their national security and defense missions. DoD officials may not manage or control such organizations or efforts.

In their official capacity, DoD personnel may not participate in the activities of any organization that has as its purpose, either directly or indirectly, insulating DoD bases from closure or realignment. This guidance is aimed at ensuring the fairness and rigor of the BRAC process.

Q35. Is the list of closures and realignments on the g2mil.com website the official position of the Department Of Defense?
A35. No. It is a privately operated website with no ties to or support from DoD.

7. TALKING POINTS:

No. 1

7.1. Both Congress and DoD recognize military value must be the primary consideration in reducing or restructuring U.S. military bases.
7.2. The 2005 BRAC process will help find innovative ways to consolidate, realign, or find alternative uses for current facilities. creativity for efficiency
7.3. All military installations will be reviewed, and all recommendations will be based on approved, published selection criteria and a future force structure plan.

Based on criteria + plan

7.4. Through the BRAC process, we will ensure that the United States continues to field the best prepared and best equipped military in the world. → staying the best.

DCN: 12123

Jarvopiage.. (?).



# Grone: BRAC 2005 important for many reasons

by Samantha L. Quigley
American Forces Press Service

4/12/2005 - **WASHINGTON (AFPN)** -- Base Realignment and Closure 2005 is in full swing and this round is important for many reasons, said Philip Grone, deputy undersecretary of defense for installations and environment.

To support ongoing force transformation, to improve the joint use of Department of Defense assets and to convert waste to warfighting are important in and of themselves, Mr. Grone said April 11.

"But the timing of BRAC for 2005 is also important because it provides a platform, an opportunity, for us to assess the sites and select the sites for forces that will return to the United States as a result of the broader global-force posture realignment that the secretary and the department have undertaken."

DOD uses the process to reorganize its installation infrastructure to most efficiently support its forces, increase operational readiness and facilitate new ways of doing business, according to the BRAC Web site. The first BRAC occurred in 1988, and more followed in 1991, 1993 and 1995.

Congress authorized BRAC 2005 in the fiscal 2002 National Defense Authorization Act. The selection criteria were published in February 2004. In March of this year, President Bush appointed the members of an independent BRAC commission.

The next big BRAC deadline is May 16 when Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld must make his recommendations for realignments and closures to Congress and the commission. By Sept. 8, the commission must send its findings to the president, who has until Sept. 23 to approve or disapprove the commission's report.

Mr. Grone said that initially all installations are considered for closure or realignment.

"By statute, all military installations are to be treated equally," he said. "Throughout this process, we are assessing all of our installations and functions and missions in an equal way so that we can have a defensible package of recommendations to provide to the independent commission."

There are several criteria for selecting a base, but one top consideration is the installation's current and future mission capabilities and the effect on operational readiness of the total force, including the impact on joint warfighting, training and readiness.

"In this round of BRAC, the joint cross-service groups that we have established have greater breadth (than BRAC 1995)," Mr. Grone said. "So rather than looking at, as we did in 1995, depot maintenance in this round of BRAC, we're looking at all of the industrial activities of the department on a joint basis."

Medical functions, headquarters and support, education and training, intelligence, supply and storage are all being assessed from a joint perspective, he said. This will help provide the most efficient military structure.

Mr. Grone said that jointness is a "key aspect" of this BRAC. "The decision process in this BRAC is joint from top to bottom in this round of BRAC," he said.

Another important criterion is the availability and condition of lands, facilities and associated airspace at existing and potential receiving locations. That availability also extends to homeland-defense training missions.

Officials at bases chosen for closure or major realignment can expect the process to be completed within six years from the approval of recommendations. They can also expect some assistance and guidance from the

**Story Tools**
Printable story
E-mail story
Subscribe now

**Related Stories**
- Force structure, military value at heart of BRAC - 5/6/2005
- BRAC: Information available for affected bases - 5/10/2005

**Related Links**
- BRAC

search storie
Advanced S

- Airmen ke turning
- BRAC: Inf available fo bases
- Air Force r patients at
- Internet-ba care can de mission rea
- Special Ol brings joy t volunteers
- C-130 mai accomplish depot maint
- Pavement
- Joint sear rescue cent coordinates efforts
- Exercising important e years
- Young Air base, peopl
- Myer's wif Mother's Da Player'
- Logistics excels in pa travel
- Incirlik em nominated service awa
- Expeditior command p eyes, ears
- Eye in the ground forc

Airmen lear Holocaust

DCN: 12123

DOD and interagency partners, Mr. Grone said.

Officials at DOD's Office of Economic Adjustment make planning grants and assistance available. Also, Mr. Grone said, a series of policy reforms will enhance the DOD's ability to move forward to close or realign a base as expeditiously as possible to allow the economic redevelopment of the areas affected.

"All the communities that support our military installations do so very solidly with a great deal of cooperation and partnership," he said. "But as a result of what we must do to enhance the military mission, it's inevitable that there will be some bases, as excess capacity, that no longer will be required.

"In those circumstances, we're going to work in a very productive way, we trust, with those local communities ... working in partnership with them to provide a foundation for solid economic redevelopment," Mr. Grone said.

DCN: 12123

Andrey – Good language here for the messages/talking points Q & A. Jim 5/9

**Staff. 2005. "BRAC Chairman Responds to Questions about Process."** ***Norwich (CT) Bulletin*** **(April 17): A4.**

Anthony Principi sat down with Norwich Bulletin Political Reporter Ray Hackett for his first interview since being sworn in as chairman of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. The interview took place at the Pfizer Washington, D.C., offices where Principi serves as corporate vice president of Governmental Affairs. Here is the full interview.

**Question:** How many people have tried to talk with you since the president announced your nomination to be the BRAC chairman?

**Principi:** Quite a few. (laughs) I got a visit from the governor of Oklahoma. The governor of Indiana is coming to visit me next week. I've met with many senators and congressmen. I talked with Gov. Bush of Florida, who called to congratulate me on my appointment. So, there's been quite a few.

But this is so important to our nation, to our national security and to the communities that could be impacted. And I'm very sensitive to that. I've committed from the very beginning, that [redacted] And I [redacted]

**Q:** Would you encourage other commission members to do the same, to meet with local leaders?

**Principi:** I would leave that up to each of the commissioners to decide for themselves. Right now, I've been sworn in but they haven't, so that may affect how they feel about that, whether at this stage in the process if they'd like to talk with interested parties.

I think, most importantly, that it is a chance to listen and learn. An opportunity in these pre-list days, to have an appreciation for some of the issues they'll be facing when the list comes out. None of us know what might be on the list. Obviously, none of us want to make any commitments, nor should we make any commitments on one course of action or another. That would be totally inappropriate.

I really trust the judgment of the other commissioners on how they'd like to proceed.

**Q:** Have you met with the other commissioners?

**Principi:** I've talked with them briefly on the phone, introducing myself. Some of them I know, others I know about. I told them I'm looking forward to working them and to feel free to call me anytime if they have any questions.

**Q:** It's been more than a month since you were nominated. How far have you gotten in planning for the work that awaits you next month?

**Principi:** It's been very difficult at the outset. This is the first BRAC Commission without any core staff. All of the other commissions had a core staff of about 15 people that were in existence, up and running, computers were lit, the lights were on. I guess after the '95 BRAC they thought that was the end of all BRACs (laughing) and so the staff disappeared.

So we've been playing catch up, really. But it's coming together now. I've appointed an executive director, Charles Battaglia, who I've known for many years and who I trust implicitly. He's now in the process of interviewing prospective staff members. We have office space, getting the computers in. So, we're beginning to pick up some speed here. I'm confident that we'll be ready to go by our first organizational meeting May 2.

**Q:** The Groton Submarine Base was targeted for closure in the 1991 BRAC. Local leaders were able to convince that commission to remove the base from the list. Does that make it more or less likely to be targeted again this year given that this BRAC is expected to be the biggest round of base closings yet?

**Principi:** I don't know, because I don't know. I don't believe because it was on the '91 list that that will be a factor on whether it will be on the 2005 list.

We, the commission, will have to live and work with the list we receive from the Department of Defense, and insure that the decisions made by the secretary of defense conform to the force structure plan, which is an important component of our work.

[redacted]

**Q:** Assuming the Pentagon did a thorough analysis in developing its list of recommended closings, [redacted]

**Principi:** We need to look at that data. [redacted] That the data is [redacted] That the data is [redacted]

Decisions ALWAYS supported by data!

→ commission's role: ensure data is correct.

The commission is not a policy-making body. The commission is this independent check. And to ensure that, we will have a very, very capable staff who have been through the process on previous BRACs. We're going to be bringing back very talented men and women who understand this process. And they will be charged to look at all of this data, and make sure there is a correlation to, and is supportable of, the decisions.

Obviously, you want to give some deference that they're sending over a list. It's our job to ensure that everything is correct. I wouldn't necessarily say it carries weight. Obviously, it's their decisions based on their analysis. And now we just need to review it carefully.

**Q:** In order for a community to make an argument to remove a base on the list, it will need access to the data the Pentagon has collected – information that is not being released to local communities now. When will local communities get access to that information?

**Principi:** I'm hesitant to give you a definitive answer because we're very early in the process. But philosophically, I believe it is important for the communities to have the information. To weigh as much information as possible so that they can review it, and that they have the opportunity to present their perspective, their viewpoint on the data.

Whether any of this is classified by nature of the military relationship, those issues need to be taken into consideration. But this commissioner, and I certainly want to confer with my fellow commissioners, believes that it is [redacted]

OPEN PROCESS. * I think that's important to demonstrate that we're not trying to politicize this. [redacted]. I don't want there to be any cynicism. Whatever decisions are ultimately made that might impact a community, I want them to feel that this chairman and this commission treated every community fairly. [redacted]

Having said that, I'm hesitant to say without knowing exactly when we'll get the data, or the format that we'll get the data. Will it be available to be put on the Web so people can review it? Or will it be a room like this filled with documents? We don't know. We haven't been told.

**Q:** But it's your position that the information be shared as quickly as possible once it becomes available?

**Principi:** I want to share as much as possible with the communities. That's my position going in.

**Q:** This commission, unlike past commissions, has more ex-military members. Does that make it easier for the commission to do its work?

**Principi:** I think it bodes well for the commission, and the work of the commission. These are men and women of extraordinary, extraordinary experience and talent. They're committed to our nation and our security. I believe they will do what's right.

I think we have a good blend of people who understand the nature of the process in Washington. People who understand the military, who speak that language. People who can really look at issues, look at the data carefully because they've seen it before. So I think it bodes well for our work and the decisions we'll have to make. These are really fine people.

**Q:** In 1993, you worked as the minority staff director for the Senate Armed Services Committee, and was involved, to a small degree, in the 1993 BRAC. What lessons did you learn from that experience that you will bring to this round of base closings?

**Principi:** What I learned was, how important this process is to a community. I remember attending a meeting South Carolina, either at a high school or college auditorium, I can't remember. You couldn't find a seat.

So these issues are important to communities and I guess I have a [redacted] that. First and foremost, [redacted] feel very, very strongly about that. [redacted] ve an [redacted] and they will be part of our deliberations as we are mandated to do. But this chairman certainly feels very strongly about it.

**Q:** As secretary of Veterans Affairs you faced a similar challenge in realigning the VA system. How helpful will that experience be for you in this role?

**Principi:** I learned a lot from the CARES process. It's not quite an apple-to-apple comparison, but what I faced as secretary, much like Secretary Rumsfeld faces as secretary, is the transformation of health care in my case. The dramatic changes that have taken place over the last 50-60 years in the way health care is delivered, and the demographics of the population. And I felt strongly that every dollar we wasted on an empty building and excess capacity, things that were really not needed to deliver health care, is a dollar that we didn't have to provide for that delivery. It was a dollar that we couldn't use to buy drugs, or couldn't have to buy technology, hire doctors and nurses and build outpatient clinics.

And I guess, in the same sense, you can say the same thing about defense. The threat has changed, the military has changed. And so, we must conform and transform our infrastructure to meet the 21st century threat to our national security. Those are very difficult issues to face.

But I found that if we had any success it was because as secretary I involved my stakeholders [redacted] They may not necessarily have agreed with me, but they were part of the process. And when I made the CARES announcement, they stood with me.

And I'm hopeful, although it's not quite the same, that I can do the same thing here by ensuring that the people do have the data, and they do have opportunity to make their voices heard.

**Q:** There have been some questions raised regarding Adm. Harold Gehman's appointment because of his work with the Virginia group working to protect the bases there. Is that a conflict of interest?

**Principi:** It could present a conflict and it will be one of the important issues our general counsel will have to make. His role will be to advise the chairman and commission members on potential conflicts of interest so that we can take appropriate actions. If there is a bonafide conflict of interest, that commissioner will recuse himself, herself, from issues relating to those bases in that area or state.

I'd rather not answer specifically about a hypothetical, but I can assure you we will have a top-notch ethics lawyer who is going to, on a day-to-day basis, monitor our activities very carefully.

There is no quicker way to undermine the integrity and creditability of the commission's work than to have folks involved in a conflict. So, whether it pertains to myself, or to anyone else, we'll do that.

**Q:** In your testimony before the Armed Services Committee you said one of your goals was to keep the process free of political influence. Can you really keep politics out of it?

**Principi:** Part of being an open process is that you need to hear the view of the elected representatives of the people of that state – the mayor, the county supervisor, the governor. That's important. You need to hear their views.

[redacted] It's one thing to hear from people. It's another thing when you engage in inappropriate behavior. You know what I mean. When someone says 'I'm pretty close to that governor and therefore I'm going to spare his military base.' That is unacceptable. That is really unacceptable.

I don't think any commissioner would do that, because of some political favor or reciprocal quid pro quo, you do this for me and I'll do that for you. We need to be above that kind of politics. [redacted]

judicious & cautions to ref[illegible]n from "p[illegible]s" in this process.

I had a wonderful meeting with Sen. Joe Lieberman, someone, to me, who is one of the great legislators in this country. And I listened to his concerns. (U.S. Rep.) Rob Simmons, and others. So, the process knows no political ideology to me. If someone needs to talk to me, I'm willing to talk, to listen, to learn. And I hope that throughout that process we'll come out with a more informed decision.

**Q:** [redacted]

**Principi:** [redacted] ngland, obviously there needs to be at least one, maybe more regional hearings. I will suggest to the commissioners that we break down into panels so that we can cover as much of the country as possible. It's impossible to send all nine to every regional hearing. [redacted]

When will they start? Sooner rather than later, although I'm not sure. I think one of the things we as a commission have to decide is, is it more important to have all the site visits first before the regional hearings. I'm not sure. But obviously it's going to be, I think, in June when we start the regional hearings.

Again, without knowing how extensive this list is, it is my plan, my intent, to have at least one commissioner visit every base on the list. Certainly with major installations, we'll give them more than one commissioner. We get the list in May, mid-May. We'll probably start with some hearings here in Washington, and then probably, shortly thereafter, maybe the last week of May. Begin the field trips, site visits.

**Q:** [redacted]

Is this [illegible]ion (?).

**Principi:** [redacted]

**Q:** [redacted]

**Principi:** [redacted]

Obviously, (the seven votes) ties the hands of the commission somewhat. No question about that. But I also think we need to be careful, careful about adding bases in that if there is ample justification to add a base, that the data supports that, fine. But that also sends tremendous economic shockwaves through a community that perhaps hasn't been prepared. It's not a reason not to do so, but again I think we need to be mindful of the economic cost to the community of our decisions. [redacted]

-Not only must there be justification, the community must be adequately prepared.

**Q:** How important is the relationship between a military installation and the defense industry complex? For example, the Groton Submarine Base and Electric Boat where you have the research, development, construction and operators all in one place. If the sub base were to close, there is concern that EB would also leave. Should that be part of the consideration?

**Principi:** I'm sure those arguments have been made to Defense Department officials, those unique aspects, the builders of the boats and the operators. I'm sure it's been explained why that's important. I'm sure it's been taken into consideration in the decision-making process at the Pentagon. I further assume if the base in Connecticut is on the list, those arguments will be made again and it will be given consideration. The military value criteria certainly is broad enough, for that reason, to take into consideration some of the unique assets of a military installation.

[redacted]

**Q:** A lot has been made about "jointness," the ability to host joint service operations. But not every installation lends itself to that, for example, submarine bases. How much of a factor is that?

* **Principi:** It is a factor. [redacted] That clearly is the focus in the Defense Department today. It's clearly a criteria the commission needs to address. A sub base may be far different than a different type of installation that lends itself more to jointness. For example, joint training of undergraduate pilot training where you can train Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps pilots.

Perhaps in some cases, it doesn't lend itself to that. That may be the case in regards to our nuclear submarine capability and where they're located. I think it's something that needs to be looked at. But jointness is very important.

**Q:** Another of the secondary criteria is environmental issues, and the potential cost of cleaning up installations.

Environmental cor[redacted] addi. inspective of base closure.

**Principi:** [redacted] You have people living close by. So if y[redacted]

But it is important. You have to do some economic modeling to determine what the true costs are. What's the return on investment so to speak. Again, the law is very clear: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, thou shall look at military value first. Shall look at conformance with force structure plan. Thou shalt also take into consideration the environmental issues, cost of remediation. And we shall do that.

It does become a little more difficult to accurately know what the costs will be. But hopefully we will, no, we will have the staff to assess that.

**Q:** You've just taken a new job with Pfizer as vice president of Governmental Affairs here in Washington. How does your appointment as chairman of the BRAC Commission affect that?

**Principi:** First and foremost, I made a commitment to the president to do this right, and I'm going to do this right.

And Pfizer is a great corporate citizen, and they have been very supportive of me in taking on this very important assignment. So it will take time away from my work here for Pfizer, and I am concerned about that because I don't want to let my colleagues at Pfizer down. This is a great corporation and we face some challenging times. But CEO Hank McKinnell believes in corporate citizenry. He's very civic minded and he told me to go for it.

**Q:** When all is said and done, what do you want hear from people?

**Principi:** That Principi did it right. He w[redacted] w[redacted] The commission conducted itself with [redacted] nd [redacted] nd, w[redacted]

**Q:** You were highly regarded for your work with the Department of Veterans Affairs. Are you concerned how you will be regarded by some in places were bases get shut down?

**Principi:** No, I'm not worried about it. Sometimes you have to step up to the plate and take on the tough jobs. Not that the VA wasn't tough, but you have to do it. I think people respect you for the way you conduct yourself.

Our role is a little more constrained than what people might believe. We're not putting bases on a list. For the most part, we're receiving a list of bases proposed for closure or to be realigned [redacted] So, we can't just pick and choose. We have to be sure that the words "substantially deviate" hasn't been met. [redacted]

**Q:** There isn't a lot of time before the commission has to file its final recommendations in September. Do you have the time it will take to do this?

**Principi:** It's a sprint. We need to get on our track shoes and forget about sleep for about three and a half months. It's enough time, but it is going to require a lot of work. A lot of long days, but we'll get through it. A lot will depend upon assembling a real top notch staff. I can't stress the importance of getting the right people. This has to be a really smooth-humming machine, everyone working together, pulling together. The commissioners have some difficult decisions to make, and the staff has some heavy lifting to do.

# BRAC Base Realignment and Closure

Home
BRAC Definitions
BRAC FAQs

Prior BRAC Rounds
Documents
Installations by Year
Installations by State

The reports listed below will be available online no later than May 16, 2005

DoD Reports
Results and Processes
Detailed Recommendations
Service Reports
Army
Navy
Air Force
Joint Cross-Service Group Reports
Education & Training
Headquarters & Support Activities
Industrial
Intelligence
Medical
Supply & Storage
Technical
Related Sites
Personnel Transition Assistance
Help for Military Families (pdf)
Office of Economic

## Frequently Asked Questions

### Q1. What is BRAC?

A1. "BRAC" is an acronym that stands for Base Realignment and Closure. It is the co authorized process DoD has previously used to reorganize its base structure to more e effectively support our forces, increase operational readiness and facilitate new wa business. (The original legislation actually states that the title of the process is Base Realignment.)

### Q2. What are some of the major elements of the BRAC 2005 process and what will will be fair?

A2. The process began with a threat assessment of the future national security environme by the development of a force structure plan and basing requirements to meet these threa then applied legally mandated selection criteria to determine which installations to recomn realignment and closure. The Secretary of Defense will publish a report containing his rea and closure recommendations, forwarding supporting documentation to the independent c

### Q3. What is transformation?

A3. According to the Department's April 2003 Transformation Planning Guidanc transformation is "a process that shapes the changing nature of military competition anc through new combinations of concepts, capabilities, people and organizations that exploi advantages and protect against our asymmetric vulnerabilities to sustain our strategic pc helps underpin peace and stability in the world."

### Q4. Why is DoD transforming?

A4. Over time, the defense strategy calls for the transformation of the U.S. defense e Transformation is at the heart of this strategy. To transform DoD, we need to change many important areas. Our budgeting, acquisition, personnel, and management systems to operate in a world that changes rapidly. Without change, the current defense prog become more expensive in the future, and DoD will forfeit many of the opportunities availa

### Q5. How is BRAC transformational?

A5. BRAC provides a singular opportunity to reshape our infrastructure to optimize militar The 2005 BRAC process will help find innovative ways to consolidate, realign, or find alter for current facilities to ensure that the U.S. continues to field the best-prepared and best-e

Adjustment
Office of Force Transformation
Army BRAC
Air Force BRAC
Air Force Real Property Agency

military in the world. BRAC 2005 will also enable the U.S. military to better match facilities meet the threats and challenges of a new century, and make the wisest use of limited def

**Q6. What benefit does the Department anticipate from a future BRAC round?**

A6. The Department will be able to divest itself of unnecessary installation infrastructure resultant savings for improving fighting capabilities and quality of life for military forces. T the Department to rationalize installation infrastructure with 21st century national security

**Q7. How will BRAC 2005 be different from past rounds?**

A7. BRAC 05 is dramatically different from previous rounds. Because we are on our BRAC, the nature of the excess capacity has changed. Most of the excess capacity t fragmented, and often in the form of underused facilities. This suggests that savings car by sharing facilities to a greater extent. Excess capacity is defined as underused or unu an/or infrastructure. Today, greater emphasis is being placed on reshaping the De opposed to simple cost cutting. There also is greater emphasis on jointness--s appropriate organizations from two or more services to share facilities in the right significantly improve combat effectiveness while reducing costs. It also generates a m military through appropriate basing. Jointness at every level will play a much greater role of BRAC.

**Q8. What's the timeline for this BRAC round?**

A8. There are several significant events taking place throughout the remainder of 2005. is a general timeline of significant events.

**May 16, 2005:** Not later than this date, the Secretary of Defense must publish in the Fec and transmit to the Congressional Defense Committees and the Commission, a list c installations that the Secretary of Defense recommends for closure or realignment.

**July 1, 2005:** Not later than this date, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the C Defense Committees, a report containing a detailed analysis of the Secretary recommendations and selection process.

**September 8, 2005:** Not later than this date, the Commission must transmit to the Presi containing its findings and conclusions based on a review and analysis of the Secretary recommendations.

**September 23, 2005:** Not later than this date, the President shall transmit to the Comm the Congress, a report containing the President's approval or disapproval of the C recommendations. If the President approves the recommendations, the recommendatior 45 legislative days after Presidential transmission or adjournment, unless Congress resolution of disapproval.

**October 20, 2005:** If the President disapproves the Commission's initial recomme Commission must submit revised recommendations to the President not later than this da

**Nov 7, 2005:** President's Approval or Disapproval of Revised Recommendations. The P approve the revised recommendations and transmit approval to Congress by this date o ends. The recommendations become binding 45 legislative days after Presidential tra adjournment, unless Congress enacts a joint resolution of disapproval.

**April 15, 2006:** Commission terminates.

**Q9. Why do we need a BRAC round?**

A9. The Department's position that significant excess capacity remains in the defense inf supported by independent agencies. The specific level of excess is very depen assumptions used in the analysis. Past experience indicates that more extensive study c use and cross-Service functional analysis could further increase the level of excess tl utilization of the remaining infrastructure.

The Department estimates that a future BRAC round, based on the costs and savings e: BRACs 93/95 and a reduction in installation infrastructure of approximately 20 percent, cc approximately $7 billion if annual recurring savings in today's dollars. Resources currentl on excess installation infrastructure could be allocated to higher priority requirements, su to modernize weapons, enhance quality of life, and improve readiness.

Additionally, another BRAC round will afford the Department a significant transformatior September 11, 2001, reinforced the imperative to convert excess capacity into warfightin performance of our forces in Iraq underscores the benefit of transformational war Department must be allowed to reconfigure its infrastructure to best support the transfor warfighting capability. The Department must be allowed the opportunity to assess it infrastructure to ensure it is best sized and placed to support emerging mission requirei national security needs.

**Q10. Which installations will be looked at in this round?**

A10. All military installations within the United States and its territories will be examined a process.

**Q11. How many installations will be closed?**

A11. It's too early to say and there are no specific numbers or "targets." Using specific sel that emphasize military value, DoD must complete a comprehensive review before it c which installations should be realigned or closed. In 2005, an independent Commission v Secretary of Defense's recommendations, hold public hearings, visit various sites, and ul its recommendations to the President.

**Q12. Why would we close U.S. installations before we close overseas installations?**

A12. BRAC, of course, only applies to our military facilities in the United States. As we Department, we didn't think it made much sense to look just at our domestic facilities s the BRAC process with our Global Force Posture Review, which in essence is a BRAC pr internationally based forces. The result is the relocation of troops to the United States and several other related changes made domestically to ensure unit cohesion, as well a for the twenty-first century. (Dollar amounts will be available when the Secretary's reco are announced.)

**Q13. How much has been saved through previous BRAC rounds?**

A13. The four previous BRAC rounds have eliminated approximately 20 percent of DoD's existed in 1988 and, through 2001, produced net savings of approximately $17.7 billion, w the cost of environmental cleanup. Recurring savings beyond 2001 are approximat annually. In independent studies conducted over previous years, both the Government A Office and the Congressional Budget Office have consistently supported the departme realigning and closing unneeded military installations produces savings that far exceed co

**Q14. What is the BRAC Commission?**

A14. The commission is an independent body responsible for reviewing the recommendations for BRAC 2005. The Base Closure and Realignment Act specified

process for commissioners. The President was required to consult with the congressior on nominations to serve on the commission.

**Q15. Who was selected as the Chairman of the BRAC 2005 Commission?**

A15. Anthony J. Principi has been appointed to serve as the Chairman of the Commissic Principi has had a distinguished career in the public and private sectors and recently s Secretary of Veterans Affairs. He is a 1967 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at An saw active duty aboard the destroyer USS Joseph P. Kennedy, and later commanded a Unit in Vietnam's Mekong Delta. Mr. Principi earned his law degree from Seton Hall Univ and was assigned to the Navy's Judge Advocate General Corps in San Diego, Calif. In transferred to Washington as a legislative counsel for the Department of the Navy.

**Q16. Who are the members of the BRAC 2005 Commission?**

A16. On April 1, 2005 President George W. Bush used his recess-appointment power tc nominations of eight individuals to be Members of the Defense Base Realignment Commission:

James H. Bilbray of Nevada, Philip Coyle of California, Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., I Virginia, James V. Hansen of Utah, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.) of Florida. G Warren Newton, USAF (Ret.) of Connecticut, Samuel Knox Skinner of Illinois, and Brig Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.) of Texas.

**Q17. Who is James H. Bilbray?**

A17. Former Congressman Bilbray was a member of the Foreign Affairs, Armed Intelligence Committees. He served in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1955 to 1963.

**Q18. Who is Philip Coyle?**

A18. Mr. Coyle is a Senior Advisor to the Center for Defense Information. He served Secretary of Defense and Director of Operational Test and Evaluation at the Department

**Q19. Who is Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.)?**

A19. Admiral Gehman served on active duty in the U.S. Navy for over 35 years. His las was as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic and as the Commander in Chief of Forces Command.

**Q20. Who is James V. Hansen?**

A20. Former Congressman Hansen was a member of the Armed Services Committee. the U.S. Navy from 1951 to 1955.

**Q21. Who is General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.)?**

A21. General Hill served in the U.S. Army for 36 years. His last assignment was a Commander of the U.S. Southern Command.

**Q22. Who is General Lloyd Warren Newton, USA (Ret.)?**

A22. General Newton served in the U.S. Air Force for 34 years. His last assignmen Commander of Air Education and Training Command.

**Q23. Who is Samuel Knox Skinner?**

A23. Mr. Skinner served as Chief of Staff and as Secretary of Transportation for Preside W. Bush. He served in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1960 to 1968.

**Q24. Who is Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)?**

A24. General Turner is a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission. She U.S. Air Force for 30 years, most recently as the director of nursing services in the Off Force Surgeon General at Bolling Air Force Base.

**Q25. What authority does the commission have?**

A25. The commission has the authority to change the Department's recommendations, if that the Secretary deviated substantially from the force structure plan and/or selection commission will hold regional meetings to solicit public input prior to making its recom History has shown that the use of an independent commission and public meetings mak as open and fair as possible.

**Q26. What is the role of the Installation Commander in the BRAC process?**

A26. A primary role of installation commanders in the BRAC process is to certify inform conduct the analyses. To enhance fairness in the BRAC process by treating all instal equal footing, all information submitted to the Secretary of Defense and the 2005 BRAC for use in making recommendations for base closures and realignments must be ce submitter as accurate and complete to the best of their knowledge and belief. Much of th regarding installation facilities and operations will be gathered in data calls initiated b Departments and sent to installations for processing. Installation commanders will have responsibility for certifying that information before it is used in the BRAC process.

Installation commanders may attend meetings, in a liaison or representational capacity, v local officials, or other organizations that may seek to develop plans or programs to impr of installations to discharge their national security and defense missions. However, DoD not manage or control such organizations or efforts. In their official capacity, DoD perso participate in the activities of any organization that has as its purpose, either directly insulating DoD installations from closure or realignment. This guidance is aimed at fairness and rigor of the BRAC process.

**Q27. Can local communities request that DoD installations in their area be co closure during BRAC 2005?**

A27. Yes. The BRAC Act of 1990, as amended, addresses this issue with the following g Secretary of Defense shall consider any notice received from a local government in th military installation that the government would approve of the closure or realign installation."

**Q28. Will communities or states that were impacted by past base closures be future base closure rounds? Would their past losses be calculated in determining economic impact?"**

A28. The Department must consider all military installations equally, without regard to installation has been previously considered or proposed for closure or realignment. Ad Department will do adhere to the statutory requirements regarding the selection criteri used in the BRAC process, of which military value is the primary consideration. In Department will consider "the economic impact on existing communities in the vicini installations." Application and evaluation of economic impacts will be consistently and fair

**Q29. How have local communities affected by installation closures fared overall?**

A29. Base Realignments and Closures cause near-term social and economic disruptic there are many success stories from previous closures. A base closure can actually be opportunity, especially when all elements of a community work together. While eac realignment has different consequences and/or results, some recent examples include:

(1) Charleston Naval Base, S.C. -- The local community, assisted by DoD, was al approximately 4,500 new jobs. Approximately 90 private, state and federal entities reusing the former naval base.

(2) Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire More than 185 operating tenants currently e the Pease International Tradeport (PIT). The PIT has been designated a Foreign Free T the U.S. Department of Commerce, and has developed an air cargo access capability v foot runway. There is in excess of 3,800,000 square feet of new, or newly renovated sp supported the creation of over 5,000 jobs, in bio technology (Lonza Biotechnics), educati New Hampshire University), in addition to a wide variety (Pan Am, Marriott, Redhook Bre and professional service availability day-to-day.

(3) Fort Devens, Mass. -- More than 3,000 new jobs have been generated and 2.7 millio of new construction has occurred. With 68 different employers on site, redevelopment small business incubators to the Gillette Corp., which occupies a large warehouse/distri and manufacturing plant.

DCN: 12123

**The reports listed below will be available online no later than May 16, 2005**



## 2005 BRAC Definitions

BASE CLOSURE LAW
The provisions of Title II of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure anc Realignment Act (Pub. L. 100-526, 102 Stat.2623, 10 U.S.C. S 2687 note), or the Defense Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (Pub. L. 100-526, Part A of Title XXIX of 104 Stat. 1 U.S.C. S 2687 note).

BRAC
"BRAC" is an acronym which stands for base realignment and closure. It is the process Dc previously used to reorganize its installation infrastructure to more efficiently and effectivel forces, increase operational readiness and facilitate new ways of doing business. DoD ant BRAC 2005 will build upon processes used in previous BRAC efforts.

Closure
All missions of the installation have ceased or have been relocated. All personnel position civilian and contractor) have either been eliminated or relocated, except for personnel reqı caretaking, conducting any ongoing environmental cleanup, and disposal of the base, or p remaining in authorized enclaves.

COBRA
Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA), is an analytical tool used to calculate the co and return on investment, of proposed realignment and closure actions.

Commission
The Commission established by section 2902 of the Defense Base Closure and Realignm 1990, as amended.

Community preference
Section 2914(b)(2) of BRAC requires the Secretary of Defense to consider any notice rece local government in the vicinity of a military installation that the government would approve closure or realignment of the installation.

Data certification
Section 2903 (c)(5) of BRAC requires specified DoD personnel to certify to the best of thei and belief that information provided to the Secretary of Defense or the 2005 Commission ( the realignment or closure of a military installation is accurate and complete.

Force structure
Numbers, size and composition of the units that comprise US defense forces; e.g., divisior

wings, aircraft, tanks, etc.

**Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC)**
One of two senior groups established by the Secretary of Defense to oversee and operate 2005 process. The Infrastructure Executive Council, chaired by the Deputy Secretary of D composed of the Secretaries of the Military Departments and their Chiefs of Services, the the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Lo (AT&L)), is the policy making and oversight body for the entire BRAC 2005 process.

**Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG)**
The subordinate of two senior groups established by the Secretary of Defense to oversee the BRAC 2005 process. The Infrastructure Steering Group, chaired by the Under Secreta Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) (USD(AT&L)), and composed of the Vice the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Military Department Assistant Secretaries for installations anc environment, the Service Vice Chiefs, and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Install Environment) (DUSD(I&E)), will oversee joint cross-service analyses of common business functions and ensure the integration of that process with the Military Department and Defe specific analyses of all other functions.

**Military Departments**
The Military Departments are the Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, which Marine Corps, and Department of the Air Force.

**Military installation**
A base, camp, post, station, yard, center, homeport facility for any ship, or other activity ur jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, including any leased facility. Such term does no facility used primarily for civil works, rivers and harbors projects, flood control, or other pro under the primary jurisdiction or control of the Department of Defense.

**National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Analysis**
An analysis conducted to evaluate an installation's disposal decisions in terms of the envir impact. The NEPA analysis is useful to the community's planning efforts and the installatic disposal decisions. It is used to support DoD decisions on transferring property for commu

**Realignment**
Includes any action that both reduces and relocates functions and civilian personnel positi does not include a reduction in force resulting from workload adjustments, reduced persor funding levels, or skill imbalances.

**Redevelopment authority**
In the case of an installation to be closed or realigned under the BRAC authority, the term "redevelopment authority" means an entity (including an entity established by a State or lo government) recognized by the Secretary of Defense as the entity responsible for develop redevelopment plan with respect to the installation or for directing the implementation of s

**Redevelopment plan**
In the case of an installation to be closed or realigned under the BRAC authority, the term "redevelopment plan" means a plan that (A) is agreed to by the local redevelopment autho respect to the installation; and (B) provides for the reuse or redevelopment of the real prop personal property of the installation that is available for such reuse and redevelopment as the closure or realignment of the installation.

**Secretary**
Secretary of Defense.

DCN: 12123

**Transformation**
According to the Department's April 2003 Transformation Planning Guidance document, transformation is " a process that shapes the changing nature of military competition and c through new combinations of concepts, capabilities, people and organizations that exploit advantages and protect against our asymmetric vulnerabilities to sustain our strategic pos helps underpin peace and stability in the world."

**United States**
The 50 states, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Vir American Samoa, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

DCN: 12123

# BRAC Base Realignment and Closure

Home
BRAC Definitions
BRAC FAQs
Prior BRAC Rounds
Documents
Installations by Year
Installations by State

**The reports listed below will be available online no later than May 16, 2005**

DoD Reports
Results and Processes
Detailed Recommendations
Service Reports
Army
Navy
Air Force
Joint Cross-Service Group Reports
Education & Training
Headquarters & Support Activities
Industrial
Intelligence
Medical
Supply & Storage
Technical
Related Sites
Personnel Transition Assistance
Help for Military Families (pdf)
Office of Economic

## Prior BRAC Rounds

- The Report of the Department of Defense on Base Realignment and Closure, April 1998, 159 pages (P
- Report of the Effect of Base Closures on Future Mobilization Options, Office of the Deputy Under Secre Defense (Installations), November 10, 1999, 40 pages (PDF file)
- Military Base Closures: Progress in Completing Actions from Prior Realignments and Closures, (GAO-C 2002) 73 pages (PDF file)
- Military Base Closures: DOD's Updated Net Savings Estimate Remains Substantial, (GAO-01-971, July pages (PDF file)
- Military Bases: Status of Prior Base Realignment and Closure Rounds, (GAO/NSIAD-99-36, December pages (PDF file)
- Military Bases: Closure and Realignment Savings are Significant, But not Easily Quantified, (GAO/NSIA 8, 1996) 23 pages (PDF file)
- The Relationship Between Base Closures/Realignments and Non-DOD Federal Costs, DoD, Septembe pages (PDF file)

## BRAC 1995

- Department of Defense, Base Closure and Realignment Report, March 1995, 316 pages (PDF file)
- Military Bases: Analysis of DOD's 1995 Process and Recommendations for Closure and Realignment, (GAO/NSIAD-95-133), 154 pages (PDF file)
- Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, 1995 Report to the President, July 1, 1995, 292 file)

## BRAC 1993

- Department of Defense, Base Closure and Realignment Report, March 1993, 246 pages (PDF file)
- Military Bases: Analysis of DOD's Recommendations and Selection Process for Closures and Realignm (GAO/NSIAD-93-173), April 15, 1993, 118 pages (PDF file)
- Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, 1993 Report to the President, July 1, 1993, 174 file)

## BRAC 1991

- Department of Defense, Base Closure and Realignment Report, March 1991, 170 pages (PDF file)
- Military Bases: Observations on the Analyses Supporting Proposed Closures and Realignments, (GAO 224), May 15, 1991, 141 pages (PDF file)
- Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, 1991 Report to the President, July 1, 1995, 331 file)

## BRAC 1988

- Base Realignments and Closures, Report of the Defense Secretary's Commission, December 1988, 85 file)
- Military Bases: An Analysis of the Commission's Realignment and Closure Recommendations, (GAO/N November 29, 1989, 114 pages (PDF file)

## Reuse of Former Bases

- Renaissance: New Jobs, New Uses of Space and Resources, New Life for Former Military Bases, 200 (PDF file)
- Community Guide to Base Reuse, describes process used in prior BRAC rounds, 61 pages (PDF file)

DCN: 12123

Adjustment

Office of Force Transformation

Army BRAC

Air Force BRAC

Air Force Real Property Agency

- Base Reuse Implementation Manual, 1997, describes process used in prior BRAC rounds, 443 pages (

**Other Documents**

- DOD Installation Visualization Tool Quality Assurance Plan, December 31, 2003, 94 pages (PDF file)
- Transformation Planning Guidance, April 2003, 39 pages (PDF file)

DCN: 12123



# BRAC: Information available for affected bases

by Master Sgt. Mitch Gettle
Air Force Print News

5/10/2005 - **WASHINGTON** -- The secretary of defense is expected to announce the proposed Base Realignment and Closure list during a press conference May 13.

Air Force officials said they understand the effect BRAC can have on servicemembers, retirees, employees and their families.

To assist people with vital BRAC information, the Air Force will provide a toll-free number, (888) 473-6120, for military and civilian members affected by the BRAC list. Besides the toll-free phone number, the Air Force has an informative BRAC Web page at **www.af.mil/brac.**

"This number will be available starting May 13 from 8 a.m. to 8 p.m. (EDT) until further notice," said Col. Thomas Fleming, Air Force BRAC response cell director. "We will have trained people from 10 different Air Force organizations to answer or assist with any questions people may have."

**Story Tools**
Printable story
E-mail story
Subscribe now

**Related Stories**
- Force structure, military value at heart of BRAC - 5/6/2005
- Commission begins next round of realignments, closures - 5/5/2005
- BRAC recommendations follow lengthy process - 5/4/2005
- Grone: BRAC 2005 important for many reasons - 4/12/2005

**Related Links**
- BRAC
- Air Force BRAC

Airmen can seek information through their chain of command. They may also contact the public affairs office at their nearest Air Force installation.

BRAC is the congressionally authorized process the Department of Defense uses to reorganize its base structure to more efficiently and effectively support its forces, increase operational readiness and facilitate new ways of doing business.

"People are our most valuable asset; and though BRAC is a careful and impartial analysis, people will be affected," Colonel Fleming said. "We care about our people, and we want to keep our people informed and provide them the best possible information on the changes that will affect them."

The Air Force Web page will have a breakdown of affected bases from the BRAC list, said Jeff Whitted, Air Force News Service operations division chief.

"We will also have links to frequently asked questions, news articles, and DOD and Air Force information concerning BRAC," he said. "As we receive new information, we will post it to this page."

Local communities surrounding these installations will also be affected. Communities can address their concerns with the president's commission at regional BRAC commission meetings or by contacting the commission at (703) 699-2950 for more information. Phone hours are 7 a.m. to 6 p.m. EDT, Mondays through Fridays.

The BRAC process will take months to be finalized. The secretary of defense's BRAC recommendations are not final. The president's BRAC commission will review the list for conformity with the office of the secretary of defense's force structure plan and published selection criteria and report its findings and conclusions to the president by Sept. 8.

search storie
Advanced
- Airmen ke turning
- BRAC: Inf available fo bases
- Air Force patients at
- Internet-b care can de mission rea
- Special Ol brings joy t volunteers
- C-130 mai accomplish depot maint
- Pavement
- Joint sear rescue cent coordinates efforts
- Exercising important e years
- Young Air base, peopl
- Myer's wif Mother's Da Player'
- Logistics excels in pa travel
- Incirlik em nominated service awa
- Expeditior command p eyes, ears
- Eye in the ground forc

Airmen lear Holocaust

DCN: 12123



**U.S. Air Force : State-by-State Information**

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Alabama | Maine | Oregon |
| Alaska | Maryland | Pennsylvania |
| Arizona | Massachusetts | Rhode Island |
| Arkansas | Michigan | South Carolina |
| California | Minnesota | South Dakota |
| Colorado | Mississippi | Tennessee |
| Connecticut | Missouri | Texas |
| Delaware | Montana | Utah |
| Florida | Nebraska | Vermont |
| Georgia | Nevada | Virginia |
| Hawaii | New Hampshire | Washington |
| Idaho | New Jersey | West Virginia |
| Illinois | New Mexico | Wisconsin |
| Indiana | New York | Wyoming |
| Iowa | North Carolina | |
| Kansas | North Dakota | |
| Kentucky | Ohio | |
| Louisiana | Oklahoma | |

**The Department of Defense BRAC 2005 recommendations will be released no later than May 16, 2005.**

**Introduction**

The purpose of BRAC 2005 is to permit the secretary of defense to make the most efficient and effective use of all the Department of Defense's resources. It allows him to improve operational efficiency, to save taxpayer's dollars, to advance transformation and enhance the combat effectiveness of U.S. military forces.

BRAC 2005 will allow defense officials to maximize both war-fighting capability and efficiency through joint organizational and basing solutions that will facilitate multi-service missions, reduce excess capacity, save money and redirect resources to modernize equipment and infrastructure and develop the capabilities to meet 21st Century threats.

Finally, the BRAC 2005 process will ensure that the United States continues to have the best-trained and equipped military in the world.

On this Web page, once the secretary's recommendations are released to the BRAC committee, the links on this page will be activated and you will be able to click on any state to review affected locations and specific information regarding BRAC actions at a particular location.

Also found on this page are related BRAC sites, a list of frequently asked questions and related stories that provide more information about the process.

Please continue to visit Air Force Link and watch the news for the announcement of the release of the BRAC recommendations, then return to this page to learn more.

Contact Us

search libra
Advanced

• DOD BRA
• Prior AF E

• BRAC De
• DOD BRA

• BRAC: Int available fc bases

• Force stru military valu BRAC

• BRAC recommen lengthy pro

• Grone: BF important fc reasons

• Communi by BRAC h partner

• 1-888-473-

Security and F

DCN: 12123

PRINT THIS
Powered by Clickability

# Rumsfeld: Base closings may be reduced

**WASHINGTON (AP) -- The Pentagon now foresees a much smaller round of base closings and consolidations, saying it has only half as much surplus space as previously estimated, according to Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld.**

That is likely to make the politically touchy subject of base closings less difficult for the Bush administration, although any closures cause angst among the affected communities and their representatives in Congress.

Cutting surplus capacity saves billions for the Pentagon.

Rumsfeld is to submit his list of recommended closures and realignments to the independent Base Realignment and Closure Commission no later than May 16, and the commission is required by law to submit its final report to President Bush by September 8.

The Pentagon has kept an exceptionally tight lid on information about which bases might be closed or realigned. Rumsfeld is scheduled to testify publicly before the commission on May 16.

For the past few years, the Pentagon has said it had 20 percent to 25 percent more U.S. base capacity than needed for the Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps.

But in a conference call with newspaper editorial writers across the country on Thursday, Rumsfeld said the amount of surplus is not nearly as large as had been estimated, in part because tens of thousands of U.S. troops will be brought home from bases in Asia and Europe.

"Without final figures, I would say the percent will be less than half of the 20 to 25 percent that has been characterized previously," Rumsfeld said, according to two writers who were on the conference call. A third writer confirmed that he said the cuts would be about half previous estimates.

Rumsfeld had previously said the current round of base closings and realignment -- the first since 1995 -- would result in less shrinkage of capacity than the 20 percent to 25 percent figure. But he had not previously said it might be only half that range.

## Capacity vs. number

Because bases vary in size and utility, cutting capacity is not the same as cutting a specific number of bases. Rumsfeld has given no estimate of the number of bases that might get cut.

Sen. John Cornyn, R-Texas, said in an interview Friday that in a meeting on February 8 Rumsfeld told him and Sen. Kay Bailey Hutchison that about 15 percent of base capacity would be eliminated.

In a related development, a congressionally chartered commission that studied the Pentagon's plan for adjusting its troop presence on foreign bases released a report Friday endorsing the concept as "important to our nation and necessary," but advised that it be slowed and re-ordered.

DCN: 12123

Bush's plan, announced last summer, to bring about 70,000 troops home from Germany and South Korea, along with their 100,000 dependents, is a major part of that global force adjustment.

"The timing and synchronization of the overseas basing plan needs further review," the report said, adding, "We foresee great disruption in the overall stability and capability of the force to meet even near term contingencies should we proceed as we currently plan."

The commission said it failed to understand the logic in the Pentagon's plan to begin investing billions to adjust the overseas troop presence before decisions are made about closing domestic bases.

"If unforeseen threats arise in either the near term or the mid term, we could be caught in mid-stride unable to meet them," it said.

A Pentagon spokesman, Bryan Whitman, said the overseas basing commission's report would be taken under advisement, but he defended the Pentagon plan as having been carefully put together.

## Estimated savings

The Pentagon estimates that it can save billions of dollars by closing unneeded bases, and base realignments are aimed at advancing the ability of the military services to operate and train together, as well as to save money. While some bases will be cut, others may be expanded.

States and cities are trying to avoid closures by making the case that their bases are crucial for national security.

The Pentagon declined to release a transcript of Rumsfeld's remarks to the editorial writers until their editorials have been published.

Three of the writers confirmed in telephone interviews Friday that Rumsfeld made the statement that the reduction in base capacity would be less than half the 20 percent to 25 percent range.

J.R. Labbe, editorial writer for the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, said Rumsfeld was pressed on this point, noting that his words suggested that only 10 percent to 12 percent of capacity would be eliminated in this round of base closings. She said Rumsfeld did not dispute her characterization.

Andrea D. Georgsson, editorial writer for the Houston Chronicle, confirmed that Rumsfeld did not object to the 10 percent to 12 percent estimate, although he did not use those figures in his own comments.

---

Copyright 2005 The Associated Press. All rights reserved.This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.

**Find this article at:**
http://www.cnn.com/2005/POLITICS/05/06/base.closings.ap/index.html

☐ Check the box to include the list of links referenced in the article.

**McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk**

**From:** Daniel Else [delse@crs.loc.gov]
**Sent:** Friday, May 06, 2005 8:46 AM
**Subject:** The Daily BRAC - the Mounting the Gravy Train edition, Pt IV (end)

Elizabeth Cooper. 2005. "Clinton: Area Needs Vision." Observer-Dispatch (Utica, NY) (May 3): 1.

The Mohawk Valley's economic-development efforts aren't well coordinated, making it difficult for a clear vision and direction to emerge, U.S. Sen. Hillary Clinton told the Observer-Dispatch's editorial board in a meeting Monday.

Clinton said she had been able to work more closely with other communities around New York to help with their economic-development efforts because they had come to her with specific goals. She cited the Syracuse and Binghamton areas, where public-private efforts are beginning to bear fruit.

"It's been harder here," the Democratic senator said. "I have to say, it's been harder."

The Syracuse area in recent years has moved toward greater coordination through the Metropolitan Development Association. The Binghamton area, which recently landed a major military contract in Owego, has made progress through a group called the Greater Binghamton Coalition, she said

"Here in Rome-Utica, it's difficult to know who's in charge," she said. "EDGE is a good start, but has focused a lot of its energy on the Griffiss park."

Mohawk Valley EDGE President Steven DiMeo expressed surprise at Clinton's statements and said EDGE is involved in a wide range of projects throughout the region.

"We have initiatives other than Griffiss," he said. "We'd love to have the opportunity to talk and work with her on a variety of things that are more than just Griffiss."

He suggested Clinton thought EDGE was Griffiss-focused because the agency had worked most closely with her on issues at the Rome business park. EDGE has devoted significant time and effort to protecting the Air Force Research Lab from being plucked away in the 2005 Base Realignment ands Closure Process, and Clinton has also been involved in that battle, he said.

He cited several other efforts EDGE is part of, including the plan to bring a semiconductor manufacturing, or chip fab, plant to Marcy near SUNYIT.

But, he conceded, much of EDGE's focus has been on the Griffiss Business and Technology Park because of its size and importance to the area.

"The truth of the matter is, we are a smaller metropolitan area, and Griffiss is such a large thing it does consume a lot of time," DiMeo said.

He added that neither Binghamton nor Syracuse has a comparable situation to the one Oneida County faced in the aftermath of the Griffiss Air Force Base closure a decade ago.

Clinton said other communities have come and asked her to be part of their jobs-development efforts. And, she said, in many cases, they have hired an outside consultant to give a big-picture analysis.

"In Syracuse, the development agency came to me and said 'We're missing something, we can't figure out why we're not making progress. Would you support us in getting an appropriation to hire a consultant to take a hard look at us,'" she said.

A study that resulted from that conversation generated illuminating information about Central New York. It turned out the area had more colleges and universities per capita than average, and clusters of companies within the same industry had never networked together, Clinton said.

For DEMand, there were several medical device manufacturers in the area that did not communicate. One was planning to outsource the manufacture of an item to China, but through a new consortium, it learned a manufacturer nearby in Auburn could do the same job, Clinton said.

DiMeo pointed to a 1997 study and economic summit in the Mohawk Valley that generated a regional strategy for development. EDGE has been using that plan as a blueprint for growth, he said.

Steve Zogby, chairman of the board of the Mohawk Valley Chamber of Commerce based in Utica, said there is a perception locally that EDGE is more focused on Griffiss.

"I think that, yes, sometimes EDGE is seen as just developing Griffiss and I think it has to do with perceptions," said Zogby, who also sits on the EDGE board because of his position at the chamber. "Although they are Mohawk Valley EDGE, and supposed to be the economic development arm for the Mohawk Valley, perhaps people don't always see it that way."

Clinton said as with other areas, she would do what she could to help the Mohawk Valley grow economically.

"Utica-Rome is a more challenging environment," she said. "We have to figure out what is the local strategy in order to be able to support and add value to whatever local people decide is the way we tackle job creation."

CLINTON QUOTES

On gas prices:

"We need to have more sources that are more accessible of finished gasoline. ... Secondly, we do need a better conservation and fuel efficiency policy that would be incentivized by the federal government, but it has to be undertaken by car manufacturers. ... And, finally, we need an energy policy in which gas is a part."

On the Sherrill decision and the Oneida Indian Nation land claim:

"I think now is the time to try to figure out how to deal with these issues and bring everybody to the table and use the leverage that the Supreme Court decision has provided to get a fair and lasting resolution."

On base realignment and closure

"If it were on the merits, I honestly believe we made our sacrifices in the 1995 base closing round and that New York now has bases all of which have an essential military mission. Unfortunately, the system doesn't always work on the merits, and what we've tried to do is just to make the very best case we can, over and over again."

PATRICK PALLADINO / Observer-Dispatch

In a meeting with the Observer-Dispatch's editorial board, U.S. Sen. Hillary Clinton, D-N.Y., said it's "difficult to know who's in charge" of economic development in the Mohawk Valley.

*******

Unattributed. 2005. "Gov. Bush Welcomes Manufacturer to Manatee County." US Fed News (May 2).

Gov. Jeb E. Bush, R-Fla., issued the following news release:

Gov. Jeb Bush today announced that the German-based Gammerler AG has chosen to locate its North American manufacturing headquarters (Gammerler US) in Palmetto. With this location, Gammerler US will create 70 new high-wage jobs and make an initial capital investment of $4.25 million in the construction of an 80,000 square foot facility and the purchase of machinery and other equipment.

"A global leader in printing equipment and machinery, we are proud that Gammerler US has chosen Florida to be its North American home," said Governor Bush. "Their presence in Palmetto will not only provide a positive economic impact for the region, but will complement our state's overall manufacturing sector. We are pleased to have worked closely with our economic development partners to bring this project to fruition and wish Gammerler US great success from their new base in Manatee County."

Gammerler US Corporation is the U.S. subsidiary of Gammerler AG, based in Bayern, Germany. The company was founded in 1977, and its U.S. subsidiary began operations in 1985. Gammerler Corporation maintains a global customer base that includes the largest commercial and newspaper printers in the world. Using state-of-theart material handling technology and superior construction materials, Gammerler is committed to providing inline-finishing equipment of exceptional quality that increases efficiency and reduces downtime. In addition to North America, Gammerler has business operations throughout Europe, Asia, and Latin America.

"Receiving the QTI incentive from the state is the key factor in our decision to move our facility and our employees to Florida," said Gammerler CEO, Gunter Gammerler. "We look forward to a bright and successful future doing business from the Sunshine State."

The Governor's Office of Tourism, Trade and Economic Development worked closely with the Economic Development Council Manatee Chamber of Commerce, the Board of County Commissioners of Manatee County, and Enterprise Florida, Inc., to bring this value-added project to the state.

"Manatee County has found our state's incentive programs to be a useful tool to help attract targeted companies like Gammerler who are creating high wage jobs," said Manatee County Administrator Ernie Padgett. "Gammerler's choice of Manatee County is one example of the increased interest by international companies in Florida as an attractive destination to do business."

Governor Bush has made diversifying Florida's economy a top priority for his second term in office, placing particular emphasis on fostering the development of emerging technologies, securing the Permanent Secretariat of the Free Trade Area of the Americas in Miami, and protecting the state's military installations from the 2005 federal Base Realignment and Closure process.

*******

Unattributed. 2005. "Your Town." Monterey County (CA) Herald (May 1).

Monterey County

Sam Farr to host online forum on base closures An online forum to answer questions about the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure process will be held by Rep. Sam Farr, D-Carmel, from 10 to 10:30 a.m. Thursday at http://farr.house.gov .

The Department of Defense is compiling a list of bases recommended for closure or realignment. The list will be sent to the BRAC Commission by May 16, after which the commission will spend at least three months evaluating it.

*******

Unattibuted. 2005. "Member's Bio: Rep. MCHUGH, John M., R-N.Y. (23rd CD)." US Fed News (April 29).

Rep. John M. McHugh, R-N.Y. (23rd CD), has posted the following biography on the members' Web site:

John M. McHugh was first sworn in to the U.S. House of Representatives in January 1993, as the voice in Congress for Northern New Yorkers. In 2003, his district was redrawn to include new territory in Central New York and renamed the 23rd Congressional District. And with the start of the 109th Congress in January 2005, Rep. McHugh began his seventh consecutive term in office.

During this time, Rep. McHugh has been a champion of fiscal responsibility; lower taxes; protecting Social Security and Medicare; providing stronger, better schools; and

protecting America's farmers. He has also been a leader in the country's policy on nat[illegible]efense. He brings to the House of Representatives more than 30 years of demonstrated public service to upstate New York, including eight years as a State Senator.

In addition to lowering taxes, Rep. McHugh believes one of Congress' top priorities is to make our government less intrusive and more efficient. He has been on the front-line fighting to eliminate the marriage tax, the telephone tax, and the death tax. Since 1994, when Republicans took control of Congress as the majority party for the first time in 40 years, Rep. McHugh has helped set our Federal government in a new direction. With Rep. McHugh's support, Congress has maintained critical services, protected vital programs like Social Security and Medicare, and provided American taxpayers with the first meaningful tax relief since 1984.

As a result of his travels throughout his eleven-county Congressional District, Rep. McHugh knows that many individuals do not have access to health insurance, either because their employer does not offer a health care plan, they cannot afford premiums on an individual policy, or some other reason. Consequently, affordable and accessible health care for people residing in rural areas is a priority for Rep. McHugh. He firmly believes that any discussion of health care reform must include the issue of cost and whether the enactment of reforms adversely impacts individuals' pocketbooks and their ability to secure adequate health care coverage.

The Congressman has also been in the forefront in the fight to help farmers secure better prices for their crops. He has voted to extend crop insurance protections to specialty crop farmers, such as apple and onion growers. This effort ensures that farmers will have a better safety net in place to make it through the tough times that occur because of falling prices or extreme weather. Rep. McHugh is also pushing for a new "Value-Added Producer Package" that would help farmers and producer groups earn more by reaching up the agricultural marketing chain to capture more of the profits their product generates. The package is aimed at jump-starting agricultural enterprises by assisting cash-strapped producers to help them reap more of the profits themselves.

Rep. McHugh is recognized as a "Champion of Dairy Farmers" for his aggressive approach to forcing Congress to address the needs of dairy farmers. By rallying Members of Congress from across the country, Rep. McHugh was successful in enacting the Option 1-A pricing system, which provides higher payments to our farmers for their milk. When faced with a major obstacle in the expiration of the Northeast Dairy Compact, Rep. McHugh continued to fight for New York's farmers through the creation of the Milk Income Loss Contract (MILC) program. And because he has long believed that the entire dairy industry stands to benefit from the stable milk prices brought about by a market-based pricing system, Rep. McHugh continues to push for reform of the MILC program to provide greater assistance to more of our family farmers and ultimately replacement of that program with the National Dairy Equity Act. Everyone * from farmers to processors to consumers * would benefit from its existence.

Education is another one of Rep. McHugh's top priorities. He believes that a good educational foundation allows children to reach their full potential and lead responsible adult lives. As such, Rep. McHugh has been a strong supporter of a bill that would subsidize $25 billion in zero-interest school modernization bonds. Funds that would have gone to pay bond interest would be freed for other educational needs. Additionally, Rep. McHugh has voted to send education money directly to the classroom to provide stronger, better schools through local control.

Rep. McHugh began his public service career in 1971 in his hometown of Watertown, where he served for five years as a Confidential Assistant to the City Manager. Thereafter, he joined the staff of New York State Senator H. Douglas Barclay, where he served as Chief of Research and Liaison with local governments for nine years. Succeeding Senator Barclay in 1984, Rep. McHugh served four terms in the legislature's upper house before coming to Congress.

Congressman McHugh is a senior member of both the House Armed Services Committee and the House Government Reform Committee. The Armed Services Committee oversees the Pentagon and America's defense policies. Rep. McHugh chairs the Committee's Subcommittee on Military Personnel, which oversees more than $70 billion in federal defense spending related to personnel issues and $15 billion in health benefits. Military Personnel is also responsible for reserve component integration, military education, POW/MIA, Morale, Welfare, and Recreation and quality of life programs. In addition, he serves on the

Committee's Readiness Subcommittee that is responsible for military readiness, training, logistics and maintenance issues and programs, as well as all military construction, installations and family housing issues, including the base closure process.

DGN 12123

The Committee on Government Reform reviews, on a continuing basis, government activities at all levels with a view to determining their economy and efficiency. As a recognized authority on postal matters in light of his six years as Chairman of the Subcommittee on the Postal Service, Rep. McHugh was appointed to serve as the chairman of the Committee's Special Panel on Postal Reform and Oversight in early 2003. In the 109th Congress, he has again introduced legislation to significantly reform the Postal Service for the first time in 35 years. He also currently serves on the Committee's Subcommittee on National Security, Emerging Threats, and International Relations, as well as its Energy and Resources Subcommittee.

At the start of the 109th Congress, House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert appointed Rep. McHugh to serve on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. The committee is responsible for overseeing activities of the U.S. Intelligence Community, including the annual legislation that directs its operations and spending. It maintains an effective oversight process to ensure that intelligence resources are not misused and that intelligence activities are conducted lawfully. Many aspects of the committee's work are, and must be, classified for reasons of national security. Rep. McHugh serves on three Intelligence Subcommittees: Terrorism/Human Intelligence, Analysis and Counterintelligence; Technical and Tactical Intelligence; and Intelligence Policy.

Rep. McHugh is a resident of Pierrepont Manor in Jefferson County, New York. Born on September 29, 1948, the Congressman was educated in Watertown public schools, graduating in 1966. He received a B.A. in Political Science from Utica College of Syracuse University in 1970, and earned a Master's Degree in Public Administration from the State University's Nelson A. Rockefeller Graduate School of Public Affairs in 1977.

This bio was available on the Member's Web site on April 29.

*******

End

D : 12123



# Wars Strain U.S. Military Capability, Pentagon Reports

By JOSH WHITE
and ANN SCOTT TYSON
Washington Post Staff Writers

The Defense Department acknowledged yesterday that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have stressed the U.S. military to a point where it is at higher risk of less swiftly and easily defeating potential foes, though officials maintained that U.S. forces could handle any military threat that presents itself.

An annual risk assessment by Gen. Richard B. Myers, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, concluded that commanders are having difficulty meeting the higher standards imposed on them by conflicts around the world, including the military effort against terrorism. Presented to members of Congress yesterday, the assessment found that the risk has increased but is trending lower, according to defense and military officials who briefed reporters at the Pentagon yesterday.

Underscoring the stress facing the armed services, the Army reported separately yesterday that its recruiting efforts are continuing to slip, as recruiters nationwide obtained less than 60 percent of the April goal of 6,600 new recruits into the active-duty force. It was the third straight month in which the Army missed its recruiting goal, and it represents a significant downward trend.

According to the Army, the recruiting effort is 16 percent behind where it should be at this point in the fiscal year, and current figures project a nearly 10 percent shortfall by the end of the fiscal year in September. Army recruiting officials believe enhanced recruiting efforts and incentives should increase their enlistments over the summer, but they would have to consistently beat monthly goals over the next five months to meet annual goals. While the Army should have had 42,585 new recruits for the year as of the end of April, it had 35,833. It hopes to have 80,000 new enlistments this fiscal year.

"We are still cautiously optimistic," said Col. Joseph Curtin, an Army spokesman.

Myers's risk assessment is a rare open acknowledgment that the stresses on the force and the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan could have an impact on other military operations. Although the assessment does not indicate a greater threat to the nation, or a greater threat to the military, it does indicate that additional conflicts could take longer, or eat up more resources, than expected.

Military and defense officials spoke to reporters on the condition of anonymity yesterday because the risk assessment is a classified document, but they wanted to emphasize that the heightened risk does not indicate vulnerability on the part of U.S. forces and that it should not be read by other nations as an opportunity to attack. The officials said the United States would win any projected conflict across the globe, but the path to victory could be more complicated.

"There is no doubt of what the outcome is going to be," a top defense official said. "Risk to accomplish the task isn't even part of the discussion. The way we accomplish the task is."

A senior military official said, for example, that it is obvious that if another conflict arises while the United States does battle in Iraq and Afghanistan and fights the global war on terrorism, it would not be as easily accomplished as if the other three conflicts did not exist.

"It wouldn't be as pretty," the official said.

Defense officials are also working to mitigate the risks by following through with plans to transform the military, making it more agile and lethal, and by looking at how U.S. troops are positioned around the globe. By raising operational standards, officials say commanders can save lives by acting faster and by using fewer resources.

The military's need for manpower on the ground, however, continues to highlight demands on the Army and the Marines, the two services charged with conducting the ongoing wars. Along with the Army missing recruiting targets, the Marines missed contracting targets in February and March, though by relatively small amounts. The Army Reserve has also missed its recruiting targets each of the past four months, in some cases dramatically.

The shortage of recruits has the Army's boot camps running at lower-than-usual capacity. The Army's basic training center at Fort Benning, Ga., is training seven companies currently, half of its maximum capacity of 14 companies, according to Col. Bill Gallagher, commander of the Basic Combat Training Brigade. Moreover, each company of fresh recruits is smaller than usual, with only 190 troops compared with a maximum possible of 220, he said.

The only way the Army can meet its annual recruiting goal is with a large surge of enlistments this spring and summer, leading Fort Benning officials to prepare for "a huge influx, in case it happens," Gallagher said. Last year, however, there was "no summer surge," he said.

As of the end of March, 7,800 infantry soldiers had been trained at Fort Benning, compared with a target of 25, 541 for fiscal 2005.

## McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk

**From:** Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2005 7:03 AM
**To:** Meyer, Jennifer, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk
**Subject:** FW: Roll out of the Report

FYI. Pls pass to Christine and Jim.

-----Original Message-----
From: Stanley, Daniel, CIV, OSD-LA
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2005 7:04 PM
To: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Re: Roll out of the Report

That is not our plan. We intend to deliver the report to all congressional offices at the same time, prior to the press conference. You get it at the moment of public release.

---
Sent from the Gizmo.

-----Original Message-----
From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC <C.Battaglia@wso.whs.mil>
To: Stanley, Daniel, CIV, OSD-LA <Daniel.Stanley@osd.mil>
Sent: Mon May 09 18:59:52 2005
Subject: Roll out of the Report

I understand that select Member of Congress will be briefed by OSD at a Friday breakfast to be followed by a more general brief of all other MOCs. When do you plan to brief the BRAC Commission, esp the Chairman?

# Overseas Realignment Process Proceeding in 'Deliberate, Thoughtful' Manner

By Donna Miles
American Forces Press Service

WASHINGTON, May 9, 2005 – The Defense Department is moving forward with plans to reshape its force structure overseas through close coordination with Congress, other government agencies and U.S. allies and partners, defense officials told Pentagon reporters here today.

The global defense posture review is being undertaken as a "deliberate, thoughtful and flexible" process that meets 21st-century threats and improves troops' quality of life, according to Ryan Henry, principal deputy undersecretary of defense for policy.

Henry joined Ray DuBois, acting undersecretary of the Army, in countering charges by the Commission on Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States that DoD is moving ahead too quickly and without sufficient coordination. The independent commission released its report last week and held a news conference on its findings today.

DoD welcomes the commission's support for the global posture realignment, announced last August by President Bush, Henry said. The plan calls for the return of up to 70,000 troops and 100,000 family members and civilian employees currently based overseas to the United States.

"We believe the commission's report reflects an earnest effort to assess the military facility structures of the United States overseas," Henry said. "It recognizes that our overseas presence must reflect the challenges we face in the 21st century."

In announcing the initiative last summer, Bush said the U.S. force structure overseas reflects Cold War threats, not those that exist today.

Basing more troops in the United States and taking advantage of new technologies to quickly deploy them and their increased combat power will result in "a more agile and flexible force," the president said.

During today's Pentagon briefing, Henry re-emphasized the need for flexibility of U.S. forces and disputed the commission's assertion that global posturing needs to reflect concrete threats.

"We live in a world of uncertainty," he said. "We can predict with a certain degree of certainty that in the coming years we will need to use our military forces. ... What we cannot predict is where, when or in what manner we may need to use those forces."

Returning heavier forces as well as administrative and support functions to the United States will help increase the flexibility of the U.S. armed forces and their ability to respond quickly as necessary, he said.

Plans for what has been called the most significant rethinking of U.S. overseas military posture in more than 50 years have been coordinated "every step of the way," Henry said. They reflect input from regional combatant commanders, interagency partners, Congress, U.S. ambassadors and U.S. allies and partners, he said.

At the same time, the process is being conducted in a way that dovetails with several other initiatives under way: the department's Base Realignment and Closure Commission

recommendations, to be released later this week; a mobility capabilities review expected this summer; and the Quadrennial Defense Review.

Coordinating these efforts will prevent gaps in military capabilities as well as infrastructure and quality-of-life programs for troops and their families, DuBois said. "It's a complex set of moves, and they are all interrelated," he said.

Throughout the planning, quality-of-life programs have remained a top priority, Henry said. "We in DoD realize that the No. 1 resource we have in the department are the fighting men and women ... and their families who support them," he said. "They are the one asset that we want to make sure we optimize."

**Biographies:**
Ryan Henry
Ray DuBois

DCN: 12123
Wall Street Journal (WSJ.com)
May 9, 2005

# Pentagon: Base Shifts To Take Account Of Transport Needs

By Rebecca Christie, Dow Jones Newswires

WASHINGTON -- The Pentagon 's new plan to bring 70,000 U.S. troops back from foreign bases won't overwhelm the military's ability to transport soldiers to war, Defense Department officials said Monday.

A Congress-appointed panel raised questions about the strain the base changes could put on supply ships and long-range cargo planes. In a new report, the Overseas Basing Commission said the Pentagon lacks sufficient transport capability and already is overtaxing its fleets.

"Moreover, the commission notes that budgetary plans for mobility assets are inadequate to meet projected lift demand," the commission said in the report, officially released Monday.

Pentagon officials responded that the changes will phase in gradually and mesh well with the recommendations of a mobility capability study now in the works. The upcoming quadrennial defense review also will address the issue, said Ryan Henry, the Defense Department's principal deputy undersecretary for policy.

"We will work in exactly what the timing and the pacing is so that strategic lift and inter-theater lift is exactly paced with the implementation of the Global Defense posture," Henry said during a press briefing.

Ray DuBois, acting undersecretary of the Army, said the Defense Department's top generals have not raised transportation concerns about the troop shift plan.

"The Joint Chiefs of Staff have fully embraced the return of this force structure from overseas, in no small measure because in their judgment, in their military judgment, moving to the fight or getting faster to the fight is enabled by being in the United States," DuBois said.

The Army is heavily dependent on other services for getting its units to combat zones. Because of this, the Overseas Basing Commission recommended that the Pentagon keep some stocks of key heavy equipment in Europe.

Both the Navy and the Air Force have struggled recently over how to fund new ships and aircraft programs to upgrade older systems. The Navy's shipbuilding budget will allow construction of just four ships next year, while the Air Force faces funding threats to a wide range of programs including refueling tankers, a key element in any air mobility plan.

The Air Force still has not decided on how it will upgrade its tanker aircraft, which date back to the 1960s. A $23 billion plan to lease and buy planes from Boeing Co. (BA) collapsed under a mushrooming procurement scandal, and any new plan now will have to pass muster with Congress and audit agencies.

Boeing also makes the C-17 long-range transport aircraft, on track to end production by 2008 unless the Pentagon places more orders. The C-130 cargo plane, made by Lockheed Martin Corp. (LMT), faces even more immediate pressures - the Pentagon 's 2006 budget request calls for ending production of the

DCN: 12123

plane's latest model next year, although the Pentagon is reviewing whether to change its recommendation.

DCN: 12123
Colorado Springs Gazette
May 8, 2005

# Bracing For BRAC

*Base closures a reason for anxiety, optimism*

These are anxious days for towns and cities, like ours, with close ties to the military. We're probably only days away from the much anticipated, much dreaded release of the Pentagon's recommended list of base closures and consolidations. And while most signs point to the likelihood that Colorado Springs will emerge from the process unscathed — and might even benefit from the changes — nothing is certain and we're still a long way from being in the clear.

Tuesday was the first day on the job for the nine-member Defense Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission, which will study the Pentagon's list and present its own recommendation to the president in September. If the president signs off, Congress has 45 legislative days to reject or approve it, without amendment.

The Pentagon is taking extraordinary steps to keep the rumor mill in check. Base commanders may get as little as 12 hours advance notice on their status. And even members of Congress won't learn what facilities are on the list until an hour before Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld makes the announcement. So sensitive is the issue that the Pentagon has hired a public relations firm to help handle communications.

The Bush administration, meanwhile, is guarding against any last-ditch efforts by members of Congress to sabotage the process, or to politicize it, which amounts to the same thing, since key to BRAC's success is the perception that it is fair, methodical and free from political manipulation.

Politics could still intrude, of course. It was reported last week that members of Congress might attempt to use the 2006 defense reauthorization bill to toss a monkey wrench into the works. And recently, Mississippi Sen. Trent Lott blocked the nomination of BRAC commission Chairman Anthony Principi, former secretary of veteran affairs, forcing President Bush to use his recess appointment powers to get the panel up and running.

Because "BRAC is a creation of Congress, Congress can change the rules under which BRAC is carried out," one analyst at the Congressional Research Service told Congress Daily. "During previous sessions, some members of Congress have contemplated proposing significant changes to the BRAC process, such as delaying its effects for up to two years, but so sweeping a change has not yet been enacted."

As self-serving as they can be, most members of Congress still seem to understand the long-term damage they could do to national security and the budget process by destroying the only means available for eliminating unneeded military facilities. As disliked as BRAC is, it's also designed with politicians in mind. It gives them political cover by making it appear that such decisions are largely beyond the influence or control of individual members of Congress. BRAC allows Congress to do what it would never do otherwise, given the understandable tendency to protect bases back home.

Rep. Joel Hefley, who chairs the House Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee, was at one time a leading advocate for shelving this round. But his desire to derail BRAC waned as indicators began to suggest that Colorado Springs could benefit this time around. "He personally feels that Colorado is going to come out OK," Hefley spokesperson Kim Sears told us. Given the difficulty of amending the

DCN: 12123

process at this late date, the Senate's traditional support for BRAC and the Bush administration's unwavering commitment to downsizing, "Mr. Hefley realizes that, at this point, it might be better to allow the process to go forward and see what happens," Sears said.

We don't relish another BRAC any more than members of Congress do. A closure here could deliver a body blow to the local economy. But we think the administration has made a convincing case that this is necessary, so we'll hold our breath and wait, torn between narrow self-interest and the broader national interest. And we try to keep in mind a point made by Principi when he opened his first hearing by reminding Americans that "military bases are a means, not an end."

This much is clear, though: Colorado Springs has shown over the years that it is a good host to the military, and the military has shown it is a good neighbor.

DCN: 12123

Los Angeles Times
May 10, 2005

# Air Force General In Probe Is Nominated For A 2nd Star

By Associated Press

AIR FORCE ACADEMY, Colo. — The Pentagon said Monday that it wanted to promote one of the top commanders at the Air Force Academy, a "born-again" Christian who has been the subject of complaints that he improperly mixed religion with education.

The announcement came one day before the scheduled arrival of a task force investigating allegations that cadets were pressured to attend religious services, public prayers were held before official events and Jewish cadets were harassed.

Brig. Gen. Johnny Weida, the academy's No. 2 officer, was nominated to receive the second star of a major general.

In an e-mail in May 2003, Weida urged cadets to "ask the Lord to give us the wisdom to discover the right.... The Lord is in control. He has a plan for ... every one of us."

Later he issued a memo stating that cadets were accountable first to their God.

Through a spokesman, Weida declined to comment Monday. Earlier, academy officials said Weida now runs his messages by several other commanders before sending them.

Pentagon spokesman Col. Gary Keck said he could not comment on whether the board that recommended Weida's promotion knew of the inquiry.

Keck said the board recommended promotions based on an officer's record and potential. He said he had no specifics on Weida's promotion.

The nomination angered critics of the academy.

"I am absolutely shocked that anyone would get a promotion in the middle of an investigation in which he is a central figure.... It casts doubt on the seriousness of this ongoing investigation," said the Rev. Barry Lynn, executive director of Americans United for the Separation of Church and State. His group conducted an investigation of religious intolerance at the academy and has threatened a lawsuit.

DCN: 12123

**Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk**

**From:** Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2005 7:13 AM
**To:** Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk
**Subject:** We could all be in the mix

# Defense Jobs in N.Va. At Risk

## Many Buildings Fall Short of New Security Standards

By Spencer S. HsuWashington Post Staff Writer
Tuesday, May 10, 2005; Page A01

The Defense Department will have to move as many as 50,000 employees out of Northern Virginia office buildings if it strictly enforces new security regulations, and local lawmakers say Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld could announce some of those relocations this week.

Rumsfeld is to release a list of planned military base closings and realignments by Friday. Although Pentagon officials have declined to provide details, Rumsfeld said last week that the department wants to move workers from leased office space to buildings it owns to cut long-term costs.

The department would have to begin moving those jobs anyway because of anti-terrorism regulations it adopted two years ago, which require, among other things, that buildings not on military bases be set back at least 82 feet from traffic to protect against truck bombs.

The new standards, already in effect for new construction, become mandatory in October for new leases and will be phased in for all lease renewals starting in 2009.

The Pentagon rents about 8 million square feet of space in 140 Northern Virginia buildings -- and almost none of them can meet the new requirement, according to analysts and lawmakers.

Although just how the Pentagon will implement the rules is uncertain, local members of Congress say they fear that tens of thousands of defense jobs will leave Arlington County and other densely populated parts of Northern Virginia over the next five to 15 years, moving to military bases or commercial sites outside the Capital Beltway -- or elsewhere in the country -- where land is cheaper.

The District and Maryland have fewer Defense Department leases but could also be affected.

"I think the [base realignment] process is about to drop an economic bombshell on Northern Virginia. It's probably the greatest threat to our economy since the real estate recession of the late 1980s," Rep. James P. Moran Jr. (D-Va.), who represents Arlington, home to about 60 percent of the leased Defense space in the region, said in an interview.

"I don't want to cause people to panic, but I suspect very strongly that . . . its target is going to be DOD-leased space, particularly leased space within proximity of the Pentagon," Moran said.

In addition to the economic impact on such jurisdictions as Arlington, land-use experts say the security regulations could increase suburban sprawl and frustrate "smart growth" efforts in urban areas.

Moran has asked Rumsfeld to ease the setback rule, and a spokesman for John W. Warner (R-Va.), chairman of

the Senate Armed Services Committee, said he, too, supports a more flexible standard as long as it does not sacrifice safety.

Besides the minimum setback requirement, the new Pentagon rules call for buildings to be more collapse-resistant; to eliminate uncontrolled below-ground or rooftop parking; and to have protective window glazing, mailroom ventilation and emergency shutoff switches for air distribution.

"The Department of Defense does not have an interest in going back into Fort Apache. But we do have an interest in protecting our people," said Ralph E. Newton, who heads the branch of the Pentagon that manages its leased space in the capital region.

Several real estate analysts cautioned that lack of funding might limit how quickly the Pentagon can move to more secure buildings and that it is likely to apply the new standards to its most sensitive facilities first.

They also said the relocations might not seriously hurt the region as a whole, as inner jurisdictions' losses would be offset by outer suburbs' gains.

For instance, the Fort Belvoir Engineering Proving Ground, a former military airfield in southeastern Fairfax County, has been touted by developers as a site that could accommodate up to 20 million square feet of office space, although it has environmental and traffic problems.

Newton said it is unlikely that all 50,000 defense workers in leased space would be moved outside the region.

"I think until we test the standards and see what the market will bear, it is impossible for us determine what the impact will be," he said.

But Washington area planners and real estate experts say the new Defense Department rules are part of a wider trend toward fortification of government offices that has forced them to alter their thinking.

Intense demand for homeland security and military-related office space has caused rents to soar near the National Security Agency at Fort Meade and the Patuxent River Naval Air Station in Southern Maryland, each at least 20 miles from Washington, for example.

Robert M. Pinkard, chief executive of Cassidy & Pinkard, the area's largest locally owned commercial real estate firm, said he has never before seen a time when the private lease market is so driven by the federal government's decisions on location.

Closer to the capital, Arlington planners are discussing whether to seal off street traffic around individual building, or perhaps even several blocks of Crystal City or Ballston, to try to keep their defense jobs, although that could run counter to the county's history of "urban village" planning.

In Southeast Washington, District leaders are revising plans to redevelop 300 acres around St. Elizabeths Hospital into a residential and commercial center, now that the U.S. government wants to use its portion of the property for a secure compound for federal agencies.

In Prince George's County, planners are worried that their dream of redeveloping a "town center" across from the 226-acre Suitland Federal Center will be limited because federal agencies have retreated behind fences and buffer zones, said Teri Bond, project manager with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

"We have had a sea change . . . in the way security is perceived for federal employees and people within federal buildings, and I don't believe it will ever go back to the way it was before," said Joseph D. Delogu, principal and partner with Spalding & Slye Colliers, a real estate firm that helped the Transportation Security Administration choose its new headquarters.

DCN: 12123

At the same time, some anti-terrorism specialists have criticized the federal government for not adopting uniform standards. For non-defense agencies, the Department of Homeland Security and the General Services Administration finalized less restrictive rules in February. They require setbacks of 20 to 100 feet for new buildings only, and they allow exceptions if an agency can reach an overall level of security "performance."

Some agencies, such as the Justice and State departments, have stronger requirements.

"We don't want to say if you don't have 19 1/2 feet of setback you're out of consideration," said Wade D. Belcher, who chaired the working group that produced the standards and is with the Office of the Chief Architect at GSA.

"We will not be bullied by domestic or international persons who want to do harm or disrupt the government. And if we abandon an area, it can be perceived that the potential adversaries have won."

*Staff writer Dana Hedgpeth contributed to this report.*

DCN: 12123

**McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk**

**From:** Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2005 7:13 AM
**To:** Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk; Van Saun, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk
**Subject:** We could all be in the mix

# Defense Jobs in N.Va. At Risk

## Many Buildings Fall Short of New Security Standards

By Spencer S. HsuWashington Post Staff Writer
Tuesday, May 10, 2005; Page A01

The Defense Department will have to move as many as 50,000 employees out of Northern Virginia office buildings if it strictly enforces new security regulations, and local lawmakers say Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld could announce some of those relocations this week.

Rumsfeld is to release a list of planned military base closings and realignments by Friday. Although Pentagon officials have declined to provide details, Rumsfeld said last week that the department wants to move workers from leased office space to buildings it owns to cut long-term costs.

The department would have to begin moving those jobs anyway because of anti-terrorism regulations it adopted two years ago, which require, among other things, that buildings not on military bases be set back at least 82 feet `om traffic to protect against truck bombs.

The new standards, already in effect for new construction, become mandatory in October for new leases and will be phased in for all lease renewals starting in 2009.

The Pentagon rents about 8 million square feet of space in 140 Northern Virginia buildings -- and almost none of them can meet the new requirement, according to analysts and lawmakers.

Although just how the Pentagon will implement the rules is uncertain, local members of Congress say they fear that tens of thousands of defense jobs will leave Arlington County and other densely populated parts of Northern Virginia over the next five to 15 years, moving to military bases or commercial sites outside the Capital Beltway -- or elsewhere in the country -- where land is cheaper.

The District and Maryland have fewer Defense Department leases but could also be affected.

"I think the [base realignment] process is about to drop an economic bombshell on Northern Virginia. It's probably the greatest threat to our economy since the real estate recession of the late 1980s," Rep. James P. Moran Jr. (D-Va.), who represents Arlington, home to about 60 percent of the leased Defense space in the region, said in an interview.

"I don't want to cause people to panic, but I suspect very strongly that . . . its target is going to be DOD-leased space, particularly leased space within proximity of the Pentagon," Moran said.

`n addition to the economic impact on such jurisdictions as Arlington, land-use experts say the security `gulations could increase suburban sprawl and frustrate "smart growth" efforts in urban areas.

Moran has asked Rumsfeld to ease the setback rule, and a spokesman for John W. Warner (R-Va.), chairman of

the Senate Armed Services Committee, said he, too, supports a more flexible standard as long as it does not sacrifice safety.

Besides the minimum setback requirement, the new Pentagon rules call for buildings to be more collapse-resistant; to eliminate uncontrolled below-ground or rooftop parking; and to have protective window glazing, mailroom ventilation and emergency shutoff switches for air distribution.

"The Department of Defense does not have an interest in going back into Fort Apache. But we do have an interest in protecting our people," said Ralph E. Newton, who heads the branch of the Pentagon that manages its leased space in the capital region.

Several real estate analysts cautioned that lack of funding might limit how quickly the Pentagon can move to more secure buildings and that it is likely to apply the new standards to its most sensitive facilities first.

They also said the relocations might not seriously hurt the region as a whole, as inner jurisdictions' losses would be offset by outer suburbs' gains.

For instance, the Fort Belvoir Engineering Proving Ground, a former military airfield in southeastern Fairfax County, has been touted by developers as a site that could accommodate up to 20 million square feet of office space, although it has environmental and traffic problems.

Newton said it is unlikely that all 50,000 defense workers in leased space would be moved outside the region.

"I think until we test the standards and see what the market will bear, it is impossible for us determine what the impact will be," he said.

But Washington area planners and real estate experts say the new Defense Department rules are part of a wider trend toward fortification of government offices that has forced them to alter their thinking.

Intense demand for homeland security and military-related office space has caused rents to soar near the National Security Agency at Fort Meade and the Patuxent River Naval Air Station in Southern Maryland, each at least 20 miles from Washington, for example.

Robert M. Pinkard, chief executive of Cassidy & Pinkard, the area's largest locally owned commercial real estate firm, said he has never before seen a time when the private lease market is so driven by the federal government's decisions on location.

Closer to the capital, Arlington planners are discussing whether to seal off street traffic around individual building, or perhaps even several blocks of Crystal City or Ballston, to try to keep their defense jobs, although that could run counter to the county's history of "urban village" planning.

In Southeast Washington, District leaders are revising plans to redevelop 300 acres around St. Elizabeths Hospital into a residential and commercial center, now that the U.S. government wants to use its portion of the property for a secure compound for federal agencies.

In Prince George's County, planners are worried that their dream of redeveloping a "town center" across from the 226-acre Suitland Federal Center will be limited because federal agencies have retreated behind fences and buffer zones, said Teri Bond, project manager with the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.

"We have had a sea change . . . in the way security is perceived for federal employees and people within federal buildings, and I don't believe it will ever go back to the way it was before," said Joseph D. Delogu, principal and partner with Spalding & Slye Colliers, a real estate firm that helped the Transportation Security Administration choose its new headquarters.

At the same time, some anti-terrorism specialists have criticized the federal government for not adopting uniform standards. For non-defense agencies, the Department of Homeland Security and the General Services Administration finalized less restrictive rules in February. They require setbacks of 20 to 100 feet for new buildings only, and they allow exceptions if an agency can reach an overall level of security "performance."

Some agencies, such as the Justice and State departments, have stronger requirements.

"We don't want to say if you don't have 19 1/2 feet of setback you're out of consideration," said Wade D. Belcher, who chaired the working group that produced the standards and is with the Office of the Chief Architect at GSA.

"We will not be bullied by domestic or international persons who want to do harm or disrupt the government. And if we abandon an area, it can be perceived that the potential adversaries have won."

*Staff writer Dana Hedgpeth contributed to this report.*

**McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk**

**From:** Daniel Else [delse@crs.loc.gov]
**Sent:** Friday, May 06, 2005 8:45 AM
**Subject:** The Daily BRAC - the Mounting the Gravy Train edition, Pt III

Karamagi Rujumba. 2005. "DeWine Optimistic about Air Base." The Blade (Toledo, OH) (May 5).

There is a good chance that the Ohio Air National Guard's 180th Fighter Wing will keep its base of operations at the Toledo Express Airport, said U.S. Sen. Mike Dewine (R., Ohio) who toured the base yesterday.

In the fifth and final round of the Base Realignment and Closure process known as BRAC, the Department of Defense task force will draw up a list of military bases, which it will recommend to the White House for closure.

The Pentagon is expected to release its list of base closure recommendations May 16. It will send the list to President Bush on Sept. 8, and he will have to approve or reject the list by Sept. 23. Congress then must approve the recommended list of base closures.

After touring the fighter wing and meeting with the base commander, Ohio's senior senator said he was impressed by the level of community support in efforts to keep the base open. His counterpart, U.S. Sen. George Voinovich (R., Ohio), also recently inspected the base.

"This is a fighter wing that has great military value," Mr. Dewine said. He noted the base has 100 acres for future expansion, and has "great community support."

"All these things are very positive," Mr. Dewine said.

He noted that the Toledo-based Guard unit has had great representation in Washington because of community leaders who have traveled to Washington on several occasions to lobby on behalf of the base.

Supporters of keeping the Guard unit at Toledo Express said the base employs 1,343 area residents and estimate the base contributes $70 million to the regional economy.

A group of Toledo supporters were on Capitol Hill Monday to present their case to Lt. Gen. Daniel James, a member of the Pentagon's base-closing task force.

"I don't want to speculate, but I think we have a good chance," Mr. Dewine said. "We have to wait and see, but the community here is well prepared."

In the event that the Guard unit's base is selected for closure, the process then will enter another phase that entails members of the task force inspecting all the bases recommended for closure, the senator said.

*******

Lorraine Mirabella. 2005. "Planned Sale of Former Army Base to Maryland Developer Is under Review." The Baltimore (MD) Sun (May 5).

The Maryland Attorney General's office is reviewing the planned sale of the former Fort Ritchie Army base in Western Maryland to a Columbia-based commercial developer, after community members raised concerns about the $5 million to $9 million transaction.

PenMar Development Corp., a state agency created to redevelop the closed base in the mountains of Washington County, has a contract to sell the 637-acre property to Corporate Office Properties Trust. COPT, which plans 1.7 million square feet of office space and 673 homes, would pay the lower amount if the development generates the anticipated 1,500 jobs. The deal is on hold because the Army's transfer of the property to PenMar has been blocked by an injunction issued in connection with a lawsuit against PenMar filed by a former Fort Ritchie tenant.

Kevin Enright, a spokesman for Maryland Attorney General J. Joseph Curran Jr. said yesterday that Curran assigned one of his top attorneys to look into the matter after U.S. Sens. Paul S. Sarbanes and Barbara Mikulski wrote a letter alerting him to concerns raised by the Cascade community.

DCN: 12123

"No response has been given yet. It is being looked into at this time," said Enright, who said he has not been given a time frame for a response. "It will be looked at and addressed fairly soon."

The senators referred the matter to Curran's office after hearing concerns about the PenMar contract with COPT from two PenMar board members, including William Wivell, who is also vice president of the Washington County Commissioners. Community activists and the dissenting board members have said they have misgivings about how the contract was awarded, about the lack of a written appraisal and about the sale price, which they believe is below fair market value.

"My issue has been with the contract (PenMar) has with COPT," Wivell said yesterday. "It doesn't have a lot of teeth in it to enforce anything if something doesn't work out the way COPT says it will. My concern has always been trying to get the most for the community. That base is worth a lot more than $5 million."

"With land values in the county what they are, the property has become much more valuable today than what it was a few years ago," he said.

George G. B. Griffin, chairman of the board of PenMar, said yesterday that the board had had extensive discussions about having an appraisal * which would require finding comparable properties * and voted instead to use a "fairness opinion" issued by a real estate professional, which he said the board obtained.

He said no one on the board has done anything unethical or illegal as dissenting board members have charged.

"To my knowledge, nobody at the PMDC has undertaken any such activity, and I would welcome having the AG look into those allegations," he said. "I don't think you'll find any such thing."

Randall M. Griffin, president and chief operating officer of COPT, which develops and owns office buildings, said his company is ready to proceed with the mixed use development on the site as soon as PenMar is able to close the sale. He called the concerns over the contract unfounded.

"There's an excellent opportunity to create a lot of jobs and re-create a tax base for that county," he said.

The former base, which was closed in September 1998, will be losing its only current commercial tenant in 2006 when the International Masonry Institute moves its national training center off the grounds where it has leased space since 1997 and had a contract to buy the 26 acres to expand with some 200 jobs.

"We had had a contract to purchase the land so we could break ground and build the center we need, but the title never got cleared to move ahead," said Hazel Bradford, an IMI spokeswoman. "We've been stuck for a while, and there wasn't any promise of that changing."

The IMI, the training arm of the Washington-based International Union of Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers, will instead build a new center in Bowie.

*******

Tu-Uyen Tran. 2005. "Expect List May 12." Grand Forks (ND) Herald (May 5).

Early Release Allows Lawmakers to Return Home for Announcement

The Pentagon likely will release its list of bases to close or realign May 12, four days ahead of the original deadline, the head of Grand Forks' efforts to retain its Air Force base said Wednesday.

That's a week from today. John Marshall said he heard the date from three separate sources, one of them a high-level official. Though that date would mean a little less time for him and his consultants to work with the Pentagon, he said, it doesn't mean much in the scheme of things.

DCN: 12123

"You always wish you had another day to get things done," he said.

The original deadline for the Base Realignment and Closure list was May 16. It was later moved to May 13 to give members of Congress a chance to be in their home states when the news came out. To give the lawmakers even more time, Marshall said the list now is expected to go out a day earlier.

Until that day, though, he said, he'll still be fighting for the base. Even this close to the deadline, he said, "there's nothing in stone."

The new release date also cuts it closer for the effort by the state's Congressional delegation and the governor to petition the Defense Department to keep all North Dakota bases open. The due date for the online petitions is May 9, after which signatures will be gathered and sent to the Pentagon.

Though it might seem pointless in a BRAC process designed to be insulated from politics, Marshall said it is an important gesture of support for the military. "You can't look at one thing and one thing only," he said. "You've got to look at all the links in the doggone chain."

"If we are on the list, that's one more thing we can show and say here's our track record and look what we've done," he said.

Tran reports on City Hall. Reach him at (701) 780-1248 or ttran@gfherald.com.

*******

Bob Guard. 2005. "Georgia May Get More GIs in Reshuffle." The Atlanta (GA) Journal-Constitution (May 5): A8.

The repositioning of troops from overseas and an upcoming round of domestic base closings will probably boost the population of major military installations in Georgia, defense analysts and Sen. Saxby Chambliss (R-Ga.) predicted Wednesday.

"In general, Georgia looks healthier than any other state," said Loren Thompson, chief operating officer for the Lexington Institute, an independent public policy research group in Arlington, Va.

"Fort Benning and Fort Stewart both looked quite secure in the base-closing process even without the returning units from Germany and Korea. With the returning forces, they are likely to gain jobs," Thompson said.

He added that Robins Air Force Base in Warner Robins is a "critical part" of the Air Force logistics system and Kings Bay Naval Base in Brunswick is the only ballistic missile submarine base on the East Coast.

Chambliss, a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, predicted after a speech at the Atlanta Press Club that, though some Georgia bases may be targeted, the state "is going to be a net gainer overall."

"We're making preparations at Benning now for a large influx of personnel" likely to be transferred there after other bases close, he said. "It won't be the only gainer."

On Capitol Hill on Wednesday, Pentagon officials told the bipartisan commission overseeing this round of base closing that the Defense Department's recommendations for shutdowns and movements will take into account the 70,000 military personnel and 100,000 family members who will return from overseas bases in the next six years.

The Pentagon is expected to submit its recommendations to the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission next week. The BRAC panel will have until Sept. 8 to decide the future of the nation's 425 domestic military installations.

Defense officials assured the commissioners, who were holding their second day of hearings Wednesday, that the Pentagon has planned for the returning troops and families in deciding which bases it wants closed and which it wants expanded.

DCN: 12123

Fort Benning, near Columbus, is already scheduled to receive a newly organized brigade of the 25th Infantry Division and Fort Stewart, near Savannah, is due to get some new units, said Fred Bryant, deputy executive director of the Georgia Military Affairs Coordinating Committee.

Military units are gradually moving to the South and West, said Thompson. "What is happening is that the military is saving money by concentrating in places where costs are lower and the bases already have a critical mass of capabilities," he said. "A . . . Robins Air Force Base will gain work while smaller facilities in the Northeast will lose work," and "megafacilities" like Fort Benning and Fort Stewart will benefit.

Staff writer Bill Steiden contributed to this article.

*******

A; A Section

Bliss will be 'winner'

By Chris Roberts
El Paso Times
430 words
4 May 2005
El Paso Times
1A
English
(c) Copyright 2005, El Paso Times. All Rights Reserved.

El Paso Times

U.S. Sen. John Cornyn didn't spill any secrets during a news conference Tuesday at Fort Bliss, but he said he remained hopeful that the post could ultimately see an increase of up to 20,000 soldiers as the federal government looks for ways to realign the nation's military.

"If we get a division here, that's 20,000 troops potentially," the Texas Republican said shortly after being briefed by post commander Maj. Gen. Michael A. Vane at the Fort Bliss Museum and Study Center. "I don't know what we're talking about for sure, but ... Fort Bliss can take an awful lot more."

Referring to the expected announcement next week of Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's Base Realignment and Closure list, he said, "I think Fort Bliss is going to be a net winner."

The list will make proposals for changing the missions and troop concentrations at some posts to make the U.S. military more mobile and responsive in future global conflicts. El Paso officials have said the region * which also includes White Sands Missile Range and Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico * is well-positioned to take advantage of the realignment, gaining personnel and missions.

"We've made the commitment in Washington, we've assured the senator, the Department of Defense, if you bring them, we'll educate them and we'll house them," said El Paso Mayor Joe Wardy, who introduced Cornyn.

Cornyn mentioned the importance to the national security of the post's missions, which include air-defense Patriot battalions.

"Well, I don't see any real limitations to how big (Fort Bliss) can get," Cornyn said. "I think looking out over the next five or 10 years, we know we are going to continue to be very busy because this continues to be a very dangerous world."

With the growing number of countries that have ballistic missiles," he said, "that's going to continue to be a very important part of our national defense system."

He also mentioned community support, the quality of life and large training spaces at Fort Bliss and in El Paso.

Also part of the mix is the overseas realignment, which is expected to return about 70,000 soldiers from bases in Germany and Korea.

"They're going to have to find a home in the United States," Cornyn said, "and I just happen to think that Fort Bliss is one of the best places they could possibly be located."

*******

Greg Wright. 2005. "Military Official Impressed by Toledo Air Guard Unit, Ohio Lawmakers Say." Gannett News Service (May 4).

A top military official made flattering comments about the Toledo Express Airport Air National Guard base unit on Tuesday, just a week before the Pentagon is scheduled to announce a new round of base realignment and closures, two Ohio lawmakers said.

Lt. Gen. Daniel James III, director of the Air National Guard, described the base, which houses the 180th Fighter Wing, as an "excellent unit," said Rep. Marcy Kaptur, D-Toledo.

James left the meeting without talking to reporters.

The unit has 1,200 workers and pumps $70 million a year into economies of northwest Ohio and southeast Michigan. Kaptur and Paul Gillmor, R-Old Fort, met with James for almost an hour.

"My feeling after this meeting was a very good feeling," Kaptur said.

Gillmor agreed, but said it is too early to predict whether the base will be affected.

Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld is reviewing a list of recommended base closings and realignments designed to eliminate about 20 percent of the nation's base capacity. The plan, aimed at saving the Pentagon about $7 billion a year, would require shutting down dozens of military installations in the largest round of closings to date.

The list will be released to a nine-member base-closing panel by May 16. That panel will review and make changes to the list and give a final list to President Bush in September." I had a good feeling but you simply do not know," Gillmor said.

Kaptur and Gillmor have lobbied Pentagon officials to keep the base open.

Robert Decker, a retired pilot and a representative of a group in northwest Ohio that is fighting to keep the base open, attended the meeting with James. Also on hand were representatives of Cassidy and Associates, a lobbying group the committee hired to press its case.

Base closure experts said there is little communities can do to avoid a base closure because the Pentagon makes its decision based on a facility's strategic importance. And although James praised the unit, he does not sit on the commission.

Kaptur and Gillmor said the 50-year-old Toledo Express Airport Air National Guard, located about 14 miles west of downtown Toledo, has attributes that make it vital to the military.

Northwest Ohio has a workforce well trained in aeronautics and the community supports the unit, Kaptur and Gillmor said. The base can be expanded to serve other military needs, they said.

The Toledo Express Air National Guard has made $35 million in improvements in the last 15 years, Kaptur said. These improvements include a new hangar, said Terry Paul, an executive vice president at Cassidy and Associates.

*******

Otto Kreisher. 2005. "Base Panel Uncertain about Pentagon's Plans." The State Journal-Register (Springfield, IL) (May 4): 3.

Questions Also Remain on Governors' Veto Powers

The Base Realignment and Closure commissioners Tuesday plunged into the complex rules that will shape their work and encountered unresolved questions on the Pentagon's basing plans and whether governors can veto changes affecting National Guard units.

The nine commissioners voiced uncertainty about the impact of the plans to bring 70,000 troops back from overseas based on their decisions on which installations in the United States should be closed or adjusted.

Base closing experts from the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Research Service said Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld is supposed to account for the returning troops in making the recommendations on base changes that he will send to the commission next week.

GAO official Barry Holman suggested that the panel use the findings of the separate Overseas Basing Commission as a tool to analyze Rumsfeld's choices. That congressionally ordered panel is to report next week.

Two of the commissioners asked about the claim by Illinois Gov. Rod Blagojevich and members of the state's congressional delegation that the Pentagon cannot close a National Guard facility without the permission of the affected state's governor.

The Illinois officials are nervous about the fate of the 183rd Fighter Wing at the Abraham Lincoln Capital Airport in Springfield and the 182nd Airlift Wing at the Greater Peoria Regional Airport, both Air Guard units.

In response to a question from commissioner James H. Bilbray, a former congressman from Nevada, CRS analyst Daniel Else said the legal provision the Illinois officials cited was separate from the section of law covering BRAC. "In our opinion, one law had no bearing on the other," Else said.

Samuel Skinner, an Illinois resident and a former transportation secretary and White House chief of staff, argued the issue, asking if previous BRAC panels had closed National Guard facilities. He was told that they had.

Two Air Guard facilities in California and two in New York were closed in the 1990s.

"It seems to me we need to get that resolved," Skinner said. "It appears that it will have a significant impact."

Told that Blagojevich had asked his attorney general to verify the opinion on the governor's authority, Skinner said, "I would prefer to see an opinion from the Defense Department general counsel or our counsel."

Commission chairman Anthony J. Principi said the dispute was "an issue for the lawyers to decide" and would not stop the panel from continuing its work.

The Pentagon sent a letter to the Illinois officials on April 12 telling them the closure process would follow "all applicable laws" but to be "truly comprehensive" it had to deal with the facilities used by "the reserve component," which includes the Guard.

The commission should get an answer on the overseas troops movement and may get a firm opinion on the Guard issue in its session this morning.

*******

Harold Kruger. 2005. "Beale Air Force Base Land Study Approved." Appeal-Democrat (Marysville, CA) (May 4).

Yuba County supervisors Tuesday night agreed to a joint land use study with Beale Air Force Base.

They voted 4-0 for the study, which should take about 18 months.
DCN: 12123

Also known as a regional compatibility plan, the study will examine land uses near the base to ensure that "incompatible uses" don't impinge on Beale operations.

"It's good planning," said Community Development Director Tim Snellings.

The resolution supervisors adopted said they will make a "good faith" effort to include the study's findings in the county's next general plan update.

But Tim Johnson, executive director of the Yuba-Sutter Economic Development Corp., told the supervisors that if Beale winds up on the base closure list, "the study goes away."

The Pentagon will release its list of base closures and realignments by May 16.

"I see this as a great opportunity for Yuba County to send a message to the Pentagon that we want to cooperate with them in their effort to keep the bases secure and doing the best job for military readiness in the country. We want to participate to the fullest extent with Beale Air Force Base," said Supervisor Hal Stocker.

Snellings, in a memo to supervisors, noted that the existing Comprehensive Land Use Plan for Beale is 10 years old and "only evaluates flight operations."

The joint land use study will examine both flight and ground operations.

The federal government is providing $100,000 for the study. No county funds will be needed, but as much as $20,000 worth of staff time may be needed, Snellings said.

Supervisor Dan Logue missed the meeting.

*******

Marketplace. 2005. "Military Base Closing Can Actually Be Good for a Local Economy." Minnesota Public Radio (May 4).

DAVID BROWN, anchor:

Our silver-lining story of the day * you may have heard that military bases are on the chopping block. A commission that helps decide which bases will be shut down wrapped up hearings today. The Pentagon's expected to release a list of proposed closures next week. The Defense Department hopes to save billions through this process. You know how it goes, but communities close to those shuttered bases typically take a big hit and it can take years to replace all the jobs that are lost when a base shuts down. So where's that silver lining? Craig Miller tells us that with careful planning, communities can turn base closings into economic opportunity.

CRAIG MILLER reporting:

It's a hazy day on Mare Island across the bay from San Francisco. The only sound drowning out the squawk of sea gulls on this busy morning is the grind of commerce. Mare Island is hard at work transforming its naval base which closed 10 years ago, leaving chaos in its wake. It took years to clean up the toxins found on the base and to figure out what to do with the land. But Gil Hollingsworth, project manager for the conversion, says today business is booming.

Mr. GIL HOLLINGSWORTH (Project Manager): We have a number of businesses here on the island. We are renovating buildings, and as the market will absorb them, we are either selling them or leasing them out where we could not have done it back 10 years ago.

MILLER: Hollingsworth says that's because at first the base closure sent the community reeling.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Six thousand people lost their jobs and that meant that 6,000 homes out in town became vacant and they no longer shopped in our stores. So there was a great initial upheaval for the people.

MILLER: Just ask the community around Beale Air Force Base near Sacramento, another

California base up for grabs.

DCN: 12123

Unidentified Woman: Do you have Chicken Stars?

MILLER: Russ Clark owns a string of Carl's Jr. restaurants in this small rural town. He says if Beale closes, this town would be devastated.

Mr. RUSS CLARK: Beale is so much of an impact it would really devastate this area. You know, I'm looking at possibly building another restaurant in the area, to add another one. Beale's close, then no way.

MILLER: But residents near Mare Island felt they could defy conventional wisdom and survive a shutdown. Once closure became a real possibility, the town started working with the base. The Navy allowed it to lease spaces for businesses like steel construction and industrial paint companies even before it closed, and the island started collecting $200,000 a month in rentals, replacing income that would be lost in the closure.

Mr. JOHN GRADY: It's always important to be able to communicate a vision.

MILLER: John Grady is in charge of renovating the former Naval base in Philadelphia, one of the other closures many consider successful. He says there has to be a master plan to tackle each piece of the renovation.

Mr. GRADY: The biggest issues all relate to infrastructure on the site, things like utility systems, soil conditions, building adequate road access, generally integrating the site back into the fabric and life of the city.

MILLER: But that doesn't come without a price tag. Federal law mandates that the government must pay for cleanups on bases. In Philadelphia, that did not include removal of asbestos and lead paint in old military buildings which meant the city and state had to step in. Still Grady says do it right and a base closing can actually be good for a community. In fact, a 1996 RAND Corporation study argues that closures are often not the economic disaster many businesses fear they'll be.

Unidentified Woman: The renaissance of Mare Island will create a new mixed use community unlike any other in the Bay area...

MILLER: For Mare Island, much of the leadership comes from the Lennar Corporation, the developers the city hired.

Unidentified Woman: ...a place that will provide a broad variety of new homes in an island setting, complete...

MILLER: Lennar is involved in renovating five military bases around California and is trying hard to spread the gospel that bases can have a second life. It's spending more than $250 million and with a partner creating new homes, shops and restaurants on the island. Project manager Gil Hollingsworth has some advice for cities on this month's hit list. Convince the Defense Department's office of economic adjustment to help clean up the toxins around the base and be patient. It usually takes longer than expected to get rid of the pollution. And to attract developers, it helps if you're located somewhere as enticing as an island in San Francisco Bay.

On Mare Island, I'm Craig Miller for MARKETPLACE.

BROWN: That story was produced for the public television program "California Connected." For more information, go to our Web site, Marketplace.org.

*******

End Pt III

DCN: 12123
**McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk**

**From:** Daniel Else [delse@crs.loc.gov]
**Sent:** Friday, May 06, 2005 8:42 AM
**Subject:** The Daily BRAC - the Mounting the Gravy Train edition, Pt II

Staff. 2005. "South Shore Opportunity." The Boston (MA) Globe (May 5): A15.

Weymouth, Rockland, and Abington have an opportunity to convert the old South Weymouth Naval Air Station into a complex of housing, industrial development, open space, and indoor and outdoor recreational activities that would be an asset to their communities for generations. The alternative could be much worse if the towns let a few minor issues get in the way of approval.

The Navy, which owns much of the 1,450-acre property, has been waiting for the land to be developed since 1997, when the base closed. If nothing is done, a Navy spokesman said yesterday, it would "consider disposal by other means." The land would be a prime location for a shopping megamall (rejected in 2000), a commercial airport, or a large business complex. Any of these would produce more traffic than nearby residents could tolerate. The Village Center plan proposed by the LNR Property company is far more compatible.

It would include nearly 3,000 units of housing built on smart-growth principles. Homes would be clustered in condominiums or small lots. Four hundred units would be reserved for the elderly, and more than 550 would be available to people of limited means. Because the development plan is tailored to the Romney administration's growth policies, it would be a prime candidate for state infrastructure aid. This infusion of housing would require a new school, but LNR has agreed to defray a third of the cost, with the state expected to pick up the rest.

Town residents are naturally concerned about an increase in traffic on Route 18 and other roads. The commuter rail service, which stops next to the property, would ease some of the pressure. And newcomers to Village Center might not leave that often. They'd be able to enjoy the 72 percent of the land reserved for open space and recreation, with eight to 10 playing fields and an indoor community center. Shopping areas would cater to their everyday needs. Some would work at the industrial complex planned for part of the property.

Approval of the project is being delayed by minor concerns, including the exact number of bedrooms and the location of access roads for construction vehicles. The directors of South Shore Tri-Town Development Corporation, which is overseeing the transformation of the base, will meet tonight to discuss these issues. The plan needs preliminary approval by Tri-Town's directors before advancing to the Weymouth Town Council and the Rockland and Abington town meetings, which have the final say.

The Navy expects action soon. The three towns should proceed recognizing that the Village Center plan is almost certainly the best they will get for this enticing property.

*******

Jim Garamone. 2005. " Base Realignment and Closure Commissioners 2005." US Fed News (May 5).

DOD Briefs Commissioners on Strategy Concerns

The U.S. Department of Defense's American Forces Information Service issued the following press release:

Base realignment and closure commissioners heard about the strategic underpinnings of the Defense Department's approach during May 4 testimony.

Ryan Henry, principal deputy undersecretary of defense for policy, spoke to the panel about the National Defense Strategy, the upcoming Quadrennial Defense Review and the Global Defense Posture.

DCN: 12123

Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld is using these strategies as the bases for closing and realigning defense installations. He must present his recommendations to the commissioners not later than May 16.

Henry told the commission * chaired by former Secretary of Veterans Affairs Anthony Principi * that the most current DoD strategy contains the lessons learned from the global war on terrorism. The BRAC process requires that military value will be the most important criterion in closing or realigning bases. Henry said he hoped his testimony would help the commissioners understand "the way that we understand what best military value is, the way we want to use military activities and the way we want to employ the force to be able to provide for national security."

He said the old days of knowing the enemy were over. He told the commissioners there is a limit to intelligence. "We cannot tell what the future will bring," Henry said. "In the next decade, we will need to use our forces somewhere, but we cannot say with any certainty where, when or how they might be needed."

Developing capabilities, therefore, is more important than numbers of troops, tanks, ships or planes, he said.

Henry said the U.S. military must be able to move more quickly and operate with greater flexibility when it arrives in a region. He also said that a basis to the new strategy is the United States realizes it must do these operations in partnership with other nations. A big part of the effort, then, is to build the capacity and capabilities of others.

He said the National Defense Strategy remains to secure the U.S. from direct attack. He also said that it includes gaining strategic access to key areas and to have freedom of action within those areas.

Portions of the old strategy * last published in 2001 * are unchanged. This includes assuring friends the United States is a credible ally; dissuading those who harbor ambitions to confront the United States; and deterring potential adversaries.

Finally, if needed, the United States must be ready to "defeat any adversary at a time, place and manner of our choosing," Henry noted.

He said the challenge of the Quadrennial Defense Review * which will be published in February 2006 * is to balance between the new capabilities the U.S. military would like to have against the old capabilities that America would like to maintain.

He told the BRAC commissioners that their work will allow the U.S. to set its military house in order. Their mission will allow the military to better use American taxpayers money and let the military serve in a more joint environment, he said.

The Global Posture Review also plays a role in the commission's processes. The U.S. military will bring back two divisions from Europe and most of a division from South Korea. All told, this means 70,000 soldiers and more than 100,000 family members and contractors will be returning to the United States. Where these personnel will go depends in large part on the commissioners' decisions, Henry said. "How we realign overseas will affect how we are based back home," said he explained.

*******

David Callender. 2005. "Governor Lobbies to Keep 4 Key Military Bases Open." The Capital Times & Wisconsin State Journal (Madison, WI) (May 5): 3A.

With less than two weeks left before officials are set to announce a series of proposed military base closings nationwide, Gov. Jim Doyle met with Pentagon officials today to keep Wisconsin's four major bases open.

Doyle met for about half an hour with Phillip Grone, the deputy undersecretary of defense for installations and environment, to lobby for continued operations at Madison's Truax Field, Fort McCoy and Volk Field near Tomah, and Mitchell Field in Milwaukee.

Doyle said Grone and other Pentagon officials gave no indication whether any of the Wisconsin bases might be on the list of possible targets for closure.

"They are very careful not to say how they might be leaning," Doyle told reporters during a conference call this morning, adding that the officials assured him that the list of possible sites for closure had not yet been finalized.

DCN: 12123

Under federal law, the Department of Defense must submit a proposed list of bases to be closed or realigned to the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission by May 16.

Then in September, the commission will release its report with a final list, which will then be submitted to the president and Congress for final action.

Doyle said he reminded officials that Fort McCoy is one of only 15 "platforms" nationwide that prepare troops for overseas deployment and combat and, when combined with adjacent Volk Field, offers the potential for comprehensive air and ground maneuvers.

"It is the best four-season training facility in the country," he said.

Doyle also noted that Truax Field is the closest air defense base to Chicago, a role that became more important following the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, D.C.

"It's only seven minutes (by fighter jet) from Chicago and provides much of the air defense for the upper Midwest," Doyle said, adding that the F-16s based at Truax are complemented by the air refueling wing based at Mitchell Field.

"We're hopeful that when they look at our bases on the merits that we will not be on the list" given to the base closing commission. "If we are, we obviously are going to continue to work very hard" to avoid any closures, he said.

Doyle acknowledged that Wisconsin has already retained a Washington-based lobbyist, Greenberg Traurig LLP, to try to keep any state bases from being closed. He said he did not know how much the state had spent on the lobbyist.

E-mail: dcallender@madison.com

*******

Unattributed. 2005. "Force Structure, Military Value at Heart of BRAC." American Forces Information Service (May 5).

The U.S. military fighting the war on terrorism is far different from the military forces developed to confront the Soviet Union.

Today's military is smaller than the Cold War force. It is already more agile and more flexible. And experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan show that joint operations enable the military to focus more power, more quickly exactly where it is needed.

The impetus to change will increase in coming years, and the base-realignment-and-closure process will allow the Defense Department to match force structure with the necessary capabilities.

The BRAC process is a chance for the department "to get it right, right now," said a senior defense official. Changes in the global military posture and the need to reduce overhead have combined to offer the military the perfect opportunity to rationalize the military infrastructure to the force structure needed for the future.

The process will also allow the military to improve its efficiency and place emphasis on joint training and operations. "A primary objective of BRAC 2005 is to examine and implement opportunities for greater jointness," officials said.

The process is meant to allow the secretary and the BRAC commissioners to look across traditional lines to examine the potential for jointness. In fact, in the department, the entire decision-making process is joint at every level, said officials.

There are more than 520,000 DoD-owned facilities worldwide. Some are small plots of land with radio or radar towers. Others are huge ranges and bases. All are being looked at to determine how each property fits into the new force-structure plan.

This force structure plan, together with statutory selection criteria, will be the basis for all decisions. Developed by the Joint Staff, the plan is based on the new national security and defense strategies. It looks out 20 years and tries to forecast threats; probable end-strength levels and anticipated funding levels. The selection criteria were published in the Federal Register in December 2003 and later modified by Congress. The final selection criteria are set out in the BRAC statute, which specifies that "military value" as the primary consideration in making any closure or realignment decision. Military value is reflected in the first four selection criteria and includes the current and future capabilities needed and the impact on operational readiness of a post, base, range or installation. This includes the impact an installation has on joint warfighting, joint training and joint readiness.

In addition, military value includes the availability and condition of land, facilities and associated airspace. Military officials have looked at training areas that will exercise forces in a variety of climates and terrains.

Military value also includes a "surge capability" that allows the department to accommodate mobilization.

Finally, military value includes the cost of operations and manpower implications.

The remaining criteria consider the extent and timing of potential costs and savings; the economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations; the ability of the infrastructure of communities to support forces, missions and personnel; and finally, the environmental impact, including the impact of costs associated with environmental restoration, waste management and environmental compliance.

Defense Secretary Donald H. Rumsfeld's BRAC recommendations are due to be published not later than May 16. At that point the BRAC Commission, led by former Veterans Affairs Secretary Anthony Principi, will examine the recommendations. The commission's findings are due to President Bush not later than Sept. 8.

The president must approve or disapprove the whole list; he cannot agree with some recommendations and disagree with others.

If he approves the recommendations, the list goes to Congress, where senators and representatives have 45 "legislative days" to enact a joint resolution of disapproval. If they do not, then the list has the force of law.

Under the BRAC statute, actions to close or realign a base must be initiated within two years of the date the president transmits the BRAC Commission's recommendations report to Congress and must be completed within six years of that same date.

703-697-5131; media@defenselink.mil

*******

Tom Coyne. 2005. "Indiana Congressmen Believe State's Bases Should Survive." Associated Press Newswires (May 5, 16:15).

Six Indiana Republican congressmen say they believe the state's military bases should survive the upcoming round of closings because they are valuable commodities.

"We feel pretty good right now," said Rep. Steve Buyer, who is chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs. "We feel good because there's a great story to tell."

The congressmen focused most of their attention during a news conference Wednesday on the Crane Naval Surface Warfare Center, about 30 miles southwest of Bloomington, which has about 4,000 government workers and contractors.

The Department of Defense is scheduled to release a list of proposed base closures or realignments by May 16. The Base Realignment and Closure commission will then consider Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld's recommendations and send its own recommendation to President Bush by Sept. 8. The president must send a list to Congress by Nov. 7.

Officials won't specify how many of more than 425 bases are targeted * but say the military has 24 percent more capacity than it needs.

Crane benefited from base closings in 1991 when other Navy laboratories were consolidated and brought there, but the facility barely survived the 1995 closings.

Rep. John Hostettler, whose district includes Crane, said the installation is vital. He said the Pentagon was looking at which bases have military value to the war fighter as well as which bases have the ability to work jointly with the various armed forces.

Hostettler said he believes Pentagon knows the importance of Crane, which has tasks such as modifying weapons, testing laser-guided bombs and storing tons of ordnance. He said while Crane is a naval facility, the largest tenant is the Army. He said the base also serves the Marines, the Coast Guard and the Air Force.

"Crane has been joint, you might say, before joint was cool," Hostettler said.

Rep. Mark Souder said Crane is important to the entire state, saying many businesses in his northeastern Indiana district supply the center.

"Crane isn't just an issue for that district, it's an issue for the whole state," Souder said.

Rep. Mike Sodrel said the reason to keep Crane operations in Indiana is the same as it was when it was founded in 1941 * it is harder for "a terrorist or a saboteur to reach a facility that is located on the heartland than it is a facility along the coast."

The congressmen, including Rep. Chris Chocola, also talked about the importance of Grissom Air Reserve Base, midway between South Bend and Indianapolis, which has about 1,700 military and civilian employees and is home to the 434th Air Refueling Wing.

"They (Grissom's workers) have proven themselves, and the base has proven itself, with regard to its multi-use, having all four reserve facilities engage in these wars," Buyer said.

Souder said the Pentagon can't abandon the Great Lakes region, saying the nation can't just keep bases along the coasts. He said there is a need to have a presence of military in the Midwest for recruiting purposes alone.

"It is very important for the defense of the nation and for the economy of Indiana that these bases stay open," Rep. Dan Burton said.

*******

Bill HarLan. 2005. "Cost of Saving Ellsworth AFB Exceeds $12 Million." Associated Press Newswires (May 5, 14:32).

Rapid City, S.D. (AP) * On a Saturday morning in February 1995 * after a frantic roundup by telephone * community leaders gathered at the Rapid City Area Chamber of Commerce office in Rushmore Plaza Civic Center.

The New York Times had just reported that Ellsworth Air Force Base would be on the Pentagon's base-closure list, due the following Tuesday.

"It was kind of a rude awakening," Rapid City businessman Mike Derby, who was chairman of the chamber of commerce at the time, said.

Derby had gotten the news in a 6:30 a.m. call from former Sen. Larry Pressler, R-S.D., but it didn't sound right to Derby. "We honestly felt we were not listed."

Derby said it took two hours of telephone calls from the chamber office to discover that the New York Times story was wrong, but not by much.

The good news came from then-Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, who lost his bid for re-election last fall to Republican challenger John Thune.

"Yes, Ellsworth was on the list," Daschle said this week in an e-mail response to a question. "I had a number of conversations with people in the administration, including the president, about taking it off. He did."

The New York Times had been working from a leaked, outdated closure list.

Daschle also pointed out this week that then-Defense Secretary William Perry had removed Ellsworth from the Pentagon's closure list well before it went to the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. "It would have been very difficult to do it afterward," Daschle said.

After the list was published, the Air Force said Ellsworth had been saved because relocating its B-1B Lancer bombers would have cost too much. But Perry also pointedly warned that in a future round of closures, Ellsworth would be vulnerable. Once in the top "tier" of military bases, in 1995 Ellsworth was in the bottom tier.

The false alarm, Daschle's intervention with President Clinton and Perry's ominous pronouncement were a wake-up call for business and local government leaders in a group called the "Ellsworth Task Force."

Derby was a charter member and later was task force chairman.

"For half a day, everyone in western South Dakota thought Ellsworth was going away. We had to try to think what life was going to be like without it."

It was not a happy thought. Ellsworth is the biggest single employer in western South Dakota.

Derby, in fact, was so taken aback by the scare of February 1995, he had two Rapid City Journal front pages laminated as reminders. Saturday's headline said, "Times reports Ellsworth on list." Sunday's said, "Times: Never mind."

"I didn't want to forget that," Derby said Wednesday.

No one who gathered at the chamber that day wanted to forget. Since 1995, the Ellsworth Task Force has spent more than $2 million to market Ellsworth to the Defense Department, task force director Pat McElgunn said.

More than half that money has been raised in the past two or three years, including $800,000 of public money that has arrived in big chunks since 2003.

Those chunks are:

* $500,000 from the state Legislature.

* $250,000 from the city of Rapid City.

* $50,000 from Pennington County.

That doesn't include the amount donated by private businesses. That information is "proprietary," McElgunn said, because other communities are working just as hard to protect their bases.

The $2 million-plus raised in the past decade is in addition to the $10 million that the state of South Dakota and the federal government spent to relocate Exit 66 on Interstate 90 a mile to the east. Now it's Exit 67.

Moving the exit may have been the single most important thing the Ellsworth Task Force accomplished. "Encroachment," McElgunn said, is one of the most lethal killers of military bases * especially air bases.

The term refers to encroaching development. The former Exit 66 was just off the southwest end of Ellsworth's runway, in a crash-hazard zone identified by the Air Force.

In 1988, in fact, a B-1 came in too low for a landing and came dangerously close to tall lights at the McDonald's restaurant at Exit 66, before hitting another pole and crashing. (The crew ejected safely. Pilot error was blamed.)

Exit 66 had attracted a number of businesses by the mid-1990s, and an Air Force study cited the growth as a major problem.

DCN: 12123

In the summer of 1995, a report from a private consultant hired by the Ellsworth Task Force recommended not only moving Exit 66 but also relocating 450 homes in Box Elder and 30 businesses. That plan would have cost $30 million to $44 million, the consultant estimated, and it would have taken 20 years.

That turned out to be an optimistic forecast, in light of what happened next.

Owners of businesses at the old Exit 66 complained, with justification, that their investments would be all but wiped out by the move.

Box Elder officials said that $200,000 of the small town's sales tax revenues each year came from businesses at Exit 66.

Opponents of moving Exit 66 were skeptical that its location hurt the base, or they were skeptical that the base would close. Some were skeptical the base could be saved at all.

The Ellsworth Task Force eventually helped find some relocation money for businesses. The task force also helped Box Elder find money for economic redevelopment.

Last September, nearly 10 years after the last BRAC round, Exit 67 finally opened. Water and sewer lines, however, still have not been built to the area. And Box Elder's McDonald's is gone, along with several other businesses.

"We did lose some revenue," former Box Elder Mayor Glenn Baldwin said. He was in office during the debate, which at times was heated. "I think it'll be better when they get water and sewer in at the new exit," he said.

The critics were correct about one thing: Moving the exit did not guarantee Ellsworth's future.

McElgunn said that when it was clear a BRAC round was coming, the Ellsworth Task Force faced "a much larger scale operation."

The expansion included hiring two Washington, D.C., consulting and lobbying firms.

Kutak Rock * a large law and lobbying firm with offices in 11 states * is helping the task force "assess the DOD's intentions," McElgunn said, and match them to the "operational utility of the base." (Kutak Rock also has represented Grand Forks, N.D., where another air base is on the chopping blocks. The firm also represents "redevelopment authorities" trying to find new uses for closed bases, according to the nonprofit Center for Public Integrity.)

The Rhodes Group is advising the Ellsworth Task Force on "government relations" * meaning the company has contacts inside the Department of Defense and on Capitol Hill.

McElgunn said the high-priced consultants offer expertise and resources beyond the reach of local experts or congressional delegations. "It's sort of like jury selection," he said. "The smarter you are, the more information you have, the better able you are to make your case."

For example, when Gov. Mike Rounds went to Washington last month to meet with an undersecretary for defense, he was armed with more than an earnest request and a handful of Mount Rushmore brochures. The governor had detailed, professional analyses arguing why Ellsworth is a good location.

Still, that effort doesn't come cheap. The total cost since 1992 is likely well over $12 million. Rapid City alone has chipped in $730,000 since 1994.

McElgunn argued that $12 million is a reasonable expenditure to save a base that injects $278 million a year into the local economy. "That's $700,000 a day, 365 days a year," he said.

That's why the Ellsworth Task Force, which still has money in the bank, is not disbanding. If Ellsworth is on the closure list, due May 16, the task force will fight to get it off. If it's off the list, McElgunn and Co. will fight to keep it off.

*******

DCN: 12123
End Pt II

# BRAC COMMISSION STAFF MEDIA TRAINING

# Engaging the Media & Communicating the Message

Tim MacGregor
*Air Force Team*
*May 9th, 2005*

*With presentation materials provided by USAF Public Affairs*

# OUR PURPOSE TODAY

- Improve your media comfort level
- Prepare you to effectively engage the media
- Help you develop and communicate the message

# *WHY TALK TO THE MEDIA?*

- It is Our Obligation
- It is Our Opportunity
- We want Ownership of the Issue

*"Public sentiment is everything.*
*With public sentiment, nothing can fail;*
*without it, nothing can succeed."*
*-- Abraham Lincoln*

# *ENGAGING THE MEDIA*

- The key to a successful interview is to be prepared
- Must "mission plan" before engaging media
  - Define your communication goal
  - Define your audience
  - Build messages
  - Know the issues
  - <u>Practice</u>

# THE MESSAGE

What is a message?

- Messages are key bits of information you want the public to know
- Messages are designed to achieve communication goals

# THE MESSAGE

## Developing messages

- Decide on headline you want

  -- What you want the audience to know

- Write your messages down
- Evaluate your messages

  -- Must be short, memorable and relevant

- Repeat, Repeat, Repeat your messages!

# THE MESSAGE

## The Message Sandwich

- State your message
- Support your position
  - Explanation, facts, description, rationale
- Restate your message

# THE MESSAGE

## Use Your Messages

- Get to your messages quickly (Don't bury them)
- Never just "answer" a question
- Respond to the question
- Answer + Message = Response

DCN: 12123

# Interview Tools and Techniques

# INTERVIEW TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

- "Hook" the audience/viewer
  - Technique used to influence the questions you will be asked
  - Before the interview begins "hook" the reporter with your key messages
  - Make your point: Then end message with a statement that requires follow up

*"And that's just one possibility…"*

*"We've done something no other organization has ever done."*

# INTERVIEW TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

- "Bridge" to key messages
  - Technique used to move from what the reporter wants to discuss to what you want to discuss
  - Deal with the question honestly, then logically bridge to your message.

*"Yes... (Response) ... "let me explain…" (Bridge to message)*

*"… that's a good point, but the real issue is…"*

# INTERVIEW TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

- Types of Questions
- Hypothetical
  - *Problem: Asking you to forecast*
  - *Solution: "That's a hypothetical; let's deal with the facts; BRIDGE to Message*
- Machine Gun
  - *Problem: Multipart questions*
  - *Solution: Respond to the one you want to or address the issues raised*

# INTERVIEW TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

- "Flag" what people should remember
  - Technique used to emphasize your messages with the audience
  - Verbal highlight
  - Use voice and gestures to telegraph messages

*"What you really need to know is…"*

*"If you remember one thing today it should be. . . ."*

# INTERVIEW TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

- Types of Questions
- Forced Choice: Either/Or
  - *Problem: Gives you only two options for responses (A or B)*
  - *Solution: Address larger issue (3rd option) Don't repeat incorrect statements. Address the facts.*
- Loaded or Negative
  - *Problem: Question has negative language*
  - *Solution: Don't repeat negative language. Start positive. "I would say that…"*

# INTERVIEW TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

## Use personal authority, experience

- Establish professional credentials
- You are the expert
- Critics aren't shy -- you can't be !

*"From my 23 years experience . . ."*

*"When I flew that aircraft . . ."*

*"My perspective as a commander. . ."*

# INTERVIEW TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

- Tell the Truth
- Be Yourself; Believe what you Say
- Don't Argue; Rise above the Fray
- Don't Let it Get Personal
- "No Comment" is <u>not</u> a Response
  - Explain why you can't answer, then bridge
  - If you don't know, say so and bridge

# INTERVIEW TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

- Correct and Protect the Record
- Know the Facts
- "I Don't Know" is OK, then bridge to message
- Stay in your lane
- Know the Rules of Engagement
- Use PA Officers / Communications Staff

CN: 12123

# TYPES OF INTERVIEWS

- Telephone Interview
- Morning Show
- Edited Interview
- Remote Interview
- Press Conference
- Confrontational Interview

# SUMMARY

- Keys to success: Preparation & Practice
- Communicate *YOUR* Messages
- *YOU* are in control of the interview

# SPOT THE TOOLS AND TECHNIQUES

# BRAC STAFF RULES OF ENGAGEMENT

- Only the following may represent the Commission to the media:
  - Chairman
  - Commissioners
  - Executive Director
  - Communications Staff
- Direct all media queries to the Communications Staff

# BRAC STAFF RULES OF ENGAGEMENT

Unless specifically authorized to speak to the media, provide only the following information when queried:

- Who you are
- What you are doing
- Where you are visiting
- When will you will be in that area (and when BRAC report due)
- Why you are visiting

# THE MESSAGE

- Key bits of information you want *the public* to know
- Designed to achieve communication goals

- BRAC is as *thorough* and *accurate* as possible
- BRAC process is a *fair*, *objective* and *factual* review
- BRAC desires *active and ongoing dialogue* with communities

# YOUR FIVE W'S

## WHO You Are

*"My name is Tim MacGregor and I'm working as an analyst on the BRAC Commission staff."*

# YOUR FIVE W'S

## WHAT You Are Doing:

*"I'm here on behalf of the BRAC Commission as part of an active and ongoing dialogue with communities to gather information and data that will be objectively analyzed during the BRAC process."*

# *YOUR FIVE W'S*

## WHERE You Will Work:

*"The Commission is headquartered in Arlington, Virginia."*

*"While I'm here in this area, I'll be visiting locations in and around Burpelson Air Force Base."*

# *YOUR FIVE W'S*

## WHEN You Will be in the Area and WHEN the Report is Due

*"I'll be here at Burpelson until 5:00 p.m. tonight."*

*"The BRAC Commission will send its findings and recommendations to the President no later than September 8th."*

# YOUR FIVE W'S

## WHY Is There a BRAC?

*"The 2005 BRAC round is being conducted at the request of the President and with Congressional approval. The process is governed by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 as amended."*

# THE MESSAGE

## Example Scenarios

- Message Sandwich
- Bridge
- Forced Choice
- Loaded Question
- Speculation
- Hypothetical

# *THE BRAC MESSAGE*

## BRAC process is:

- Thorough and accurate
- Fair, objective and factual
- Engaging in active and ongoing dialogue with communities

DCN: 12123

# BRAC COMMISSION STAFF MEDIA TRAINING

## Engagin[redacted]

## Co[redacted] the Message

Tim MacGregor
*Air Force Team*
*May 9th, 2005*

*With presentation materials provided by USAF Public Affairs*

# BRAC STAFF RULES OF ENGAGEMENT

- Only the following may represent the Commission to the media:
  - Chairman
  - Commissioners
  - Executive Director
  - Communications Staff

- Direct all media queries to the Communications Staff

  Jim Schaefer - Director of Communications

  Or Robert McCreary - Deputy Director

  703 – 699 - 2987

DCN: 12123

# 2005 BRAC Commission Schedule

Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600 - Arlington, Virginia 22202
Telephone: (703) 699-2950

## Schedule for May 3rd and 4th, 2005

---

**3 May**

---

**Swearing in of Commissioners by Chairman Anthony Principi**
**& Hearings at the Cannon House Office Building Room 334**

**Time: 9:30 – 12:30AM – OPEN Session**
**Witnesses:**
**Congressional Research Service**
Dan Else, Specialist in National Defense
**Government Accountability Office**
Barry Holman - Director of Defense Capabilities and Management
**Subject::**
Presentation on the 2005 BRAC Schedule, Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 ( as amended thru FY 05 Authorization Act ), Review of BRAC Criteria, Lessons learned and previous BRAC results.

**Time: 1:30 – 4:30PM - OPEN Session**
**Witnesses:**
**Office of the Director of National Intelligence**
David Gordon, Chairman of the National Intelligence Committee
**Defense Intelligence Agency**
Earl Scheck - Director, Analysis and Production
**Department of State**
Carol Rodley - Principal Deputy Asst. Secretary, Bureau of Intelligence and Research
**Subject**:
Current and Long Term Threat Confronting U.S. National Security

---

**4 May**

---

**Hearings at the Cannon House Office Building Room 334**

**Time: 9:30 – 12:30AM - OPEN Session** ***NOTE: Hearing will CLOSED for the classified portions of their testimony.***
**Witnesses**:
Vice Admiral Evan Chanik – Director for Force Structure, Resource & Assessment
**Office of the Secretary of Defense Policy**
Honorable Ryan Henry - Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy
**Subject::**
Force Structure Plan, Global Posture Review and SECDEF Guidance on the Quadrennial Review

**McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk**

**From:** Daniel Else [delse@crs.loc.gov]
**Sent:** Friday, May 06, 2005 8:40 AM
**Subject:** The Daily BRAC - the Mounting the Gravy Train edition, Pt I

**Attachments:** 050503 BRAC Commission Hearing on BRAC Schedule, Criteria, Lessons, and Results (Transcript).pdf

050503 BRAC
ommission Hearing.

There are apparently still quite a few people out there who don't understand the BRAC process. Note the New Haven article which alleges that the BRAC process can be halted by Congress not taking any action on the base closure list. The reality, of course, is that Congress can remain completely inert and the process will proceed unimpeded.

The brilliant commentary and dialogue featured at the Commission's first hearing is attached.

You may be amused to know that even we, humble civil servants, are apparently the target of BRAC lobbying. We are starting to receive unsolicited offers of "help" in interpreting that darned law, 10 USC 18238, that provides a straw at which National Guardsmen and governors nationwide seem so anxious to grasp. Sigh.

Dan :-)

*******

Dave Montgomery. 2005. "Defense Secretary Eases Base-Closing Estimate." The Kansas (MO) City Star (May 6): 6.

efense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld on Thursday scaled back the projected impact of closing nd consolidating military bases.

The United States may have much less excess capacity at its domestic installations than previously thought, he said.

"Without final figures, I would say the percent will be less than half of the 20 to 25 percent that has been characterized previously," Rumsfeld said in a conference call with newspaper editorial writers days before he is to release a list of recommended base closings and consolidations.

Rumsfeld's new parameters on the extent of the base closings brighten the prospects for thousands of towns and cities.

The defense secretary previously had said that U.S. military bases have 25 percent more capacity than they need.

Rumsfeld said several factors prompted him to change his assessment. U.S. bases will be needed to accommodate more than 70,000 troops and at least 100,000 dependents returning home from overseas bases in Asia and Europe.

Moreover, Pentagon teams drawing up the list of recommendations have concluded that many Defense Department employees now working in leased space can be moved onto government-owned property, enabling the government to further save money by eliminating much of its leasing costs, Rumsfeld said.

*******

seph Straw. 2005. "Base Closing Would Cost Connecticut Thousands of Jobs." New Haven

(CT) Register (May 6).

DCN: 12123

Connecticut and surrounding areas would stand to lose 31,500 jobs worth $2 billion in income should the Navy's Groton submarine base shut down under this year's round of Pentagon Base Realignment and Closure, according to a state analysis.

This year's independent BRAC Commission is scheduled to present its list of bases recommended for closure to Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld on May 13.

The state Department of Economic and Community Development drafted the 39-page report on the base's economic impact, which was released this week by Gov. M. Jodi Rell.

The study's figures presume - as Connecticut lawmakers have warned - that closure of the submarine base would not only stifle the economy tied directly to support of the base, but could result in closure of the Electric Boat Co. shipyard just down the Thames River.

Along with the combined jobs figure, the base, shipyard and related support and supply industries generate $3.3 billion toward the gross state product, according to the report.

"The sub base is an economic catalyst we simply cannot afford to lose," Rell said. "This base has been the foundation for Southeastern Connecticut's economic growth for over 130 years, and this study underscores its importance to the region and Connecticut as a whole. If the base is on the preliminary closure list then we will fight tooth and nail to get it off."

Rell, however, acknowledged that the BRAC Commission is instructed to consider only military value relative to cost.

"But in the greater scheme of things we have to look at the economic effect of losing the base, and that makes it all the more critical that we prevail in this fight," Rell said.

Members of the state Congressional delegation, in meetings with Navy and BRAC officials, have highlighted the economic necessity of both the base and shipyard to the region's economy.

The Navy has three submarine bases on the East Coast: in Groton, Newport, Va., and King's Bay, Ga.

U.S. Sens. Christopher Dodd and Joseph I. Lieberman, D-Conn., have argued that the bases are enticing terrorist targets, and therefore as many as possible should remain open in the event that one or two are struck in coordinated terrorist attacks.

The sub base employs 7,800 military personnel, 2,400 civilians and 650 reservists. Electric Boat has more than 8,700 full-time employees at the shipyard and submarine base, and supports 9,000 indirect jobs, according to DECD.

After receiving feedback from the Pentagon, the BRAC Commission is scheduled to present final recommendations to President Bush in September, for consideration by Congress by the end of the year. The President or Congress can, however, terminate the process by simply not acting on the recommendations.

*******

Staff. 2005. "Levy to the Rescue." Newsday (Nassau, NY) (May 6): A50.

Despite his well deserved reputation for counting dollars carefully, Suffolk County Executive Steve Levy has wisely decided to forego $36,000 a year in licensing fees from the 106th Rescue Wing in Westhampton Beach. The new fee will be one dollar a year. That's good news for the wing, and it makes sense for the county for a variety of reasons.

For one thing, the wing is a major economic force on the East End, and Levy understands its overall value to Suffolk's economy. For another, he hopes to make Gabreski Airport, the wing's base, into a site for homeland security training, and the wing would be pivotal to that. Finally, the 106th provides Gabreski with about $2 million in services, from running the tower to snow removal and fire protection. If the wing were gone, those costs would fall on Suffolk.

Meanwhile, the Department of Defense is about to deliver a list of proposed base closings to the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. The wing performs a vital rescue mission, and we hope it's not on the list. But if it is, Levy's readiness to make a financial sacrifice for the wing could be one piece of evidence, as the BRAC process unfolds, to help the 106th demonstrate just how needed and vital it really is.

******

The Associated Press. 2005. "Seacoast Disappointed about Losing out on Airbus Contract." Associated Press Newswires (May 6, 02:16).

Portsmouth, N.H. (AP) – The Pease International Tradeport won't be building refueling tankers for the U.S. military, but officials say applying for $600 million contract was a learning experience that will help them attract other businesses.

The parent company of European aircraft maker Airbus selected four Southern states Thursday as finalists for a U.S. factory to build the planes. Sites in Mobile, Ala.; Melbourne, Fla.; Kiln, Miss.; and North Charleston, S.C., will compete for the right to host the factory, which could begin operations as soon as next year.

Pease was one of 70 applicants nationwide. Many locals hoped the Airbus contract would add financial stability to the area if the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard closes.

U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's list of suggested base closures is expected to be released sometime next week.

"I really feel very bad about this, it really seems like we are getting so much bad news, with the Navy yard and the Airbus," said Portsmouth Mayor Evelyn Sirrell.

George Bald, executive director of the Pease Development Authority, said he was disappointed but is trying to remain positive.

"I have great confidence in the future of Pease. I am pleased that we made a strong effort," he said. "I am particularly happy that it (the contract application) required us to get a tremendous amount of information, to respond. We will continue to use that information to encourage other companies into the area."

Bald said the geographic location of the finalists states may have played a factor in the final decision.

"I can read between the lines, I believe the cost of heating has got to be a factor in their decision, also those states are know to have tremendous incentives and tax breaks," said Bald.

Dick Ingram president of the Portsmouth chamber of commerce said the chamber will continue to assist Pease in marketing Portsmouth to large and small businesses.

"Some you win and some you loose. Some get rained out, but you have to dress for them all," said Ingram. "The shot that you will always miss is the one that you don't take."

The tradeport replaced the former Pease Air Force Base, which was ordered to shut down in 1988.

*******

Marc Shogol. 2005. "Santorum Fights to Keep Base Open." The Philadelphia (PA) Inquirer (May 6): B7.

The Willow Grove Military Site Could Be on a List of Possible Closings. The Senator Cited Security Risks.

Closing the Willow Grove Naval Air Station and Joint Reserve Base would be an indefensible military mistake, U.S. Sen. Rick Santorum said yesterday.

With the Defense Department expected to release a list of recommended base closings next

week, Santorum, a Republican facing a tough reelection fight next year, said he is functioning as a lobbyist and advocate for all Pennsylvania bases.

"This is exactly what the military says we want from our bases," Santorum said after a tour of the Willow Grove base, one of only three nationwide with Reserve and National Guard flight units from all of the military services.

Santorum also said that he would make the case that closing Willow Grove would be a threat to homeland security.

While no bases have yet been identified, many fear the prime closure risks in the Philadelphia area are Willow Grove, near the Montgomery County-Bucks County border, and the Defense Supply Center in Northeast Philadelphia.

After the Defense Department releases its list of recommended base closings, a special Base Realignment and Closure Commission appointed by President Bush will evaluate it and report its recommendations to the President and, ultimately, Congress. But Congress could only approve or disapprove it as a whole.

This is the fifth study by the commission. Philadelphia was the only major city to take big hits in each of the first four, including the Philadelphia Navy Base in 1996.

Santorum said yesterday that Pennsylvania has been hit disproportionately and that, this time, "they should look elsewhere."

The state's other senator, fellow Republican Arlen Specter; Gov. Rendell, a Democrat; and other officials also are mobilized to fight for Pennsylvania's bases. Santorum said any such fight would be bipartisan.

When the last base review was held in 1994, Willow Grove was on the initial list of bases recommended for closing.

That narrow escape persuaded the Willow Grove Chamber of Commerce to form a Regional Military Affairs Committee and retain two consulting firms to muster statistics and studies documenting what they say would be a disastrous economic impact on the area if the base closed.

Those studies will be presented to the commission if it tours Willow Grove, which it would do if the Defense Department recommends its closure.

Some of the concerns for the 1,200-acre Willow Grove facility, which employs 7,779 people, stem from "a lack of a current mission," said Edward Strouse, vice president of the Chamber of Commerce.

Although some military personnel based at Willow Grove have been and currently are on active duty in Iraq, the primary aircraft based at Willow Grove are older models that are being phased out or replaced, Strouse said.

"We're heavily campaigning to bring missions in so our base will be that much stronger going forward," he said.

Contact staff writer Marc Schogol at 610-313-8112, or mschogol@phillynews.com.

*******

Tim Funk. 2005. "Sen. Dole Steps Back into Spotlight." Charlotte (NC) Observer (May 6): 1A.

GOP Role Expands, but N.C. Issues Require Time

As she heads for the halfway point in her first term, Sen. Elizabeth Dole says she's already raising money for a re-election campaign.

Now North Carolina's senior senator and a member of the Senate's GOP leadership team, Dole has returned to the national stage she shunned her first two years in office. She has even begun bashing Democrats – especially over their threats to filibuster President Bush's

judicial nominees.

But even on her most partisan day, Dole is not the polarizing figure her predecessor, Jesse Helms, became. And she's managed to do something Helms never could: Get a tobacco quota buyout through Congress – a feat Dole calls the highlight of her time in the Senate.

"She hasn't done anything that's been a black mark," said UNC Charlotte political scientist Ted Arrington. "I could see her getting 60 percent or more (of the vote in 2008). Jesse never got 60 percent."

Still, Dole, in Charlotte today for a ceremony releasing a federal grant for the city's light rail, faces challenges that could affect her standing in North Carolina.

Among them:

Will she vote for the Bush administration's controversial free-trade agreement with Central America – as the state's farmers, eyeing the prospect of an expanded export market, are urging? Or will she vote against it – as some textile companies, worried about job losses, are hoping?

Will Dole – a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee – get blamed next week if N.C. military installations end up on the Pentagon's list of proposed base closings? Or will she get credit if the state manages to stay off the dreaded list?

Will she spend as much time and energy on her home state as she leads her party's push to recruit, fund and elect more Republicans to the Senate in 2006? Or will the escalating demands of national politics force her to put N.C. needs on the back burner – as happened with Tar Heel Democrat John Edwards?

In an interview with the Observer last week, Dole, 68, talked about those and other issues. Unlike Helms, whose style was blunt, Dole speaks more tentatively, often because she doesn't want to jeopardize her behind-the-scenes negotiations.

Asked about the Central America pact, known as CAFTA, Dole said she isn't ready to say how she'll vote. "I'm working on some issues there," she said.

Then this week, on the eve of her trip back to North Carolina, Dole announced that U.S. Trade Representative Rob Portman had agreed to seek an amendment to the trade agreement benefiting producers of textile pocketing and linings.

Asked what she's hearing about BRAC – shorthand for the Pentagon's list of proposed military base closings and realignments – Dole wouldn't speculate, saying she and other N.C. officials have made a strong case for the state. She plugged N.C. bases in conversations with Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Anthony Principi, who chairs the BRAC Commission.

"We've dotted all the i's and crossed all the t's," she said.

And on whether N.C. needs will take a backseat to her second job as a Senate leader, Dole, who was critical of Edwards' absenteeism, said her election to chair the National Republican Senatorial Committee is a boon to North Carolina.

"This puts me in the leadership," she said. "And that gives me a chance to move North Carolina's issues up the priority list."

So far, Dole has continued to spend congressional recesses in North Carolina. And she has yet to miss a roll-call vote – "not a one," she said.

But her activities as the chief recruiter, fundraiser and spokeswoman for the GOP's 2006 Senate campaign are picking up. When Sen. Jim Jeffords, the upper chamber's only independent, announced last month he wouldn't run again next year, Dole called Vermont's Republican governor to try – unsuccessfully – to coax him into the race.

If the GOP picks up seats next year, Dole "will be a star in the 202 area code," said Arrington, referring to Washington. "But back here, in the 704 and 336 (Greensboro) area

codesDCN:112123n't mean a thing."

What will: Dole's standing with N.C. groups with a stake in what happens in Washington.

Here's a look at three:

The state's bankers say Dole has been attentive to their issues and has become active on the Senate Banking Committee. Most of all, they praise her banking staffer, Al Garesch*.

"Her banking staff is as up on issues and as communicative as any I've seen in the nearly 30 years that I've been here," said Thad Woodard, president of the N.C. Bankers Association.

Some environmentalists are still sore at Dole for not stepping in to oppose the Navy's proposal for a jet aircraft landing field in northeastern North Carolina near a waterfowl refuge.

"On the Armed Services Committee, she's in a position to look out for North Carolina's interests," said Derb Carter, senior attorney at the Southern Environmental Law Center in Chapel Hill. "It's been a disappointment that she's not been more assertive in assuring that the Navy chose a site that wouldn't have such an adverse effect."

N.C. farmers were buoyed last year when Congress approved a tobacco quota buyout – and gave a lot of credit to Dole, who made its passage a campaign promise. Since then, Dole has given up her seat on the Senate Agriculture Committee and lost her farm staffer – David Rouzer – to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Larry Wooten, president of the N.C. Farm Bureau, said Dole's seat at the Senate leadership table could mean a lot to N.C. farmers – key voters in winning crucial counties in Eastern North Carolina. But as grateful as they are for what Dole did on the quota bill, they'll be watching when a new farm bill comes before Congress in 2007.

"The 2008 election is some time off," Wooten said. "How that (bill) works out will have some bearing (on Dole's chances)."

Jim Funk: (202) 383-6057; tfunk@charlotteobserver.com

Dole on... Here are excerpts from the Observer's interview with Sen. Elizabeth Dole, R-N.C., last week.

Her highlight in the Senate so far:

"(Passing the $10.1 billion tobacco quota buyout), because that was such a tough one. It was like pushing a boulder uphill. The issue (of tobacco) itself is radioactive in this city (of Washington). And you only have a handful of states that have tobacco interests."

Her low point:

"The rancor and angry rhetoric (over Bush's judicial nominees)... There are just (Democrats) who have dug in their heels, that they're going to fight everything we're trying to get through."

On Bush's proposal to create personal accounts for younger people paying into Social Security:

"I still think that's a good idea ... I would not advocate dropping that position."

On whether she could support Bush's other proposal to reduce the growth of benefits for all but low-income recipients:

"I want to look at all the options."

On John Bolton's nomination to be U.N. ambassador:

"The United Nations desperately needs reform. This is a serious guy who's got a record of getting things done ... I would support him."

On the ethical controversy surrounding House Majority Leader Tom DeLay, R-Texas:

"The man is a very effective leader. And that's a matter over at the House, and they'll get it resolved."

Compiled by Tim Funk

*****

Dave Montgomery. 2005. "Rumsfeld Says Base-Closing Impact Estimates Too High." Charlotte (NC) Observer (May 6): 16A.

Likely Cut Said to Be Half of Original 20-25% Figure for Reduction

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld on Thursday scaled back the projected impact of closing and consolidating military bases, saying the United States may have much less excess capacity at its domestic installations than previously thought.

"Without final figures, I would say the percent will be less than half of the 20 to 25 percent that has been characterized previously," Rumsfeld said in a conference call with newspaper editorial writers days before releasing a long-anticipated list of recommended base closings and consolidations.

Rumsfeld's new parameters on the extent of the base closings brightens the prospects for thousands of towns and cities that have spent more than two years trying to protect installations they consider essential to their communities' economic futures.

The defense secretary previously has said that U.S. military bases have 25 percent more capacity than they need, raising fears that the upcoming round of base closings could be far more severe than four previous rounds.

But in his discussions with editorial writers at several papers, Rumsfeld said several factors have prompted him to change his assessment. U.S. bases will be needed to accommodate more than 70,000 troops and at least 100,000 dependents being returned home from overseas bases in Asia and Europe.

Moreover, Rumsfeld said, Pentagon teams drawing up the list of recommendations have concluded that many Defense Department employees now working in leased space can be moved onto government-owned property, enabling the government to further save money by jettisoning much of its leasing costs.

Rumsfeld has a May 16 deadline to present the report to a nine-member base-closing commission that will spend the next four months preparing a final report for the president. Pentagon spokesman Glenn Flood said Rumsfeld would likely unveil his recommendations on May 13.

Since the Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) process started nearly two decades ago, the government has shut down 97 major bases and hundreds of smaller installations with a net savings of $28.9 billion.

*******

Ann Scott Tyson. 2005. "Planned Realignment of Troops Criticized." The Washington Post (May 6): A19.

An extensive and costly realignment of U.S. troops and bases overseas – if implemented on the Pentagon's ambitious timeline – risks exacerbating stress on the military and weakening its ability to respond to global emergencies, according to a government-appointed commission's report released yesterday.

The Pentagon plans to repatriate 70,000 American troops from Cold War bases in South Korea, Germany and elsewhere beginning this year, shifting to a reliance on U.S.-based forces that would rotate abroad – a change the report called "too much too fast."

The military does not have enough sea and air transportation to rotate those forces

rapidly enough to meet its timelines for responding to emergencies, the report says. Moreover, it says, the demand for additional extended rotations could strain U.S. military personnel and their families to the point that the nation could no longer maintain its all-volunteer force.

"Not slowing the pace and reordering the process puts our nation at unnecessary risk," said Al Cornella, a South Dakota businessman and Navy veteran who is chairman of the commission on Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States. The six-member commission, made up of former military and national security officials, was created by Congress in late 2003.

Cornella estimated that a delay of "a year or a number of years" is needed to ensure that the equipment, facilities, legal arrangements, funds and overarching strategy are in place for this historic shift in the U.S. global military posture. The panel estimated the cost of the Pentagon plan at $20 billion, about double the Defense Department's projection and five times the $4 billion budgeted for the global-basing strategy for fiscal 2006 to 2011.

The call for a more deliberate approach comes as the Pentagon prepares to launch by mid-month a new round of domestic U.S. base closures in conjunction with the reposturing of American forces overseas.

The report strongly recommends that Congress and a wide range of federal agencies weigh in on the plan, which it criticizes as being "too much the purview of a single agency – the Department of Defense."

The Pentagon yesterday rebutted several of the commission's main assertions. "Our global force realignments are a result of intensive study and extensive coordination within the government, the Congress and our allies," spokesman Bryan Whitman said.

"With respect to the fact that they think this is being done hastily, the analysis has been very rigorous, and these decisions are necessary for our national security," he said. "Everything that we have done with respect to our global force posture has been done to increase our global military capabilities, as well as our strategic flexibility."

The Pentagon plan draws down large permanent bases in Western Europe and Asia, and creates a network of smaller but expandable "lily pad" bases where U.S. forces can stage, refuel, train and conduct operations – often using prepositioned stocks of equipment.

In Asia, the plan calls for redeploying 12,500 U.S. troops from South Korea in three phases starting this year, through 2008, pulling out a heavy brigade and bringing in a lighter but more mobile Stryker battalion.

From Western Europe, the plan would shift U.S. forces toward Eastern European countries such as Bulgaria, Romania and Poland, as well as Africa. It envisions a sharp reduction in U.S. forces and major bases in Germany, with the scheduled return of more than 42,000 troops – including the Army's 1st Infantry Division and 1st Armored Division in 2007 and 2008 – and the closure of more than 200 individual bases and related facilities in Europe. The military would keep an airborne brigade in Italy and send a Stryker brigade to Germany.

The commission, however, warns that this rebasing, in Europe in particular, risks weakening U.S. influence with long-standing allies, while relationships, including legal agreements, with the new host nations remain uncertain. It recommends that the Pentagon revise its plan and leave one U.S. armored brigade of 4,000 troops in Europe, both to demonstrate U.S. commitment to NATO and to handle any renewed outbreak of hostilities in the Balkans.

With the U.S. military already stretched thin by the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the commission report warns that the plan to add new rotations of U.S. forces overseas "takes us to the edge of our capabilities" – in terms of manpower, transportation assets and equipment.

Meanwhile, according to the report, the extra rotations would mean that, even in peacetime, an active-duty service member would face seven extended deployments over a 20-year career, with reservists seeing deployments every fourth or fifth year. Adding to the strain, many U.S. basing communities lack the housing, educational and medical facilities

to receive the returning troops, the report says. As a result, it warns, "we may find ourselves unable to acquire the requisite numbers of recruits and reenlistments to maintain a viable volunteer force."

*******

Jeremy Craig. 2005. "BRAC List May Surface Sooner." Augusta (GA) Chronicle (May 5): A1.

pect to know Fort Gordon's fate sooner rather than later.

Maybe as soon as May 10, officials say.

May 16 is the official deadline for the first list of recommended 2005 base closures, but those involved in the process say the Defense Department will most likely make it public next week.

Larry DeMeyers, the chairman of the CSRA Alliance for Fort Gordon, which is working to stave off the Army post's closure, said his group is anticipating the list's release May 13.

Other observers and civilian Defense Department employees also have said the Pentagon would release its list that day - Friday the 13th.

For public relations reasons - and because of superstition - the list might be released earlier, between May 10 and 12, according to the National Association of Installation Developers/An Association of Defense Communities, which helps communities redevelop closed bases.

No matter when the announcement takes place, the alliance is prepared for two contingencies, Mr. DeMeyers said: Either the post is not on the list, and there will be a celebration, or the post is on the list, and the group's "plan B" begins to roll.

Mr. DeMeyers said that though the alliance is confident the post will survive the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure, or BRAC, it is considering how to defend Fort Gordon if it is on the list, and if that is unsuccessful, what to do if the post gets the ax.

xt week's list will not be final, although some observers say that more than 90 percent of the bases on it will not survive.

The nine-member BRAC commission must first review the Pentagon's list and submit its own recommendations by Sept. 8. President Bush has to give a thumbs-up or down to the entire list by Sept. 23.

"We hope that it's a waste of time and money, trying to prepare for a worst-case scenario," Mr. DeMeyers said, "but we're anticipating that it will not be used."

Unlike other issues emanating from Washington, where government officials often leak information anonymously ahead of time to the media, word on BRAC has been well guarded.

Those charged with helping defend local bases say they're amazed at how close to the chest defense officials are keeping the information.

Retired Army Brig. Gen. Philip K. Browning, the head of the Georgia Military Affairs Coordinating Committee, the state-level effort to protect the Peach State's military bases, said he has heard "not a doggone thing," or even an inkling of what bases the Pentagon definitely wants to close or realign.

"I can't believe it," Mr. Browning said. "I am really surprised. We're ready either way, but it would be nice to get something."

Reach Jeremy Craig at (706) 823-3409 or jeremy.craig@augustachronicle.com.

*******

nd Pt I

DCN: 12123

DCN: 12123

## McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk

**From:** Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 04, 2005 5:38 PM
**To:** McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk
**Subject:** RE: Planning Meeting for Base Visits and Regional Hearings

Andrew — Please make extra use of the May 3rd testimony in talking points/Q&A. Jim 5/9

Rob, here is your press guidance:

Until the Commission has had an opportunity to review the list and to hear the testimony of Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld on May 16, it will not comment on the recommendations. Immediately following the May 16 hearing, there will a media availability at which time the Chairman and the Commissioners will respond to queries.

I would like you to prep a release acknowledging that the Commission has received the Secretary's recommendations and that the Chairman has directed the staff to analyze the report and to prepare the Commissioners for the May 16 hearing. Prep a quote for the Chairman to be included based on his opening statement of the May 3rd hearing in which he stated his goals etc. That statement will be your Bible

-----Original Message-----
From: McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2005 2:59 PM
To: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: Planning Meeting for Base Visits and Regional Hearings

Done Also, we need to start organizing a plan for a press avail with the commission as a whole prior to the 16th. And, Possibly just the Chairman on Tuesday or which ever day the list is released to confirm that the list was received etc..We can set that up right here at this building or maybe even one of the committee rooms..In addition, I would like to start drafting a press release for confirmation that the list has been received..Is this ok to get started on? Christine, Jenn and I are working on the 16th details as well..and will start drafting that press release as well..

Thanks,
Robert

---

From: Battaglia, Charles, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2005 2:26 PM
To: Carnevale, Diane, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk; McCreary, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC-Polk; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: Planning Meeting for Base Visits and Regional Hearings

There will be a meeting for senior leadership on Friday May 6 at 11 am to formulate a process, timetable and responsibilities for base visits and regional hearings once the list hits the street next week.

Large Conference Room - pls reserve

Rob, pls notify Jenn and Christine Hill.

DCN: 12123

## Campbell, Jane LCDR, OASD-PA

**From:** Campbell, Jane LCDR, OASD-PA
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 10, 2005 12:32 PM
**To:** MLA dd-OASD-PA DDI_PO
**Subject:** BRAC PAG & other info

Good afternoon everybody,

Here's the link to the website: http://www.defenselink.mil/brac/

&

Here is the PAG -- (note -- this email version is BOTH messages COMBINED. . .Part I and Part II.

v/r,

Jane

UNCLAS

PRECEDENCE TO: ROUTINE DTG: 022118Z MAY 05 (Part 1)
DTG: 022120Z MAY 05 (Part 2)
PRECEDENCE CC: ROUTINE
TYPE: DMS SIGNED/ENCRYPTED
FROM PLA: SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//PA//
FROM D/N: C:US,O:U.S. Government,OU:DoD,OU:OSD,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,
L:WASHINGTON DC,OU:ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(uc)
SUBJECT: Public Affairs Guidance on BRAC 2005 - PART 1 of 2 PARTS
TEXT:
UNCLASSIFIED//

Subject: Public Affairs Guidance on BRAC 2005

1. References.
1.1. SECDEF MSG, DTG 312136Z MAR 05, SUBJ: Supplemental (PAG) - Transformation through Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC 2005).
1.2. SECDEF MSG, DTG 052323Z JAN 04, SUBJ: Supplemental (PAG) - Transformation through Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC 2005). This message specifically addressed matters related to the BRAC 2005 data call announced on 6 January 2004.
1.3. SECDEF MSG, DTG 202320Z NOV 03, SUBJ: Public Affairs Guidance (PAG) - Transformation through Base Realignment And Closure (BRAC 2005)
1.4. Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L) memo Policy Memorandum Two BRAC 2005 Military Value Principles
1.5. Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L) memo Policy Memorandum One BRAC 2005 Policy, Responsibilities, and Procedures
1.6. Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) memo on transformation through BRAC, 15 Nov 02. This is SECDEF's initial direction on BRAC 2005.
1.7. Authorizing Legislation; Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 as Amended Through FY05 Authorization Act Sections 2901-2914.

2. Background and Purpose. This message provides updated PAG for BRAC 2005, supersedes Refs 1.1 and 1.2, and is active upon the announcement of Secretary of Defense s base closure and realignment recommendations on May 13, 2005. Additional guidance will be provided as required.

2.1. The National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2002 authorized DoD to pursue one BRAC round in 2005. Ref 1.6 initiated the complex analysis and decision process involving virtually all levels of DoD management, from installation through major command and component/agency headquarters to OSD, in which all bases were considered and treated equally. The independent BRAC Commission will review the SECDEF S realignment and closure recommendations through a public process. In turn, the Commission s recommendations will

be reviewed by the President and Congress.

2.2. Because of the impact on the Military Departments and local communities, BRAC is a subject of intense interest to all stakeholders. Realignment and closure decisions of BRAC 2005 will support DoD transformation. Analytical work and subsequent deliberations must occur free from opinions (internal or external), must be based on certified data and removed from any speculation in order to provide the SECDEF, the BRAC Commission, the President, and Congress with the optimal set of recommendations.

3. Public Affairs Policy: Active. Base realignments and closures may be contentious and controversial for affected internal and external audiences. Commanders and their public affairs officers must be prepared to respond to questions and objectively and proactively communicate the details of the BRAC process to internal audiences, the public and the media.

3.1. Media Coverage Information that would be releasable in the normal course of business may continue to be released to the media and requests for informational briefings or tours of base facilities for the media that would normally be authorized may continue to be granted. In cases where media requests can be facilitated without base visits by providing B-roll, stills, fact sheets or similar information, Public Affairs Officers may offer these items as an alternate means of granting the media s request. The BRAC announcement per se does not impose any additional restrictions on media visits to DoD facilities.

3.1.1. Media Coverage in conjunction with elected official visits. Media events or media coverage of elected officials visits to bases and installations in connection with BRAC is not authorized. If elected officials request tours and briefings from installation commands, it must be done within the limits defined in paragraph 3.2., below. However, press conferences, media availabilities or traveling media are not authorized on installations in connection with such visits. In certain cases, elected officials may participate in non-political and non-BRAC related events on military installations that may be covered by media (ribbon-cutting, dedications, etc.). These visits may be supported under certain circumstances but should be coordinated though the appropriate public affairs office.

3.2. Media Opportunities. In cases where on-base opportunities would not be appropriate, as referenced in 3.1.1, local PAOs may suggest appropriate off-base opportunities vs. holding events on DoD property. Each installation shall ensure that service and DoD restrictions regarding potential media coverage of security and force protection measures at gates or entry points are enforced. Military personnel may attend Commission public hearings but may not participate in associated media activities. Exceptions must be approved by MAJCOM/Service level PAO.

3.3. Community Queries. Local communities have an extraordinary interest in the BRAC process and, consistent with the Department's need for internal deliberation, will receive access to data made public upon release of the Secretary s recommendations. Timely and consistent information from all DoD elements will minimize confusion and foster trust. PAOs may continue to release the same type and amount of information on their installations within current operational security and force protection guidelines.

3.3.1 Additionally, the BRAC Commission s review is a transparent process. Data-call information from installations will be made public by the Department when it is turned over to the BRAC Commission not later than May 16. It will be available on www.defenselink.mil/BRAC as soon as possible. The volume of data-call information may preclude all of it being available on Defenselink by May 16. While requests for local data-call information should be referred to the web site, local installations may make data call information available to local communities and media any time after the Secretary has announced his recommendations.

3.3.2 Inquiries received by local commands related to factual information upon which DoD bases were recommended for closure or realignment can be answered to the extent that factual and accurate information is on hand, properly coordinated, and cleared for release by the local command s chain of command as appropriate. Avoid using personal opinions and/or speculation in discussing BRAC recommendations. All information in the Secretary s report to the BRAC Commission and supporting documents should be considered cleared.

3.3.3. It is important to note that local commanders are not in a position to evaluate

the entire mission requirements and cross-service implications of their individual functions as they may affect DoD. Even though local commanders are well versed in the merits of their installation, they are not in a position to assess other installations or the Department s total needs. As such, local commanders are not in a position to answer questions requiring them to speculate on the senior-level deliberation that resulted in specific recommendations. These queries should be referred to the appropriate public affairs office.

3.4. Internal communications. DoD leadership recognizes that commanders, commanding officers and command spokespersons must support DoD s recommendations and the concerns of the local employees and communities. The importance of maintaining open lines of communication among all concerned cannot be overemphasized. Commanders can and should remind people of the overall goals and worldwide requirements during the BRAC process while avoiding speculation about what went into the decision process in Washington.

3.4.1. Following past BRAC announcements, some affected commanders arranged town-hall style meetings (e.g. All Hands Calls or departmental Commander s Calls ) to internally brief command personnel and their families regarding the announcement (without media). This interaction is highly encouraged. The agendas must be coordinated with the installation Human Resources staff to insure that, when necessary, the appropriate labor organization is provided the opportunity to be present. Commanders are encouraged to brief the BRAC process and emphasize that DoD recommendations will not be implemented until after hearings and review by the BRAC Commission (including local visits by two commission members to adversely affected facilities), approval by the President, and finally approval by Congress in the November 2005 timeframe. The defenselink.mil/BRAC website also will contain links to Personnel & Readiness information important for military members and civilian employees and their families and contractors.

3.5. Participation In Official Capacity. DoD personnel may not participate in activities of any organization that has as its stated purpose insulating bases from realignment or closure. This guidance is aimed at ensuring the fairness and rigor of the BRAC deliberative process. Invitations to participate in such organizations should be discussed with appropriate ethics counselors. In a liaison or representational role, DoD officials may attend meetings with state and local officials, or other organizations that may seek to develop plans or programs to improve the ability of installations to discharge their national security and defense missions. DoD officials may not manage or control such organizations or efforts.

3.5.1. Interaction with BRAC Commission. DoD personnel may receive requests, based on their professional position, to participate in BRAC Commission hearings and should be prepared to support such requests. Prepared testimony for hearings should be cleared through the chain of command up through Service and OSD congressional affairs channels, as appropriate. Likewise, PAOs should be prepared to support requests from the BRAC commission for base tours, press conferences, briefs or other information.

3.5.2. Previous Commissions asked installation commanders to support their site visits. As such, installation commanders should be prepared to support visits by Commissioners to their facility and to host informational briefings or tours of base facilities. There are no restrictions on providing normally releasable information.

3.5.3. Previous Commissions held public hearings at facilities that were not located on military installations to ensure unrestricted public access and maximum public input. For these public events, base commanders were not tasked with logistical support. The Commission (helped by the local government) set these up themselves (at school auditoriums or other public places). As such, Commanders should not have a role nor should they be a conduit for public input.

3.6. Many influential former officials and retired general/flag officers will be involved with organizations attempting to protect bases from realignment or closure. Consistent with applicable ethics laws and regulations, they are allowed to participate in this manner and regardless of their participation, the organizations are not allowed any greater or lesser information/access than the general public.

3.7. Tenant organizations or commands may be affected by BRAC recommendations, particularly those commands with high numbers of civilian employees, and can therefore expect public and/or media interest. Inquiries may overlap between the tenant command and host command. Close coordination between commanding officers and public affairs officers

DCN: 12123

of tenant commands and the hosting installation is critical to ensure message alignment.

4. Key Themes, Messages and Talking Points.

4.1. Key Themes and Messages. Themes/Messages and Talking Points will be updated when the Secretary s recommendations are made public.

4.1.1. Primary Theme and Message. The purpose of the SECDEF s recommendations is to make the most efficient and effective use of all the Department s resources; to improve operational efficiency; to save taxpayer dollars; to advance transformation and enhance the combat effectiveness of our military forces.

4.1.2. Supporting Themes and Messages.

4.1.2.1. Enabling Transformation BRAC matches infrastructure to the needs of the future force, providing a foundation of transformation.

4.1.2.2. Meeting the Needs of the Future Force--Facilitate the transformation of the Department by melding like operations of separate services; accommodate a redeploying force structure; anticipate tomorrow s uncertainties by providing surge capacity in operations, training and logistics.

4.1.2.3. Enhancing Combat Effectiveness examine and implement opportunities for greater joint activity and improving joint operations by co-locating and combining training, technology, laboratory, depot maintenance and supply chain management operations of the separate services. The Secretary of Defense established Joint Cross Service groups to review common business-oriented functions across the Department. These functions include Education and Training; Industrial; Intelligence; Headquarters and Support; Supply and Storage; Technical, and Medical. These groups were composed of members from each of the Military Departments, the Joint Staff, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

4.1.2.4. Reducing Cost of Our Base Structure Eliminate unnecessary infrastructure resulting in recurring annual savings that can be converted from waste to war-fighting resources.

4.1.2.5. Ensuring an Impartial BRAC Process the 2005 BRAC process was designed and is being executed impartially and objectively to ensure that the outcome can be trusted to advance transformation, combat effectiveness and the efficient use of the taxpayer s money.

4.2. Key Talking Points: (By changing the verb tense, the following talking points can be used both before and after the Secretary releases his recommendations.)

4.2.1. Military value was the primary consideration in assessing all military bases. Because of the diversity of functions the Services and the Joint Cross Service Groups adopted individual approaches to military value. The Navy s need for linear feet of pier space, for example, cannot be equated to the Air Force s value of flying training space or to an industrial depot s need for square footage of maintenance space.

4.2.2. The 2005 BRAC process will help find innovative ways to consolidate, realign, or find alternative uses for current facilities. (Examples will be provided after the Department s recommendations are provided to the BRAC Commission.)

4.2.3. The functions and value of all military installations were reviewed, and all recommendations were based on legally mandated selection criteria and a 20-year force structure plan.

4.2.4. The BRAC 2005 process will ensure that the United States continues to have the best-trained and equipped military in the world.

4.2.5. BRAC 2005 will enable the U.S. military to match facilities to forces, meet the threats and challenges of a new century, and make the wisest use of limited defense dollars. (Examples will be provided after the Department s recommendations are provided to the BRAC Commission.)

4.2.6. BRAC 2005 will facilitate multi-service missions by creating joint organizational and basing solutions that will not only reduce waste but maximize military effectiveness.

(Examples will be provided after the Department s recommendations are provided to the BRAC Commission.)

4.2.7. Consolidating facilities will save billions of dollars, allowing the department to focus funds on maintaining and modernizing facilities needed to better support our forces, recruit quality personnel, modernize equipment and infrastructure, and develop the capabilities needed to meet 21st Century threats.

4.2.8. The Department fully appreciates the fact that the implementation of BRAC actions, which will not be finalized until November 2005 at the earliest, can be a difficult transition for affected military and civilian personnel and their families, and communities and businesses near affected bases. DoD will do everything it can to make the transition as smooth as possible. Affected personnel and communities will be specifically briefed on programs that are available to them when BRAC actions are implemented. Information is currently available for interested personnel and communities at the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel & Readiness web site at www.defenselink.mil/BRAC .

5. Contingency and Public Statements.

5.1. Contingency Statement. Not applicable at this time.

5.2. Public Statement. By changing the verb tense, the following statement may be used both before and after the Secretary sends his recommendations to the BRAC Commission. Updated statements will be made available when the recommendations are released: "The Department of Defense has completed its BRAC 2005 process and the Secretary of Defense has forwarded his recommendations to the independent BRAC Commission. The Department used BRAC to achieve several goals: eliminate excess infrastructure; reshape our military; pursue jointness; optimize military readiness; and realize significant savings in support of transforming the Department of Defense. These recommendations eliminate excess physical capacity that has been diverting scarce resources from Defense capability. BRAC 2005 recommendations are part of the critical foundation of transforming the Department s infrastructure to meet emerging missions and revised Defense strategies. BRAC 2005 has allowed the Department to reconfigure its current infrastructure into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war-fighting capability and efficiency through joint organizational and basing solutions that will facilitate multi-service missions, reduce excess capacity, save money, and redirect resources to modernize equipment and infrastructure and develop the capabilities to meet 21st century threats.

5.2.1. Copies of Department officials public statements made at the press briefing will be made available when the statements are delivered. Until then, PAOs public statements must be within the confines of this guidance.

6. Questions and Answers. Q s and A s are not for response to query only. Authorized spokespersons/commanders can speak to the issue of BRAC as long as they are within the scope of this document.

6.1. General.

Q1. What is BRAC?
A1. "BRAC" is an acronym that stands for Base Realignment and Closure. It is the congressionally authorized process DoD has previously used to reorganize its base structure to more efficiently and effectively support our forces, increase operational readiness and facilitate new ways of doing business. (The original legislation actually states that the title of the process is Base Closure and Realignment.)

Q2. How does BRAC work? DOD
A2. The process began with a threat assessment of the future national security environment, followed by the development of a force structure plan and basing requirements to meet these threats. DoD then applied legally mandated selection criteria to determine which installations to recommend for realignment and closure. The Secretary of Defense will publish a report containing his realignment and closure recommendations, forwarding supporting documentation to the independent commission.

Q3. Will local commanders and others in their official capacities be available to help task forces or other efforts to influence BRAC decisions with regard to our base?
A3. DoD personnel may not participate in activities of any organization that has as its purpose, either directly or indirectly, insulating bases from realignment or closure.

This guidance is aimed at ensuring the fairness and rigor of the BRAC deliberative process. Invitations to participate in such organizations should be discussed with appropriate ethics counselors. DoD officials may attend meetings in a liaison or representational capacity with state and local officials, or other organizations that may seek to develop plans or programs to improve the ability of installations to discharge their national security and defense missions. DoD officials may not manage or control such organizations or efforts. (See paragraph 3.5 for additional clarification.)

Q4. Where do funds come from to perform the BRAC analysis/evaluations?
A4. The BRAC analysis was performed within available resources, specifically, Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds.

Q5. Will near-term future new force-structure changes be incorporated into the BRAC 2005 process?
A5. Yes. The statute requires that recommendations be based on a 20-year force structure plan that begins with 2005.

Q6. What impact do the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and the BRAC process have on one another?
A6. The previous Quadrennial Defense Review informed the BRAC process.

Q7. How was "jointness" assessed during BRAC 2005?
A7. The Joint Cross Service Groups reviewed common business oriented functions performed across the Department. The Services reviewed their own operations, looking across the Department for joint solutions wherever that provided benefit. Further, the leadership structure of BRAC 2005, as established by the Secretary of Defense, was joint at every level. (See the answer to question 19, above)

Q8. Are there any specific priorities for BRAC 2005? Is 'jointness' under DoD or BRAC?
A8. In his November 15, 2002, memorandum, the SECDEF established the goals and priorities for the 2005 BRAC round. A primary objective of BRAC 2005, in addition to realigning our base structure to meet evolving force structure, is to examine and implement opportunities for greater jointness. To reinforce the idea that we should be looking across traditional lines to examine the potential for jointness, the Secretary established an internal BRAC 2005 decision-making body that is joint at every level.

Q9. How will the realignment of military forces and bases overseas impact BRAC 2005 efforts?
A9. On March 20, 2003, the Secretary directed the development of a comprehensive and integrated presence and basing strategy looking out 10 years. Results of that effort, including rationalizing areas of potential excesses and identifying the utility of overseas installations informed the BRAC 2005 process.

Q10. The Secretary of Defense has placed emphasis on transforming the Department of Defense. What is transformation? Wh. ab. transformation?
A10. Transformation is shaping the changing nature of military competition and cooperation through new combinations of concepts, capabilities, people and organizations that exploit our nation's advantages, protect our asymmetric vulnerabilities, and sustain our strategic position, which helps maintain peace and stability in the world.

Q11. Why is DoD transforming?
A11. Over time, the defense strategy calls for the transformation of the U.S. defense establishment. Transformation is at the heart of this strategy. To transform DoD, we need to change its culture in many important areas. Our budgeting, acquisition, personnel, and management systems must be able to operate in a world that changes rapidly. Without change, the current defense program will only become more expensive in the future, and DoD will forfeit many of the opportunities available today.

Q12. How is BRAC transformational? (?)
A12. BRAC provides a singular opportunity to reshape our infrastructure to optimize military readiness. The 2005 BRAC process will help find innovative ways to consolidate, realign, or find alternative uses for current facilities to ensure that the U.S. continues to field the best-prepared and best-equipped military in the world. BRAC 2005 will also enable the U.S. military to better match facilities to forces, meet the threats and challenges of a new century, and make the wisest use of limited defense dollars.

Q13. How much excess capacity does the DoD currently have?

A13. In March 2004, the Department reported to the Congress that as much as 24 percent of its aggregate installation capacity could be excess using an analysis that considered the ratios of forces to bases before and after the previous BRAC rounds. This was similar to a 1998 report in which the Department reported to Congress that approximately 23 percent of its capacity in the aggregate could be considered excess. However, neither of these estimates were used as targets for the BRAC 2005 analysis. More importantly, as military value was the primary consideration, there were no capacity reduction targets of any kind established for BRAC 2005. Specific capacity indicators depend on the function being analyzed (pier space, aircraft apron space, warehouse square footage, etc.,).

Q14. The SECDEF and other officials have said several times over the last couple of years that the Department has 20-25 percent excess capacity. How much capacity are you recommending be closed in this round of BRAC?
A14. See answer to question 13 for background. The materials accompanying the release of the Secretary s recommendations will include metrics that will quantify the results, in the aggregate.

Q15. If a base is selected for closure/realignment, will DoD continue to fund/complete ongoing MILCON?
A15. Yes, we will complete construction where cost effective (that is, the cost to terminate exceeds the savings) and/or where an unfinished structure would present an unreasonable impediment to reuse.

6.2. Key Groups and People.

Q16. What is the BRAC Commission?
A16. The commission is an independent body responsible for reviewing the Secretary s recommendations for BRAC 2005. The Base Closure and Realignment Act specified the selection process for commissioners. The President was required to consult with the congressional leadership on nominations to serve on the commission.

Q17. Who was selected as the Chairman of the BRAC 2005 Commission?
A17. Anthony J. Principi has been appointed to serve as the Chairman of the Commission. Secretary Principi has had a distinguished career in the public and private sectors and recently served as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. He is a 1967 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., saw active duty aboard the destroyer USS Joseph P. Kennedy, and later commanded a River Patrol Unit in Vietnam's Mekong Delta. Mr. Principi earned his law degree from Seton Hall University in 1975 and was assigned to the Navy's Judge Advocate General Corps in San Diego, Calif. In 1980, he was transferred to Washington as a legislative counsel for the Department of the Navy.

Q18. Who are the members of the BRAC 2005 Commission?
A18. On April 1, 2005 President George W. Bush used his recess-appointment power to approve the nominations of eight individuals to be Members of the Defense Base Realignment and Closure Commission:
James H. Bilbray of Nevada, Philip Coyle of California, Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.) of Virginia, James V. Hansen of Utah, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.) of Florida. General Lloyd Warren Newton, USAF (Ret.) of Connecticut, Samuel Knox Skinner of Illinois, and Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.) of Texas.

Q19. Who is James H. Bilbray?
A19. Former Congressman Bilbray was a member of the Foreign Affairs, Armed Services and Intelligence Committees. He served in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1955 to 1963.

Q20. Who is Philip Coyle?
A20. Mr. Coyle is a Senior Advisor to the Center for Defense Information. He served as Assistant Secretary of Defense and Director of Operational Test and Evaluation at the Department of Defense.

Q21. Who is Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.)?
A21. Admiral Gehman served on active duty in the U.S. Navy for over 35 years. His last assignment was as NATO's Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic and as the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Joint Forces Command.

Q22. Who is James V. Hansen?
A22. Former Congressman Hansen was a member of the Armed Services Committee. He served in the U.S. Navy from 1951 to 1955.

Q23. Who is General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.)?
A23. General Hill served in the U.S. Army for 36 years. His last assignment was as Combatant Commander of the U.S. Southern Command.

Q24. Who is General Lloyd Warren Newton, USA (Ret.)?
A24. General Newton served in the U.S. Air Force for 34 years. His last assignment was as the Commander of Air Education and Training Command.

Q25. Who is Samuel Knox Skinner?
A25. Mr. Skinner served as Chief of Staff and as Secretary of Transportation for President George H. W. Bush. He served in the U.S. Army Reserve from 1960 to 1968.

Q26. Who is Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)?
A26. General Turner is a member of the American Battle Monuments Commission. She served in the U.S. Air Force for 30 years, most recently as the director of nursing services in the Office of the Air Force Surgeon General at Bolling Air Force Base.

Q27. What authority does the commission have?
A27. The commission has the authority to change the Department's recommendations, if it determines that the Secretary deviated substantially from the force structure plan and/or selection criteria. The commission will hold regional meetings to solicit public input prior to making its recommendations. History has shown that the use of an independent commission and public meetings make the process as open and fair as possible.

Q28. What happens to the commission s recommendations?
A28. The commission forwards its recommendations to the President for review and approval, who then forwards the recommendations to Congress. Congress has 45 legislative days to act on the commission report on an all-or-none basis. After that time, the commission's realignment and closure recommendations become law. Implementation must start within two years, and actions must be complete within six years. (See Q23 for more details.)

Q29. Who has oversight of the BRAC process within DoD?
A29. The Infrastructure Executive Council (IEC), chaired by the Deputy Secretary, and composed of the secretaries of the Military Departments and their chiefs of services, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics) (USD(AT&L)) has policy making and oversight authority for the entire BRAC 2005.

Q30. Who will assess the joint use aspect of BRAC 2005?
A30. The Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG), chaired by the USD(AT&L) oversees joint cross-service analyses of common business oriented functions and ensure the integration of that process with the Military Department and defense agency specific analyses of all other functions. The Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Military Department assistant secretaries for installations and environment, the service vice chiefs, and the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Installations & Environment) (DUSD(I&E)) form the ISG. There are seven joint cross service groups as described in section 4.1.2.3.

Q31. How can communities get involved in BRAC to enhance their support to the base population/mission and their prospects during the BRAC 2005 round?
A31. The Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission will solicit community input once it has received the Secretary of Defense's base closure and realignment recommendations. The BRAC Commission can be contacted at 703-699-2950. Their address is BRAC Commission, 2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600, Arlington, VA 22202. The BRAC Commission expects to have a web page on line by May 16.

Q32. If a base is approved for closure or realignment, how long will the process take?
A32. Under the BRAC statute, actions to close or realign a base must be initiated within two years of the date the President transmits the BRAC Commission's recommendations report to Congress, and must be completed within six years of that same date.

Q33. How were communities impacted by base closure in past BRAC rounds?
A33. Most communities affected by closure and realignment decisions in the last four rounds of BRAC have successfully transitioned to productive economic development. We are committed to working with BRAC 05 communities to duplicate that success when BRAC recommendations are approved. DoD s Office of Economic Adjustment is chartered to assist

local communities with planning for the reuse of closing and realigning installations and in that capacity will provide individual community assistance. Examples of past success can be found on the DoD Office of Economic Adjustment web site that can be accessed through the www.defenselink.mil/brac.

Q34. If the final decision is to close or realign the base, with whom will the community leaders work in the transition of the base from its current mission to civilian use?
A34. Each Military Department will have a central point of contact for each closing activity to assist in coordinating the involvement of the various organizations. It is the Military Department s role, in consultation with local communities, to make decisions on how the base property will be conveyed to new owners. Additionally, the DoD s Office of Economic Adjustment is chartered to assist local communities with planning for the reuse of closing and realigning installations and in that capacity will provide individual community assistance.

Q35. How will the property be disposed of or sold?
A35. The BRAC statute provides the Military Departments with a variety of authorities for disposing of property at closed or realigned military installations. In consultation with the local community, the Military Department will select the most effective combination of transfer methods to return the property to productive use and ensure equitable return for DoD and the taxpayers. Property conveyance authorities include public sales, negotiated sales to public entities, public benefit conveyances, economic development conveyances at cost or no cost, and conveyances for conservation purposes or to entities that will perform environmental cleanup. Some property may also be transferred to other federal agencies for continued use for Government purposes.

Q36. How will you decide reuse of the base?
A36. The Department of Defense does not decide the reuse of former military installations. The local community prepares a redevelopment plan through its designated Local Redevelopment Authority (LRA) for federal surplus property. This redevelopment plan will designate future land uses. The Military Departments will then make property disposal decisions, giving deference to the LRA s Redevelopment Plan.

Q37. Our base has some environmental contamination. Will DOD clean it up?
A37. DoD is responsible for ensuring that all known contamination is addressed in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local environmental laws and regulations. In some cases, DoD may choose to perform the required cleanup itself before the property is transferred. In others, DoD may arrange to have the work undertaken by the new owner as part of the real estate transaction. In either case, there will be oversight and enforcement by environmental regulators to ensure that the cleanup is protective of human health and the environment. Also, there are a number of safeguards to ensure that the cleanup is indeed completed. These safeguards include the possible purchase of private sector environmental insurance by the new owners of the property and provisions in the laws requiring DoD to ensure the cleanup of any contamination discovered only after the transfer of the property.

Q38. During the time cleanup is taking place -- several years in many cases -- will the base property be vacant and unused until all the cleanup is completed?
A38. DoD s environmental cleanup program has progressed significantly. Environmental cleanup is complete or near completion at many sites and the nature and extent of contamination is well defined at remaining locations. Consequently, DoD believes that a much greater percentage of the property comprising this round of closures will be ready to be conveyed by the time the military missions at the base cease. If additional cleanup is required, DoD now has available to it legal authorities that were not available at the outset of the process in prior BRAC rounds. These authorities enable DoD to convey property to new owners in its existing condition so long as the property is suitable as is for the near-term use the new owners intend to make of it. This allows cleanup and redevelopment of the property to occur concurrently. This option can often save time and money, and facilitates rapid economic redevelopment by allowing the new owners to put the property into productive use immediately. The Military Departments can also consider leasing if that would benefit redevelopment without delaying conveyance.

Q39. Now that SECDEF has forwarded his list of recommendations, what s the next step in the BRAC process?
A39. See timeline in question 51.

Q40. If a base or facility is among the DoD recommendations, does that mean that it will

definitely be closed/realigned? How will communities learn when that will occur?
A40. The DoD recommendations must be approved by the BRAC Commission, the President and the Congress before they can be implemented.

Q41. If my base/installation is NOT on the list, can the BRAC commission recommend it for closure or realignment?
A41. Yes. The statute addresses three different options: additions to the recommendations, expansions of the recommendations, and removal from the recommendations. This is a change from previous rounds.

Option 1 - Additions: In accordance with the statute, the Commission may not add a new facility unless:
The Commission provides the SECDEF with at least a 15-day period, before making the change, in which to submit an explanation of the reasons why the installation was not included on the closure or realignment list by the Secretary.
The decision to add the installation for Commission consideration is supported by at least seven of the nine members of the Commission.
The Commission shall invite the SECDEF to testify at a public hearing (or a closed hearing if classified information is involved), on any proposed change by the Commission to the SECDEF s recommendation.

Option 2 - Expansions: To expand one of the SECDEF s realignment recommendations requires:
At least two members of the Commission must visit the installation before the date of the transmittal of the report to the President.
The decision to make the change is supported by seven of the nine Commissioners.

Option 3 - Removals: To remove one of the SECDEF s recommendations requires:
A majority vote of the Commission.

Q42. What percentage of SECDEF recommendations have become approved closure/realignment actions?
A42. Historically, the BRAC Commissions have accepted 85 percent of the Department s recommendations.

Q43. What is DoD s relationship with the BRAC Commission? Can military personnel attend commission hearings in a personal/official capacity? What if I m a civilian?
A43. The BRAC Commission is an independent body with members appointed by the President of the United States in consultation with the Congress. The Department of Defense provides logistic support to the Commission but has no other formal relationship with the Commission. Anyone may attend the Commission s public hearings.

Q44. There are a number of civilians on my facility who may lose their jobs if the recommendations are approved, who is responsible for taking care of them?
A44. The Department will do everything it can to make the transition as smooth as possible and there are a number of programs available for military members and civilian employees and their families and contractors that will help do that. All DoD personnel are encouraged to visit www.defenselink.mil/BRAC for links to the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness discussion of those programs. Additionally, the Department will have a dedicated BRAC website: www. www.bractransition.com, which will hyper link to defenselink.mil/BRAC. This new website will provide information to inform employees, managers, and human resource specialists about various transition assistance programs and services. Information on the www.bractransition.com website will include a "What's New" section; a link to a transition assistance video for employees outlining various transition programs; an employee brochure providing information on the reduction in force process, job placement programs, separation incentives, and employee benefits and entitlements; a "Frequently Asked Questions" section concerning all transition assistance programs; links to military department BRAC websites; links to the Civilian Personnel Management Service Civilian Assistance and Reemployment (CARE) website; and links to pertinent job search websites such as Office of Personnel Management's USAJobs and Department of Labor's CareerOneStop. The www.bractransition.com website will be available by May 13, 2005. Additionally, this website will be continually updated during the BRAC process.

Q45. What happens if Congress passes a joint resolution disapproving the Commissions recommendations?

A45. The President has the option of vetoing the resolution and if he does, Congress has the option of overriding the veto. If the President does not veto the resolution or if Congress overrides that veto, the BRAC round in 2005 would end there and there would be no closures or realignments. However, this would adversely affect military transformation and joint collaboration and training, which would still have to be addressed by DoD and the Congress.

Q46. Can the public provide comment on the list of recommendations? If so, where and when?
A46. Yes, through the BRAC Commission. (See answer to question 31, for phone number and address.)

Q47. What does it mean that the recommendations were based on certified data?
A47. The BRAC statute requires that DoD personnel certify to the best of their knowledge and belief that information provided to the Secretary of Defense or the 2005 Commission concerning the realignment or closure of a military installation is accurate and complete. DoD components and the Joint Cross Service Groups established procedures, internal control plans, and designated personnel to make these certifications.

Q48. What role did the Joint Cross Service Groups play in this round of BRAC?
A48. The Secretary of Defense established Joint Cross Service groups to review common business-oriented functions across the Department. These functions included: Education and Training; Industrial; Intelligence; Headquarters and Support; Supply and Storage; Technical, and Medical. These groups were composed of members from each of the Military Departments, the Joint Staff, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Q49 What do you think about the BRAC list?
A49. (Personnel outside the BRAC process are not in a position to evaluate the entire DoD cross-service mission requirements or to speculate on analysis.) We are confident in the fact that the BRAC process is impartial, giving priority consideration to military value based on and the recommendations from installations using certified factual data and the 20-year force structure plan. DoD leadership will continue to support the formal BRAC process as necessary through its completion and the recommendations will ultimately advance transformation, combat effectiveness and the efficient use of taxpayers' money.

Q50. Don't you think XXX base (a base on BRAC list) is militarily important? How will you get along without it?
A50. BRAC 2005 gave priority consideration to military value, to include advancing the transformation of our forces, enhancing their combat effectiveness, and reducing overall costs for military infrastructure. All bases were considered against their peers with the emphasis on enhancing the military value of the end state. BRAC 2005 will allow DoD to realign our base structure to transform and to meet post-Cold War force structure.

Q51. What events are upcoming in the BRAC 2005 process?
A51. There are several significant events taking place throughout the remainder of 2005. The following is a general timeline of significant events.

May 16, 2005: Not later than this date, the SECDEF must publish in the Federal Register and transmit to the Congressional Defense Committees and the Commission, a list of the military installations that the SECDEF recommends for closure or realignment.

July 1, 2005: Not later than this date, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Congressional Defense Committees, a report containing a detailed analysis of the SECDEF s recommendations and selection process.

September 8, 2005: Not later than this date, the Commission must transmit to the President a report containing its findings and conclusions based on a review and analysis of the SECDEF s recommendations.

September 23, 2005: Not later than this date, the President shall transmit to the Commission and to the Congress, a report containing the President s approval or disapproval of the Commission s recommendations. If the President approves the recommendations, the recommendations are binding 45 legislative days after Presidential transmission or adjournment, unless Congress enacts joint resolution of disapproval.

DCN: 12183

October 20, 2005: If the President disapproves the Commission's initial recommendations, the Commission must submit revised recommendations to the President not later than this date.

Nov 7, 2005: President s Approval or Disapproval of Revised Recommendations. The President must approve the revised recommendations and transmit approval to Congress by this date or the process ends. The recommendations become binding 45 legislative days after Presidential transmission or adjournment, unless Congress enacts a joint resolution of disapproval.

April 15, 2006: Commission terminates.

6.3. Past BRAC Rounds.

Q52. What were the closure results of the last four rounds of BRAC (88, 91, 93 AND 95) from the total available to the number selected for BRAC action?
A52. The four prior rounds of BRAC resulted in recommendations to close 97 out of 495 major domestic installations. BRAC 88 - closed 16 major installations; BRAC 91 - closed 26 major installations; BRAC 93 - closed 28 major installations; and BRAC 95 - closed 27 major installations.

Q53. How much has been saved through previous BRAC rounds?
A53. The four previous BRAC rounds have eliminated approximately 20 percent of DoD's capacity that existed in 1988 and, through 2001, produced net savings of approximately $17.7 billion, which includes the cost of environmental cleanup. Recurring savings beyond 2001 are approximately $7 billion annually. In independent studies conducted over previous years, both the Government Accountability Office and the Congressional Budget Office have consistently supported the department's view that realigning and closing unneeded military installations produces savings that far exceed costs.

Q54. How have local communities affected by base closures fared overall?
A54. Base Realignments and Closures cause near-term social and economic disruption. However, there are many success stories from previous closures. A base closure can actually be an economic opportunity, especially when all elements of a community work together. While each closure or realignment has different consequences and/or results, some recent examples include:

(1) Charleston Naval Base, S.C. -- The local community, assisted by DoD, was able to create approximately 4,500 new jobs. Approximately 90 private, state and federal entities are currently reusing the former naval base.

(2) Pease Air Force Base, New Hampshire More than 185 operating tenants currently established at the Pease International Tradeport (PIT). The PIT has been designated a Foreign Free Trade Zone by the U.S. Department of Commerce, and has developed an air cargo access capability via an 11,300 foot runway. There is in excess of 3,800,000 square feet of new, or newly renovated space, that has supported the creation of over 5,000 jobs, in bio technology (Lonza Biotechnics), education (Southern New Hampshire University), in addition to a wide variety (Pan Am, Marriott, Redhook Brewery) of retail and professional service availability day-to-day.

(3) Fort Devens, Mass. -- More than 3,000 new jobs have been generated and 2.7 million square feet of new construction has occurred. With 68 different employers on site, redevelopment ranges from small business incubators to the Gillette Corp., which occupies a large warehouse/distribution center and manufacturing plant.

Q55. Is the historical information available to the general public?
A55. The Office of the Secretary of Defense maintains the documentation used by the previous BRAC Commissions. While much of the information is maintained on DoD websites, the actual records are located at 1745 Jefferson Davis Highway, Crystal Square 4, Suite 105, Arlington, VA. The information is open to the public; however, due to security requirements for building access, we ask that individuals call the office, (703) 607-3207, before arriving to ensure a government representative is present. There is a copier available.

Q56. How could BRAC proceed without an Integrated Global Presence and Basing Strategy (IGPBS) decision? How was BRAC coordinated with the Overseas Basing Study? Weren t IGPBS

and BRAC 2005 being considered in a stove piped manner?
A56. BRAC, of course, only applies to our military facilities in the United States. As we transform the Department, we didn t think it made much sense to look just at our domestic facilities so we coupled the BRAC process with our Global Force Posture Review, which in essence is a BRAC process for our internationally based forces. The result is the relocation of troops to the United States from abroad and several other related changes made domestically to ensure unit cohesion, as well as realignment for the twenty-first century. (Dollar amounts will be available when the Secretary s recommendations are announced.)

Q57. What is the Cost of Base Realignment Actions (COBRA)?
A57. COBRA is an economic analysis model that estimates the costs and savings associated with a proposed base closure or realignment. COBRA is not designed to produce budget estimates, but rather to provide a consistent and auditable method of evaluating and comparing different courses of action over a period of 20 years. COBRA s key outputs are Net Present Value, the Payback Year, and the Payback Period for a course of action. Each Service and the JCSG s used COBRA to evaluate the courses of action.

Q58. How does COBRA 05 differ from COBRA 95?
A58. COBRA 05 validated and updated several cost algorithms (e.g., sustainment costs). It added more installation specific data rather than national averages, added functions to calculate costs associated with privatization initiatives and standardized data among the Services, OSD and the JCSGs. These enhancements are responsive to the GAO findings from BRAC 95.

Q59. How are base cleanup costs factored into the cost and savings estimates for this BRAC round?
A59. DoD policy guidance has historically stipulated that environmental restoration costs were not to be factored into analyses of costs and savings when examining potential installations for realignment and closure, since DoD was obligated to restore contaminated sites on military installations regardless of whether or not they were closed.

Q60. How is BRAC 2005 different from past rounds?
A60. BRAC 05 is dramatically different from previous rounds. Because we are on our 5th round of BRAC, the nature of the excess capacity has changed. Most of the excess capacity today is more fragmented, and often in the form of underused facilities. This suggests that savings can be achieved by sharing facilities to a greater extent. Excess capacity is defined as underused or unused facilities an/or infrastructure. Today, greater emphasis is being placed on reshaping the Department as opposed to simple cost cutting. There also is greater emphasis on jointness--selecting the appropriate organizations from two or more services to share facilities in the right location can significantly improve combat effectiveness while reducing costs. It also generates a more powerful military through appropriate basing. Jointness at every level will play a much greater role in this round of BRAC.

Q61. Have you considered the impact on retirees and veterans if you close base facilities such as commissaries and BX s?
A61. Yes, of course. Morale and welfare are key ingredients in readiness. We would prefer not to inconvenience anyone. BRAC is hard. The process is hard, but necessary. There is no escaping the fact that we have more infrastructure than we need to support the nation s defense force in the 21st century. We must be organized and arranged as efficiently as we can be to get the highest and best use out of our defense force.

7. Miscellaneous Information.

7.1. Command Relationships.

7.1.1. OASD(PA) has developed this BRAC 2005 PAG in coordination with Service PAOs and DUSD (I&E). Local commanders and their PAOs are encouraged to respond to questions within the scope of this PAG. Questions that cannot be answered within the scope of this guidance will be taken without comment and forwarded with proposed answers to OASD(PA).

7.1.2. To protect the integrity of the BRAC 2005 process and to ensure that consistent and accurate information is provided, OSD, the military departments, and participating defense agencies will respond to community and Congressional inquiries with information that has been approved for public release. Unauthorized discussion, dissemination of information or speculation regarding BRAC matters by DoD personnel and contractors is prohibited.

7.1.3. The Office of Economic Adjustment is Department of Defense's primary source for assisting communities that are adversely impacted by Defense program changes, including base closures or realignments, base expansions, and contract or program cancellations. To assist affected communities, OEA manages and directs the Defense Economic Adjustment Program, and coordinates the involvement of other Federal Agencies. The OEA has its own public affairs clearance channels and Command and Base PAOs are not tasked with clearance responsibilities for OEA issuances and statements. The OEA is encouraged to coordinate all public utterances with the Base PAO.

7.2. Media Information Centers. Not applicable.

7.3. DoD National Media Pool. Not applicable.

7.4. Internal Media and Audiovisual Coverage. It is imperative that commanders and PAOs at all levels maximize internal communications opportunities to keep personnel informed about the BRAC 2005 process. OASD/PA will support this effort through utilization of The Pentagon Channel (on line at www.thepentagonchannel.mil ) the Department of Defense web link (www.defenselink.mil/BRAC) and the American Forces Press Service.

7.5. Online Information Sources. Public information about the current BRAC process and past experience with prior BRAC rounds is available through several key DoD web sites

7.5.1. The primary BRAC 2005 website is located at www.defenselink.mil/brac . Contents include the text of the current Defense Base Closure Act, the reports of the Secretaries of Defense and the Defense Base Closure And Realignment Commissions in prior BRAC rounds, Government Accountability Office reports on the status of bases realigned and closed in prior rounds, and information on assistance available to communities with bases that have been realigned or closed. DoD personnel are encouraged to refer the media, community representatives, and other interested parties to this public web site for further information about what has happened in prior rounds and the process for BRAC 2005. Additional public information related to BRAC 2005 will become available and posted to the website as the process proceeds.

7.5.2. An important website is maintained by DoD s Office of Economic Adjustment, or DoD OEA. That site is located at http://www.oea.gov/oeaweb.nsf/Home?OpenForm. This site is particularly useful for local communities. The site also will be available through www.defenselink.mil/brac .

8. Points of Contact. Please note that this information is not intended for media referrals. Individuals needing to refer a member of the media to the following organizations shall contact the POC first, and determine the recommended public/media contact information. OASD/PA POC is Mr. Glenn Flood, cmcl 703-695-6294, DSN 225-6294, email glenn.flood@osd.mil ; Army Public Affairs POC is LTC Barry Johnson, 703.693.6475, barry.johnson@hqda.army.mil, Navy Public Affairs POC is LT Christine Ventresca, 703.697.5342. email christine.ventresca@navy.mil ; Air Force Public Affairs POC is Ms. Shirley Curry, 703.693.9091, Shirley.curry@pentagon.af.mil ; Marine Corps Public Affairs POC is Major Nathaniel Fahy, 703.614.6092, FahyNG@hq.usmc.mil; National Guard POC, Mr. Dan Allen, 703-607-2632, Dan.allen@ngb.ang.af.mil .

==========

ORIGINAL TO RECIPIENTS:
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:OSD,OU:ADDRESS LISTS,CN:AL 8777(UC)
[AIG 8777]
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:AUTODIN PLAS,OU:CE-CS,OU:CHINFO
WASHINGTON DC
[CHINFO WASHINGTON DC]
No DN
[SAF WASHINGTON DC//PA//]
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:AF,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC,OU:SAF(UC),OU:PA(UC),OU:PAI(UC)
[SAF WASHINGTON DC//PAI//]
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:AF,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC,OU:SAF(UC),OU:PA(UC),OU:PAM(UC)
[SAF WASHINGTON DC//PAM//]
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:AF,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:PENTAGON
WASHINGTON DC,OU:SAF(UC),OU:PA(UC),OU:PAR(UC)
[SAF WASHINGTON DC//PAR//]

C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:ARMY,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:CONUS,
L:WASHINGTON DC,OU:DA HQDA SECRETARIAT(UC),OU:CHIEF OF PUBLIC
AFFAIRS(UC)
[DA WASHINGTON DC//SAPA//]
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:ARMY,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:CONUS,
L:WASHINGTON DC,OU:DA HQDA SECRETARIAT(UC),OU:CHIEF OF PUBLIC
AFFAIRS(UC),OU:CMD INFO DIV(UC)
[DA WASHINGTON DC//SAPA-CID//]
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:ARMY,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:CONUS,
L:WASHINGTON DC,OU:DA HQDA SECRETARIAT(UC),OU:CHIEF OF PUBLIC
AFFAIRS(UC),OU:PLANS DIV(UC)
[DA WASHINGTON DC//SAPA-PLAN//]
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:OSD,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:WASHINGTON
DC,OU:ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(UC)
[SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//PA//]
C:US,O:U.S. GOVERNMENT,OU:DOD,OU:OSD,OU:ORGANIZATIONS,L:WASHINGTON
DC,OU:ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(UC),OU:DOD PRESS OFFICE(UC)
[SECDEF WASHINGTON DC//PA-PO//]
PROFILED DISSEMINEES:
DMSFORMAY@PTSC.PENTAGON.MIL (CC)
DMS.PA.V3@OSD.MIL (TO)
DA ID: 1760170
MTSID: c=US;a=DMS;p=GOV+DMS+NIPR;l=AVTAYZ05-050502212057Z-15213
SIGNED BY: /C=US/O=U.S. Government/OU=DoD/OU=OSD/OU=ORGANIZATIONS/
L=WASHINGTON DC/OU=ASD(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)(uc) ***
VALIDATED ***
ENCRYPTED BY: /C=US/O=U.S. Government/OU=DoD/OU=OSD/OU=ADDRESS
LISTS/CN=AL 8777(uc) *** VALIDATED ***
MESSAGE TYPE: OTHERORG
OTHER TO RECIPIENTS:
AIG 8777 @ AL 8777(uc)
CNO WASHINGTON DC
DIA WASHINGTON DC

UNCLAS