DCN: 12428

General Lloyd W. Newton, USAF (Ret)
Commissioner

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

MEDIA BRIEFING BOOK

NAVSUBBASE NEW LONDON, CT
PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD, NH
NAS BRUNSWICK, ME

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MEDIA BRIEFING BOOK

NAVSUBBASE NEW LONDON, CT
PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD, NH
NAS BRUNSWICK, ME

NAVSUBBASE NEW LONDON, CT

A. Media Advisory
B. Suggested Talking Points for Installation Visits
C. Suggested Qs & As for Installation Visits
D. Sampling of Local Media Coverage Relating to BRAC

PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD, NH

E. Media Advisory
F. Suggested Talking Points for Installation Visits
G. Suggested Qs & As for Installation Visits
H. Sampling of Local Media Coverage Relating to BRAC

NAS BRUNSWICK, ME

I. Suggested Talking Points for Installation Visits
J. Suggested Qs & As for Installation Visits
K. Sampling of Local Media Coverage Relating to BRAC

L. Survey of Inquiry/Comment Numbers by Issue

NEW LONDON MEDIA SCHEDULE

Tuesday, May 31, 2005

16:15 (Tentative) NewsHour with Jim Lehrer

Location: Mystic Marriott Hotel and Spa

Attendees: TBD - Chairman Principi
TBD - Commissioner Coyle

Reporter: Kwame Holman

17:00 – 18:00 Editorial Board Meeting

Location: Octagon Restaurant
Mystic Marriott Hotel and Spa

Attendees: ***BRAC Commission***
Chairman Principi
Commissioner Bilbray
Commissioner Coyle
Commissioner Newton
Charlie Battaglia
Jim Schaefer

Participants
Ellen Lind, President and Publisher, Norwich Bulletin
Stu Shinski, Executive Editor, Norwich Bulletin
Ed Dunn, Editorial Page Editor, Norwich Bulletin
John Markowitz, Community Member Editor, Norwich Bulletin
Chairman, SubBase Realignment Coalition
Morgan McGinley, Editorial Page Editor, New London Day
Bob Hamilton, Reporter, New London Day

NEW LONDON MEDIA SCHEDULE

Wednesday, June 1, 2005

07:45 Depart Hotel Enroute to Submarine Force Library and Museum

08:00 Pre Brief

Attendees:

BRAC Commission
Chairman Principi
Commissioner Bilbray
Commissioner Coyle
Commissioner Newton
Charlie Battaglia
Jim Schaefer

Participants
SEN ChristopherDodd
SEN Joe Lieberman
GOV M. Jodi Rell
CONG Rob Simmons
John Markowitz, Chairman, SubBase Realignment Coalition
Dr. Robert Ballard

08:30 Meeting

09:30 Depart Submarine Force Library and Museum enroute to Groton-New London, CT Airport

09:45 New London Press Availability

Attendees:

BRAC Commission
Chairman Principi
Commissioner Bilbray
Commissioner Coyle
Commissioner Newton

OPEN PRESS

10:00 Depart Press Availability enroute to LANMAR Aviation for departure to Portsmouth, NH

NEW LONDON PRESS AVAILABILITY
JUNE 1, 2005
PROJECTED MEDIA

TV

Channel 3 – local CBS
Channel 8 – local ABC
Channel 12 – Local station that runs in the NY, CT area
Channel 30 – local NBC
Channel 61 – local FOX
CTN – Connecticut TV News
New England Cable News
NBC National
ABC National

WRITERS

AP
Hartford Current
New London Day
Norwich Bulletin
New Haven Register
Rhode Island Newspapers

RADIO

CT Radio Network (AP for radio)
Metro Network
WELI
WSUB
NPR

MEDIA AVAILABILITY

MEDIA ADVISORY

BRAC Commission Chairman, Anthony Principi, Commissioners, General Lloyd Newton (USAF Ret.), Honorable Philip Coyle and Former Congressman James Bilbray (NV), will visit Submarine Base New London in Connecticut on Tuesday, May 31, 2005. We will be visiting the base throughout the afternoon and hold media availability the following day, Wednesday 1 June.

Also attending the visit will be representatives from Connecticut. The visits are closed to both the public and media.

Media Availability

Date & Time:
Wednesday, 1 JUNE at 10:00AM (Please arrive by 9:00AM).

LOCATION:
Groton Airport (There will be representatives to help direct you to the exact location).

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Suggested Talking Points for New England Installation Visits
Submarine Base New London, Connecticut

1. **The 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission is an independent, non-partisan, and non-political entity, established by Congress for the purpose of evaluating DoD's suggestions of bases for closure or realignment.**
    - The process followed by the BRAC Commission has been distinctly outlined by law. The Commission is following what is prescribed by statute in its determination of which factors to take into account.
    - The purpose of the Commission is to ensure that DoD reviewed all the legally-necessary components in the formulation of its suggestions to close or realign a military installation.
    - The Commission is completely non-political and non-partisan in nature, as the Commissioners were appointed by the President and key Congressional leaders from both parties. The staff was hired based upon the individual's competency and availability.
    - *The Commission recognizes that New England has been particularly affected by the current round of closures and realignments. As such, the Commission will review all recommendations to ensure that these decisions were made in accordance with established criteria.*

2. **The Commission was established by Congress to provide accountability to the public for the decisions to close or realign a military installation, and welcomes community input as an important factor in its decision-making process.**
    - The Commission is completely transparent, and all documents, with the exception of those sensitive to national security, are and will be made available for public access through both the website and the BRAC library.
    - While military value is the most important consideration, the Commission is also aware of the human impact that the decision to close or realign a base would have on a community and will take the economic, environmental, and other effects into account in its analysis of the recommendations put forth by DoD.
    - Community input is encouraged through the regional hearings and documentation provided by the public of facts that may have been overlooked by DoD in its legally-outlined, decision-making process are both helpful and crucial to the Commissioners decision-making process.
    - *The Commission recognizes the unique relationship that has developed between the residents of the base and the neighboring communities since the base's construction in 1872. The Commission certainly recognizes the value of the base both economically in the region and the distinguished role that the base has played in our nation's defense infrastructure. These factors will be considered in the final decision-making process.*

3. **While other factors are taken into consideration by the Commission, military value is the most important.**
    - As DoD creates the strategy to best prepare our forces to face changing global threats, the Commission was created to ensure that DoD followed the process outlined by law in determining the military value of an installation.
    - While community impact is taken into account, the purpose of this round of BRAC is to strengthen and enable our troops to perform their duties of keeping the United States secure and military value will, by far, outweigh any other consideration.
    - *The Commission recognizes New London's strategic value in its proximity to deep water and the polar ice cap route. These circumstances give the base a unique "surge capacity" and will be considered by the Commission in its final recommendation.*
    - *While military value is the primary criteria for the Commission's final recommendation, other factors unique to the base will be considered. The Commission recognizes the economic synergy that has existed between the base and General Dynamics Electric Boat Shipyard. This will be taken into account in the Commission's final recommendation.*

2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission
Suggested Q's & A's
Submarine Base New London, Connecticut

Installation Specific Questions-Generic

Q. When will the Pentagon release the documents/data used to justify the recommendation of closure? Why have they not done so immediately?
A. The Commission will not comment on tasking specific to the Pentagon. Be confident that as the Commission received documents from DoD, those documents will be made available to the public on its website: www.brac.gov.

Installation Specific Questions-Historic

Q. In 1993 the Commission was successful in removing the base from the closure list, why shouldn't it do so again?
A. The statute, *not precedence,* establishes the criteria. As outlined by the statute, the Commission will place priority on military value; while also taking into consideration economic, environmental, and other effects that the closure or realignment of a base would have on the community surrounding that base. Information that is gathered in the analysis of a base, with the exception of information that is sensitive to national security, will be made accessible to the public.

Q. This facility was built in 1872 and served as the Navy's first submarine base. Is the Commission taking into consideration the historic value of the Groton facility?
A. The Commission understands the unique relationship fostered between military installations and the neighboring communities. This factor, as well as many others, will be taken into account in our final decisions.

Installation Specific Questions-Strategic

Q. Is the Navy (DoD) moving beyond nuclear submarines? What is the future of the Navy's submarine fleet?
A. This is a question of the overall strategic direction of the U.S. military and would best be directed to the Department of Defense (DoD). The BRAC Commission will evaluate, in a completely transparent manner, whether DoD has followed the process prescribed by law in their evaluation and decisions as to whether or not to close or realign a military installation.

Q. Do submarines have any strategic/tactical value in the new Global War on Terrorism?
A. This is a question of the overall strategic direction of the U.S. military and would best be directed to the Department of Defense. The Commission will consider military value as the most important factor in the decision to close or realign a base and will evaluate

whether DoD has followed the leally prescribed process, in the formulation of its suggestions.

Q. This base has the ability to handle nuclear-powered submarines, while the others do not. What is the logic behind the transfer of the submarines?
A. In making the recommendations, the first and most important factor is military value. After that, the economic effect on the surrounding community, the extent and cost of potential future savings, the ability of the community's infrastructure to support the base, and the environmental impact of the closure of the base will be considered.

DoD is working to make our military more efficient and effective, paying close attention to jointness and ease of troop mobility. The task of the Commission is to ensure that these complex factors have been properly taken into account by DoD, in the process determined by law, in evaluation of the military value of a base and their suggestions to close or realign that base.

Q. This base is strategically important due to its access to deep water and proximity to the critical polar ice cap route to the Pacific Ocean. Why the transfer to bases with a less strategic advantage?
A. DoD has evaluated our bases to ensure our military is best prepared to face the changing global threats. Military value is of pre-eminent importance and the Commission will ensure that DoD has followed the process prescribed by law.

Installation Specific Questions-Political

Q. Is it your belief that the Pentagon produced these recommendations without political influence?
A. The Commission is a non-political, non-partisan entity, established by Congress. The Commission will provide an independent evaluation of the suggestions put forth by DoD, and will consider military value to be the most important factor. In addition, the Commission will take into account the economic, environmental, and other effects that the closure or realignment of a military installation would have on the surrounding community. The statute established the criteria of factors that the Commission would take into account.

Installation Specific Questions-Economic

Q. Does the Commission take into account the economic impact of base closure on the local community?
A. In concert with many other factors, the Commission will take into account the economic impact of the Pentagon's recommendations on the local community.

Q. Does the Commission understand the synergy between the base and General Dynamic's Electric Boat? And the economic impact on the community of closing the base?

A. The Commission understands the unique relationship that exists between the base and the local community and local businesses. Be confident that the Commission will take into account the economic impact of the Pentagon's recommendations on the local community.

Q. Estimates state that 31,500 jobs are linked to the sub base. The economic repercussions of closing the base are enormous. Does the Commission understand this?
A. While economic effects are tken into account by the Commission, the most important factor in their evaluation is the military value of a base and whether DoD followed the process prescribed by law in determining this.

Q. Kings Bay, one of the bases slated to receive the subs, will require $238 million in physical improvements prior to receiving the subs. Why does the Pentagon feel the need to spend such a huge sum to build facilities that already exist here?
A. The first and most important factor is military value. After that, the economic effect on the surrounding community, the extent and cost of potential future savings, the ability of the community's infrastructure to support the base, and the environmental impact of the closure of the base will be considered. The Commission is evaluating whether DoD has followed the process prescribed by law in determining the military value of an installation. Part of what constitutes military value is how the base plays into the Pentagon's consideration of the changing global threats, jointness of the different military branches, and ease of mobility.

Q. Will Kings Bay be able to handle a 21 percent increase in workforce as 3,200 jobs are transferred to that area?
A. The first and most important factor is military value. After that, the economic effect on the surrounding community, the extent and cost of potential future savings, the ability of the community's infrastructure to support the base, and the environmental impact of the closure of the base will be considered.

The Commissioners will be sensitive to the needs in the community and will weigh those needs against the military value of the base.

Q. If the base relocates, there will be a tremendous loss of skill and continuity because some employees will not relocate. How does the Pentagon intend to handle this?
A. The Commission will make a careful evaluation of the factors that play into the military value of a base and will specifically analyze whether DoD has followed the process prescribed by law in making its recommendation to close or realign a base.

Installation Specific Questions-Environmental

Q. The military's estimate of roughly $23 million for environmental restoration at the sub base is unrealistic. How did the Pentagon arrive at this number for a base that contains 29 contaminated sites?

A. The DoD has the responsibility to maintain appropriate environmental conditions of a base, whether or not it is a candidate for closing. The law requires that the costs of the environmental restoration of a base that is closed, be factored into the decision of whether or not to actually close the base. The Commission will evaluate whether or not DoD came to its conclusions correctly and in a manner prescribed by law. While military value is by far the most important factor, the environmental impact that the closure or realignment of a base would have on the surrounding community will also be taken into account.

SUBMARINE BASE NEW LONDON
CONNECTICUT

National News Articles
Base Closing Commissioners To Visit New London Next Week
Two Off-Base Closures
Rell's "Strike Force" Looking At BRAC Details
House Race Hotline Extra
Navy BRAC List Would Concentrate Undersea Warfare, Submarine Basing
Connecticut Businesses Join Battle To Save Submarine Base

Local News Articles
BRAC Visits Next Week
Stratford's Sikorsky Aircraft Plant Will Make 5 More Blackhawk Helicopters
Saving A Sub Base: '93 Offers Strategy Lessons;
Uncertainty In Groton
Veterans Journal - Navy Officials Defend The Closing Of Groton Submarine Base
Only A Few Major Defense Contractors Remain In The State, And Leaders Are Nervous
Silent Service Ebbs;
Uncertainty In Groton;
Submarines' Role Being Reduced To Fit In With New, Leaner Military
Base Emotions -- And Hard Realities The Battle Over Military-Base Reductions Will Be Bitter, But There's No Denying The Need For Consolidation
Submarine Base Rescue Effort Ramping Up
Rell Picks Sub Base Strike Team;
Assigns State Agencies To Challenge 1,000-Page Defense Department Plan
Planned Base Closing Questioned;
Shutdown Of Conn. Sub Facility Would Burden Ga. Site, Chairman Says

Opinions/ Editorials
Fighting Closure With Facts

National News Articles

Base Closing Commissioners To Visit New London Next Week
The Associated Press
May 23, 2005

Members of the commission reviewing proposed military base closings will visit the Naval Submarine Base in Groton, Conn., next week, and state officials are hoping to persuade them to also visit nearby Electric Boat.

Members of the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission are beginning their base visits

Tuesday and are spreading out across the country. They are slated to be in Connecticut on June 1. One or more members of the panel will visit each base proposed for closing, including the Groton facility.

Members of Connecticut's congressional delegation have been asking for all the data used by the Pentagon to justify closing the base, but as of Monday they still had not received it.

"It's an abomination," said Todd Mitchell, spokesman for Rep. Rob Simmons, R-Conn. "We need the data, and we need the transcripts from the meetings they had internally. They can't put a base on the base closing list and not allow us to sift through the data and build our case."

Mitchell said state officials want the commissioners to visit submarine builder Electric Boat so they can understand the synergy between the sub base and the manufacturer.

The Pentagon delivered its biggest blow to Connecticut, proposing to close four military bases in the state, shedding about 8,600 jobs.

Two Off-Base Closures

The New York Post
May 22, 2005

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has proposed permanently shut ting 33 facilities, including historic Fort Monmouth in New Jersey and the U.S. Navy Submarine Base **New London** in Groton, Conn.

While closing obsolete facilities is a painful necessity - particularly for local communities that have come to rely on them for economic stability - closing these two particular installations would be a serious mistake.

Indeed, the independent Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission (BRACC) overruled the Pentagon in the early '90s, when closing Fort Monmouth and Groton was first proposed. Shutting them down now - and moving the jobs they provide down South - would be an even bigger mistake.

True, the Navy is scaling back its submarine fleet to a target of 41 ships from what was once 100. But Groton, the nation's oldest sub base and once the largest, has what others lack: the ability to handle nuclear-powered craft.

It has the best ready access to deep water and the critical polar ice cap route to the Pacific Ocean, giving it unrivaled "surge capacity" - the ability to quickly move personnel, vehicles and weapons around the globe.

And it is just a few miles from the headquarters of Electric Boat, the dean of global submarine builders.

The Navy wants to keep just two sub bases on each coast; Groton's jobs and facilities would go primarily to the base in Kings Bay, Ga., and Naval Station Norfolk in Virginia. Much of the closings would move facilities and personnel away from the Northeast to southern and western bases.

That's a mistake on two counts: For one thing, it would lead to unwise "clustering" of assets that

would place the entire fleet at risk if two ports in the same general region are incapacitated due to, say, a military attack like Pearl Harbor, or some other reason.

For another, it would lessen daily contact between the armed forces and those who live in the Northeast - not a terribly swift idea as the country fights a War on Terror that has already seen a part of the Northeast (i.e., New York City) as a battleground.

Closing down Fort Monmouth and moving its facilities southward - in this case, to the Aberdeen Proving Grounds in Maryland - also would contribute to these trends.

Plus, there is no denying that shuttering these facilities will have enormous economic repercussions. This is particularly true of Groton, where closure will cost the local economy 8,600 jobs. Indeed, Connecticut state economists estimate that fully 31,500 jobs are linked to the sub base.

On the flip side, the expected transfer of 3,200 of those jobs to Kings Bay would increase the workforce of the nearby town of St. Mary's by 21 percent - and officials have raised serious questions about its ability to handle such a major infusion.

It would also cost $238 million to make needed physical improvements at Kings Bay - raising the question of why the Pentagon feels the need to spend such a huge sum to build facilities that already exist elsewhere.

Doubts also have been raised about the accuracy of the Pentagon's estimates of the cost of shutting down Groton and the amount to be saved by moving its facilities south. The Navy figures environmental cleanup at Groton would cost just $29 million, an absurdly low sum for a facility that includes 16 federally mandated Superfund sites.

BRACC officials are now touring the targeted bases to determine whether they will endorse the Pentagon plan. It takes a majority of the nine commissioners to remove a site from the list - which is what happened with both Groton and Monmouth in 1993.

Then President Bush must accept or reject the entire plan, not the individual sites.

BRACC acted prudently more than a decade ago when it determined that Groton and Fort Monmouth were critical to the nation's security.

Despite deep changes in the armed forces and warfare, that conclusion remains true today.

Rell's "Strike Force" Looking At BRAC Details

The Associated Press
Susan Haigh
May 19, 2005

Gov. M. Jodi Rell's top commissioners on Wednesday began poring over a federal report that recommends closing the Groton submarine base, hoping to find fault with the Pentagon's decision-making process.

The state's environmental commissioner, Gina McCarthy, is already questioning the government's $23 million estimated price tag for cleaning up the base. McCarthy said that amount would not cover the remediation costs for an estimated 29 contaminated sites on the sprawling 300-acre

property.

"It will be staggering to see how you can come up with a $23 million figure," McCarthy said.

Rell has appointed the commissioners of nine state agencies to a new "strike force." The group held its first meeting Wednesday. Each agency will be charged with attacking a specific issue involved in the decision to close the base.

Four Connecticut military bases are on the Pentagon's list of proposed closures. Besides the U.S. Naval Submarine Base in Groton, federal authorities are recommending closing the Sgt. Libby U.S. Army Reserve Center in New Haven, Turner U.S. Army Reserve Center in Fairfield and the U.S. Army Reserve Center Maintenance Support Facility in Middletown. The Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station would be realigned.

The proposed actions would affect nearly 8,600 Connecticut jobs, nearly all of them from the Groton base.

Brigadier General Thaddeus Martin, interim adjutant general of the Connecticut National Guard, said there is a good argument to be made in keeping the Bradley Guard station intact. He said it is the single largest facility on the East Coast that supports A-10 aircraft.

"We're very optimistic that when we get our hands on the specific data, we can identify the shortfall that was missed by the BRAC (Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission) committee and correct that error and roll back in with a force of 18 A-10s aircraft assigned to Bradley," Martin said.

Rell said her staff has still not received the data behind the Department of Defense's closure proposals. She said she expects her staff to look through that information with "a fine tooth comb."

In the meantime, she wants her strike force to look at the information used to promote other Navy bases in Virginia and Georgia and see if any data are incorrect.

Rell has also instructed the state Department of Labor to look at the impact of job losses from the base closures, including estimated unemployment compensation costs and the ability of displaced workers to find new jobs.

The Department of Transportation is examining whether the state needs to invest millions of dollars to make capital improvements to the **New London** port area, while the Connecticut Development Authority is looking into whether there is available funding to improve the base.

"We know closing the sub base is a mistake and there are some hopeful signs that people in high places in Washington feel the same way - but the BRAC Commission is going to make its decision on cold, hard facts," Rell said. "The job of this strike force is to come up with those facts."

The BRAC will hold public hearings before presenting its recommendations to President Bush by Sept. 8.

House Race Hotline Extra
National Journal's CongressDaily

May 19, 2005

The Pentagon last Friday announced its first round of military bases to be closed or realigned since 1995, setting off simultaneous panic attacks and sighs of relief among members of Congress.

Most of the Pentagon recommendations are likely to be approved, despite last-ditch attempts by members of Congress.

Below is a list of the some of the districts that were winners and losers in the Pentagon's recommendations. All of the numbers in this article are culled from Defense Department and BRAC reports, and reflect total jobs directly and indirectly related to base **realignment.** Many states have their own predictions on job losses and gains but they are not included here.

Losers:

Alaska, at-large: Eielson Air Force Base will likely lose 4,710 jobs, which is approximately 8.6 percent of the employment in Fairbanks. House Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman Young, though, has a reputation for bringing home the bacon, and given his long tenure, he is a safe incumbent.

Connecticut 02: Republican Rep. Rob Simmons fared probably the worst in the House, not just because of the whopping 15,813 jobs the Norwich-**New London** area might lose, but also because he is one of the most vulnerable House members. Simmons is already a target for the Democrats, and the possible closure of **New London's** submarine base likely will be in their arsenal of attacks.

Georgia: Georgia, as a whole, fared pretty well in the Pentagon's list, though the proposed closure of the Athens Naval Supply Corps School would take away about 800 jobs. Interestingly, this base is in freshman Democratic Rep. John Barrow's current district, not the new district he is likely to run in. Republican redistricting this year placed Athens in Republican Rep. Charlie Norwood's district. It probably will not harm Norwood, but it is one less obstacle for Barrow's re-election bid, which is expected to be competitive.

Indiana 08: The Naval Support Center in Republican Rep. John Hostettler's district is scheduled to lose about 683 jobs, about 11.6 percent of the Martin County work force. The county is moderate territory that Republican Gov. Mitch Daniels won by less than 500 votes in 2004. If there is another hard-fought battle in the "Bloody Eighth," it will be worth noting if Hostettler's numbers are affected in this area.

Maine 01: Democratic Rep. Tom Allen is facing closure and **realignment** of two naval bases in his district, which could result in the loss of more than 13,000 jobs. Those kind of numbers might make for a campaign issue, as well as for neighboring Republican Rep. Jeb Bradley, whose New Hampshire district borders the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, Maine.

New Mexico 03: Cannon Air Force Base is scheduled to lose 20.5 percent of the workforce in the Clovis area, or about 4,780 jobs. In terms of the proportion of an area workforce losing employment, Democratic Rep. Tom Udall actually tops the list. However, Udall is a safe incumbent.

New Jersey 12: Fort Monmouth is losing nearly 10,000 jobs in a closure. The facility is in

Democratic Rep. Rush Holt's district, but some of the affected areas also are in Democratic Rep. Frank Pallone's 6th District.

North Dakota, at-large: The **realignment** at the Grand Forks Air Force Base is expected to cause a 7.4 percent loss in the workforce. Democratic Rep. Earl Pomeroy, who is a frequent Republican target but always manages to win, will doubtless be challenged again in this conservative state. The actual job losses will likely have a ripple effect into the neighboring Minnesota district of Democratic Rep. Collin Peterson.

South Dakota, at-Large: The closure of Ellsworth Air Force Base is expected to result in the loss of nearly 4,000 jobs. This could be used as an attack against Democratic Rep. Stephanie Herseth, though protecting the base was much more an issue in last year's Senate race between now-Republican Sen. John Thune and former Minority Leader Thomas Daschle. Thune has until 2010 to mend his fences, though. Because Herseth has been so careful about her votes since being elected, it could be one of the few pieces of fodder to use against her.

And some of the winners:

Georgia: Fort Benning in Columbus is slated to gain more than 13,000 jobs from **realignment.** The base and metropolitan area under the new Georgia lines will be split between Republican Rep. Lynn Westmoreland and Democratic Rep. Sanford Bishop. Republican Rep. Jack Kingston's district is scheduled to gain 5,000 jobs at the submarine base at St. Mary's.

Virginia 04: Republican Rep. Randy Forbes won big when Fort Lee was chosen to receive 11,000 new jobs, which nearly doubles the number of the base personnel.

Texas 16: Rep. Silvestre Reyes' district is slated to gain 11,000 jobs at Fort Bliss, along with another 9,000 indirectly. The base extends into GOP Rep. Steve Pearce's New Mexico district.

There is no evidence to suggest that any member's re-election chances have been seriously diminished by a BRAC round, but it seems certain to be a campaign issue in Simmons' re-election campaign, and perhaps a few others, and will be the talk of Capitol Hill for months to come. By Molly Chapman Norton

Navy BRAC List Would Concentrate Undersea Warfare, Submarine Basing
Aerospace Daily & Defense Report
May 18, 2005

NAVY BRAC: The U.S. Navy's recommendations for the 2005 Base **Realignment** and Closure process would create a center of excellence for undersea warfare near San Diego, as well as consolidate some submarine activity in Norfolk, Va., and Kings Bay, Ga. The moves come as the Navy is proposing to close Submarine Base **New London,** Conn., which the department said would save $1.58 billion over 20 years.

The Navy also is recommending basing its East Coast maritime patrol community at Naval Air Station Jacksonville, Fla. Meanwhile, Naval Shipyard Portsmouth, Kittery, Maine, was chosen for closing over Naval Shipyard Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, because it would eliminate excess capacity but still satisfy strategic Pacific capability, according to top Navy officials who testified May 17 at a hearing of the BRAC commission on Capitol Hill.

Connecticut Businesses Join Battle To Save Submarine Base

The Associated Press
Pat Eaton-Robb
May 18, 2005

Business and community leaders from across southeastern Connecticut pledged resources Tuesday to the state's effort to remove the Navy's submarine base from the Pentagon's closure list.

Several dozen of them met for an hour with Gov. M. Jodi Rell and offered to provide everything from environmental analysts to office space to data the state says it needs to reverse the recommendation of the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission.

The commission will present its final recommendations to President Bush by Sept. 8. The matter will also go before Congress.

Leaders from submarine builder Electric Boat, Pfizer and the region's tourism industry were among those at the meeting.

"This will build what I think will be the strongest public-private partnership in defense of Connecticut the state's ever seen," said Michael J. Thomas, chairman of the Mashantucket Pequot Tribe, which owns the nearby Foxwoods Resort Casino.

Thomas said the tribe will help the state come up with economic and environmental analyses of the effect of the proposed base closing, and help lobby in Washington, he said.

Rell said she asked the community leaders to help the state assess the impact on local tax bases, schools, child care and public safety. She also asked businesses to provide data on how many employees have family members in the military or with links to the base.

"We need to show the military impact on jobs in this area," she said.

Economists say closure of the Groton base would devastate the state economy and threaten 31,000 jobs statewide, more than 8,000 of them at the base itself.

The Groton facility was built in 1872 as the Navy's first submarine base and is home to the Naval Submarine School and 18 attack submarines. Its effect on the regional economy is estimated at $2.5 billion.

Dan Caulum, 50, said he worries about the effect on his 16-year-old daughter, who is already talking about losing all her friends from military families, and the impact on her school.

"They are putting in millions of dollars to redo the high school and put in two new elementary schools," said Caulum, who works for a janitorial contractor. "What are they going to do with those if the base closes? You start yanking everybody out of here and this is going to be a ghost town."

Rell said she will be appointing commissioners of various state agencies to a new "strike force" Wednesday. Each agency will be charged with attacking a specific issue involved in the decision to close the base.

The state Division of Homeland Security, for example, will be asked to pick apart the commission's reasoning for consolidating submarine operations in Virginia or Georgia. The

Department of Environmental Protection will be asked to show how much it would cost the federal government to clean up the site.

The governor has proposed allocating $1.5 million to try to convince federal officials to keep the base open. On Tuesday, state Senate President Pro Tem Donald E. Williams Jr., D-Brooklyn, proposed setting aside another $10 million in bonding for infrastructure improvements.

"We must take bold action in the same way other states have committed resources to save their bases and the positive economic impact they create," Williams said. "Obviously there is no time to waste."

State officials said Tuesday that they have adopted a theme song for the effort to keep the base open. A **New London** rock band, "Superbald," penned the tune "Submarine Town" before the plans for the base were announced.

"Well I live, you live, We all live in a submarine town," the lyrics say.

"Don't be surprised when you hear it on the radio," said state Sen. Andrea Stillman, D-Waterford. "It's southeast Connecticut saying, 'Come and help us.'"

Local News Articles

BRAC Visits Next Week
The Union Leader (Manchester NH)
Jerry Miller
May 25, 2005

KITTERY, Maine -- The fate of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard could be sealed as early as next week, when several members of the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission (BRAC) visit the facility.

William McDonough, a former shipyard commanding officer and spokesman for the Seacoast Shipyard Association, said yesterday the chairman and three commission members are expected to arrive next Wednesday about 12:30 p.m.

"We're gearing up to be ready for them," he said.

The Seacoast Shipyard Association is a grassroots organization attempting to keep the yard open and operational.

"We have to educate members of the commission," McDonough added. "This is the only opportunity we will have to do that here."

McDonough characterized the visit as critical to the yard's future, adding, "It's the only shot we are going to have with the people who can vote to take us off the list."

The members are expected to arrive following a morning visit to the **New London,** Conn., submarine facility, which was also recommended for closure.

McDonough said BRAC members will be met by many of the 4,800 workers, who will line the

streets leading to Gate 1.

BRAC is a nine-member body appointed by the White House. Its function is to review Department of Defense (DOD) base closure recommendations and develop its own recommendations for consideration by the White House and Congress.

On May 13, DOD recommended the closure of the local shipyard, the only one of the nation's four remaining nuclear shipyards recommended for closure.

The DOD recommendation was reinforced last week, when Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and key Navy officials testified before the commission, telling the group Portsmouth was recommended for closure because of the dwindling number of submarines.

"Our task is to convince the commissioners that in some areas, the Secretary of Defense deviated from the (closure) criteria," McDonough said. "They must agree that he ignored the criteria if we are to be removed from the list."

In four previous rounds of base closings, only 15 percent of bases recommended for closure have been spared.

Asked if supporters have the necessary data, used by the Navy, to make their case, McDonough responded, "Not yet . . . we have data to make the case, but we need to see how the Navy used the data submitted to them" by the shipyard ". . . or how the Secretary may have deviated from the data."

McDonough said plans are under way for members of the New Hampshire and Maine Congressional delegations and the governors of the two states to greet BRAC members at Gate 1.

The public and news media will not be allowed to attend the BRAC briefing by shipyard command staff. But a news conference is expected to be held before or after the session.

Stratford's Sikorsky Aircraft Plant Will Make 5 More Blackhawk Helicopters

New Haven
Phil Helsel
May 24, 2005

STRATFORD -- Following two years of crushing defense contract losses, Sikorsky Aircraft workers received good news Monday: U.S. Sen. Joseph Lieberman and Rep. Rosa DeLauro visited the plant to announce that five more Blackhawk helicopters will be made at the factory this year and a contract for up to 84 more could be approved by Congress this week.

Making the announcement were U.S. Sen. Joseph Lieberman and Rep. Rosa DeLauro, both Democrats from New Haven.

"The last time I was here was one of the darkest days of Sikorsky," Lieberman, D-Conn., told reporters Monday from the factory floor, with a partially built Blackhawk helicopter and a crowd of workers as a backdrop. "Today is one of the bright days."

Sikorsky workers say they've been living "under a black cloud" since January, when the company lost a prestigious contract to build the Marine Corps' fleet of presidential helicopters that it had enjoyed since 1957. Last year, the Pentagon eliminated Sikorsky's Commanche armed

reconnaissance helicopter program.

"It was like losing a family member," said Ken Holden, 43 of Milford, an inspector who has been with Sikorsky for 25 years. "It hurt. It hurt a lot."

DeLauro, using crutches because of a stress fracture to her right hip, and Lieberman, walked down aisles of testing equipment and half-built helicopters Monday, pausing to chat with employees. Many employees, especially with the recent spate of lost contracts, seemed accustomed to appearances by of lawmakers.

"This is good news today, but they don't run away when there's trouble," said Rocco J. Calo, secretary-treasurer of the Teamsters Local 1150, which represents about 3,800 of the company's 9,000 workers. "They were here when we lost the Commanche and they were here when we lost the Marine One (presidential helicopter)."

Lieberman and DeLauro were optimistic about the Blackhawks and the company's contract to design and build the Marine Corps' CH-53X heavy-lift military helicopter, which could be worth $ 272 million if Senate funding appropriations were approved. But many of the questions by reporters Monday were about recent Pentagon recommendation to close the U.S. Naval Submarine Base **New London** in Groton, a move that both lawmakers pledged to fight.

"We are going to continue the fight," DeLauro said. "We promise you, we will not let up one bit."

Lieberman called the proposed Groton sub base closure, which would send 8,500 jobs and 16 to 19 nuclear submarines to existing bases in Kings Bay, Ga. and Norfolk, Va., "wrongheaded" and "irrational." He added that he is confident that at least five of the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission's nine members will oppose closing the base. The commission, usually referred to as the BRAC, is an independent panel that will evaluate the list of base closures.

Despite Sikorsky's two most recent contract losses, workers who shook hands and met with the lawmakers Monday are standing behind the company.

"We've been number one for a long time and we want to stay that way," said Miguel Otervo, 48, a mechanical leadsman from Bridgeport, after a quick chat with DeLauro. "I've been here 27 years and I would stay here another 15 or 20 years."

Saving A Sub Base: '93 Offers Strategy Lessons; Uncertainty In Groton

Hartford Courant (Connecticut)
David Lightman And Jesse Leavenworth
May 23, 2005

Sam Gejdenson has a well-honed list of do's and don'ts from the 1993 fight to keep submarines in Groton: keep the statements short and pointed, provide good graphics, don't let politicians ramble.

But he also advises this year's submarine base advocates to remember another lesson. ``It takes a little bit of luck," the former 2nd District congressman recalled.

2005 is similar to 1993 in some ways: The Pentagon is again armed with precise, detailed data to back up its argument that the Naval Submarine Base in Groton should be mothballed, and will again allow Connecticut to present its case at a Boston hearing July 6.

But there are important differences. This year's proposal is more sweeping and would close the entire base, while in 1993 the Defense Department wanted to move the subs, but expand submarine training in Groton.

There are other major changes: The state lacks a key argument from last time, that Russia and other Cold War rivals are still threats. Closing the sub base is the biggest item on the 2005 agenda of the Commission on Base **Realignment** and Closure, and therefore a key part of the cost-saving strategy -- a hard argument to overcome. And most notably, Connecticut lacks the political clout it had a dozen years ago.

``My perception is that the politics are a lot more intense than in '93," said **New London** City Manager Richard Brown. ``The whole idea of red state/blue state and whether we're looking at rewarding or punishing certain areas, depending on their support in the election, seems to be a lot more pronounced."

The state again is cranking up an extensive effort that, at least on paper, should rival the Pentagon for depth of research and expertise. But what probably will matter most is the twist no one can predict.

In 1993, for instance, retired Navy Capt. Frank ``Mike" O'Beirne Jr., stole the show at the regional hearing. Supporters recruited him to help the cause after reading a letter he wrote to TheDay newspaper in **New London.**

``He was right out of central casting," Gejdenson recalled. Sure enough, his colorful presentation ``brought the sometimes laconic commission members to life," The Courant reported at the time.

The state got another break, thanks to a chance encounter Gejdenson had had some years earlier, on a Sierra Club trip to Green River. Because of the pouring rain, the party had to keep moving to higher ground -- not a pleasant experience.

One of Gejdenson's companions was Rep. Beverly Byron, D-Md. Though they had served together in Congress for more than a decade, they moved in very different political circles. Now, they had shared this experience for a few days.

When Byron faced the fight of her political life in 1992, Gejdenson went to western Maryland to campaign for her. She lost, and the next year was a member of the base-closing commission.

At a key hearing, the commission gave local officials 45 minutes to present their case. Don't take 50, Gejdenson advised everyone -- the commission has a lot of people to hear from, and you don't want to get a reputation as long-winded.

But when Connecticut got to the end of its 45 minutes, Byron said, ``Sam, sit down. We've got plenty of time." Connecticut got an extra hour, and the decision to close the base was overturned.

Local Arguments

The strongest, and most difficult, pitch Connecticut has to make is why its communities deserve to be spared more than any other states facing the Pentagon's ax.

It's essential, Gejdenson said, that ``you just don't come in and say this hurts my community.

Every BRAC commissioner has heard that from everyone else."

There's a sense among local officials that they are struggling to play catch-up to the Pentagon, which has been studying the bases for years.

John Markowicz, who heads the current Submarine Base **Realignment** Coalition, said that many of the same people who served on the 1993 panel are serving now, so they do have experience.

On the other hand, William Moore, president of the Chamber of Commerce of Southeastern Connecticut, who headed the coalition in 1993, was concerned that the wait for detailed Pentagon information is dulling any local edge.

``It's outrageous that they make the announcement ... and communities are left swinging in the wind," said Moore, who added, ``I believe it's purposeful, to make it harder on the communities to make a cogent argument."

But they'll try, and here's where experts thought Connecticut advocates could make convincing arguments:

Investment in the submarine base. It's easy for the Pentagon to make the argument that by going to the lower-cost South, labor and construction costs will be less, and it will be cheaper to maintain facilities.

``New England costs more money," said Charles Hellman, military policy analyst at the Center for Defense Information, a Washington research group. So far, said political consultant Alex Albert, ``this has been a very numbers-driven BRAC."

While the Pentagon estimates closing the base will save $1.6 billion over the next 20 years, Connecticut will counter with numbers of its own.

The submarine base has recently completed numerous infrastructure improvements. In the last fiscal year, some $98.5 million in investments were made, and another $50 million is due this year. Projects have included renovation of barracks and Warehouse B-33 and construction of the new Navy Lodge.

Displaced workers. Simply moving pieces of the mission to Georgia and Virginia, as the Pentagon proposes, will not mean that much-needed expert workers will follow.

BRAC Commissioner Harold W. Gehman Jr. estimated that 25 to 40 percent of the employees at a closed base usually agree to move, and ``obviously there's a loss of skill and continuity," he said.

That raises not only questions about where new skilled workers can be found, but what happens to those left behind.

``Depending on where you are, it may not be easy to find a new job," said retired Air Force Brig. Gen. Sue Ellen Turner, another commission member. ``These kinds of questions are important."

Infrastructure. Will Kings Bay or any of the other sites targeted for expansion be ready for a sudden infusion of people?

Commission members asked this question repeatedly, trying to assess whether the Pentagon had adequately consulted with local officials about whether the roads, water supply, housing and sewage systems were ready for the influx.

While Pentagon officials insisted they checked and the new sites would be ready, commissioners had their doubts. Chairman Anthony Principi raised a number of questions about whether the Kings Bay area was ready to handle ``a large, large jump in employment ... that's one factor we have to consider."

The way to make the points, said veterans of the 1993 fight, is to offer easy-to-understand figures, try to show **New London** and Groton are unique and, hard as it may be, remain statesmanlike.

Remember, said Sen. Joseph I. Lieberman, D-Conn., ``We are pushing for **New London.** We're not against anyone else."

There is some thought that sentiment could be an important argument; Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Vernon Clark was stationed at the base in the late 1960s, and the submarine base has a history dating back to World War I.

Sen. Christopher J. Dodd, D-Conn., warned against making that point too emphatically. ``It's somewhat valuable," he said, ``but we're not going to base our argument on nostalgia."

Military Values

One of the key differences between 2005 and 1993 could be tougher to overcome: The military mission is far different today.

In 1993, the nation had just won the Cold War, but was still uncertain of where future threats were coming from. Would Russia still be an adversary? What would become of its former satellites?

Today, the chief military threat is not across the Atlantic, but from terrorists and from rogue states such as North Korea, Iran and Iraq.

Arguing otherwise is futile. But Lieberman and Rep. Rob Simmons, R-2nd District, also have suggested that Connecticut interests can challenge strategic thinking in other ways.

The state placed 12th among 16 bases in a ``military value" score, largely because the Pentagon saw Groton as too one-dimensional.

Advocates of keeping different bases open maintain that consolidating subs, or other kinds of military operations, becomes a homeland security threat because it makes it easier for terrorists to cripple American readiness with one strike.

``What we're seeing is a massive shift of military installations from the North to the South and West. How does that protect our country?" asked Sen. Susan M. Collins, R-Maine.

``How large a base, with lots of real estate, can you accommodate and have it make sense?" Simmons asked. ``Use that logic and you'll have one military base" for the whole country.

Lieberman also suggested questioning the Pentagon's plans for the sub fleet. Navy officials said

last week that the attack sub fleet should shrink to about 41 -- it's now 54 -- and has been around 100. Lieberman maintained that Norfolk and Kings Bay do not have the capacity to handle subs based in the Atlantic.

Lieberman's staff plans again to use an argument they used last time: that not all naval bases are alike. There is a feeling that the recommendations equate submarines with cruisers, and the staff is likely to point out once again how there's a big difference.

Its biggest problem, though, could be fighting the numbers. The Pentagon is under severe pressure to cut costs, and the $1.6 billion estimate in savings could not be easily found elsewhere.

The cost of the Iraq mission, said former Connecticut Gov. Lowell P. Weicker, has ``gone to the moon, and so they're looking at ways to peel it back."

The X-Factor

For all the analyses and charts and terse-talking local officials, what the decision is likely to come down to is some intangible -- a Sierra Club trip, the sentimental ties between the Navy and Groton -- something no one can foresee.

There were strong relationships in 1993 -- Weicker had been a three-term senator and in his third year as governor. ``I was lucky," he recalled, ``having come out of the Senate, I still knew all the players and could sort of play a dual role of the former senator and the governor."

Dodd and Lieberman were close to President Clinton, and Gejdenson had his new friend, Byron.

But the politicians also warned not to count too much on those personal relationships -- no base commission member wants to look like he's doing someone a favor -- and to make sure the politicians don't overwhelm everyone else in the public hearings.

Lieberman's staff found in 1993 that the way to get heard is to act professionally, presenting the base commission staff with data and reasoned arguments. This is not the time for fancy lunches or bonding.

Any staff member or political figure who has influence is going to have it through relationships built over the years, or in the same way as the local people -- with cold, hard facts.

Former Utah Rep. James V. Hansen, now a commission member, recalled how he helped save that state's Dugway Proving Ground, a biological warfare testing site, in the 1995 base-closing round.

``We flew 'em around and we asked, `Where else in the lower 48 states can you do this kind of testing?' No one could name another spot," Hansen recalled.

The Pentagon, the story goes, quickly decided Dugway would not be affected.

Veterans Journal - Navy Officials Defend The Closing Of Groton Submarine Base
The Providence Journal (Rhode Island)
George W. Reilly
May 23, 2005

The Navy's two top officials on Tuesday offered the most detailed defense to date of the Pentagon's proposal to close the submarine base in Groton, Conn., a move that would cost nearly 8,500 military and civilian jobs.

In testimony before the nine-member Base **Realignment** and Closure commission, Navy Secretary Gordon R. England and Adm. Vern Clark, the chief of naval operations, said the Navy could not afford to operate three submarine bases on the East Coast given that the number of attack submarines has declined to 54 from nearly 100 during the Cold War era, and is expected to drop further, to about 41 boats in the next few years.

Faced with that excess capacity, the officials said they needed to close one of the three East Coast bases. When judged on military requirements such as port quality, environmental factors and operational training requirements, the officials said, Groton ranked well behind the bases at Norfolk, Va., and Kings Bay, Ga.

Navy officials have stated that moving the Groton operations to Virginia and Georgia would also put Groton's 17 submarines closer to the rest of the East Coast fleet.

Only A Few Major Defense Contractors Remain In The State, And Leaders Are Nervous

Connecticut Post (Bridgeport, CT)
Peter Urban
May 22, 2005

WASHINGTON -- When Adolf Hitler launched his mad campaign of conquest, Connecticut was there to arm the U.S. military and its allies in defense of democracy.

That call to duty -- answered in Bridgeport, Conn., by General Electric, Bryant Electric, Singer Manufacturing, Remington, Vought-Sikorsky Aircraft and others -- has remained a source of great pride. Six decades later, Bridgeport can no longer lay claim to the title "arsenal of democracy," nor can Connecticut. Only a few major defense contractors remain in the state, and leaders are nervous. Since Sept. 11, 2001, there has been improvement in the state's share of defense dollars. Defense contracts were at $2.1 billion in 2000, but rebounded as President Bush and Congress approved several increases get. In 2003, Connecticut defense contractors received $7.9 billion, according to the Census Bureau's consolidated federal funds reports.

But there are storm clouds swirling around the state's defense industry.

The Pentagon this month unveiled a plan to all but abandon its presence in Connecticut by closing its submarine base in **New London** and consolidating its Army Reserve and National Guard facilities.

Closing the sub base would mean a loss of 15,813 jobs in the Norwich-**New London** metro area -- about 9.4 percent of the area's work force, according to the Pentagon. State officials put the economic hit at $2.5 billion.

More than 100 other jobs would be directly lost with the closings of the Turner Army Reserve Center in Fairfield, Sgt. Libby U.S. Army Reserve Center in New Haven, Army Reserve Center Maintenance Support Facility in Middletown, and **realignment** of the Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station.

Beyond those losses, Connecticut economists and political leaders worry that closing the submarine base may be the beginning of the end for Electric Boat, which employs about 8,700 workers in Groton.

Electric Boat has tried to allay fears about its future in Connecticut with or without the submarine base, which the company admits provides "important synergies."

While jobs could be affected in the future, Electric Boat officials stressed that ongoing Navy contracts for Virginia-class submarines will keep it busy for the foreseeable future. Each Virginia Class submarine costs about $2.5 billion.

"We intend to build on our rock-solid foundation of advancing submarine capabilities," the company said.

Peter Gioia, an economist with the Connecticut Business and Industry Association, said that the departure of the Navy submarine base could put pressure on Electric Boat to move at least some of its operations to Virginia or Georgia.

"It could be something that comes about down the road," Gioia said. "It certainly does not leave one with a warm and fuzzy feeling about continued operation of the facility at its present scale."

State Department of Labor economist Lincoln S. Dyer wrote in February that the defense sector is critically important to Connecticut because of the high-value jobs it creates. Keeping the submarine base open would "help preserve the complimentary submarine-building infrastructure of General Dynamic's Electric Boat Shipyard," Dyer said.

Since the end of the Cold War, Connecticut defense jobs have been slashed from about 100,000 in 1988 to roughly 48,600 today -- the bulk employed at Pratt & Whitney in Hartford, Sikorsky Aircraft in Stratford and Electric Boat in Groton.

In 1985, the state received $7.1 billion in defense contracts but that fell to $2.1 billion in 2000. It has rebounded since Sept. 11, 2001 as President Bush and Congress approved increases in the military's budget. In 2003, Connecticut defense contractors received $7.9 billion.

Although there have been increased orders for submarines, helicopters and jet engines in recent years, the state has been rocked by several major losses over the years.

The Army's abrupt about-face on the $38 billion Comanche helicopter program in March 2004 shocked Sikorsky and partner Boeing. The Army had planned to purchase 650 Comanche helicopters that would be built jointly at a Boeing facility outside Philadelphia and at a Sikorsky Aircraft plant in Bridgeport.

That was followed by the Navy's decision in January to give its prestigious Marine One helicopter contract to a Sikorsky competitor. Sikorsky had been the helicopter of choice for the commander-in-chief since 1957.

"Obviously, we've taken a major hit in Connecticut and have for some time now. And there is a constant battle to keep whatever major defense contractors are left," said Phil Wheeler, director of the United Auto Workers union that represented workers at the now defunct Allied Signal's tank and aircraft plant in Stratford.

The Allied Signal factory moved to Arizona after the Pentagon decided in 1995 to close its Army base in Stratford, where turbine engines were manufactured for the Abrams M1 tank.

Rep. Rosa DeLauro, D-3, said the plant closing had a serious impact on the local economy.

"They were the second largest employer in the town," DeLauro said.

More than 1,000 employees were laid off, although job growth at Sikorsky tempered the impact, she said. Beyond that, DeLauro said that delays in environmental cleanup have hindered private development of the property.

"It is a cautionary tale for Groton," she said.

Despite the gloom and doom, Gioia said Connecticut is seeing an improvement in its manufacturing sector. In the last year, the state added 1,300 manufacturing jobs and companies are still hiring.

"Connecticut is a very high-cost place to do business, but we can compete with things that can't get done elsewhere or get done so much better here," he said. "There is a lot of high-end stuff done here."

Ed Deak, a professor of economics at Fairfield University, said that Sikorsky appears to be in the strongest position of the remaining defense contractors in Connecticut.

Sikorsky has a number of projects in the pipeline that will keep it busy for the near future. The company earned $2.5 billion in 2004 and plans to double that by 2008.

The Army plans to purchase about 1,200 UH-60M variants from the company. The Navy also wants 500 new helicopters. And, the Marine Corps hope to replace its fleet of heavy-lift helicopters with a new CH-53 variant currently under design.

Sikorsky also plans to compete for a contract to supply the Air Force with a new combat search-and-rescue helicopter.

Yet, the potential closing of the submarine base is a blow to Connecticut's psyche.

Richard Hanley, an assistant professor at Quinnipiac University in Hamden, said that the submarine base and Electric Boat are among the few remaining icons of Connecticut's "arsenal of democracy."

"The World War II generation is passing on and the artifacts they left are passing on," said Hanley, who produced the documentary, "Home Front: Connecticut During World War II."

Rep. Christopher Shays, R-4, said that losing the submarine base is a shot to the heart.

"We have taken pride in the fact that submarines began in Connecticut. To take away the 18 attack submarines from the place where we make submarines is a real difficult one for us to comprehend," Shays said.

It is the same feeling Shays had when the Marine One contract went to Lockheed Martin.

"The thing we lost was 50 years of carrying the president -- that prestige," he said.

And, it is the same feeling Shays gets when he recalls the gloried history of Bridgeport's defense industry during World War II.

"Bridgeport was basically responsible for 25 percent of the free world's munitions against Hitler," he said.

Silent Service Ebbs;
Uncertainty In Groton;
Submarines' Role Being Reduced To Fit In With New, Leaner Military
Hartford Courant (Connecticut)
Jesse Hamilton
May 22, 2005

Nobody hunts for Red October any more.

U.S. submarines that for decades have silently ruled the world's oceans have slipped quietly out of favor. Hollywood depictions of their Cold War exploits are more historical footnote than current-affair documentary.

And in the steady decline of the U.S. submarine fleet, specifically the nuclear-powered fast-attack subs designed to hunt other vessels, nothing is sacred -- certainly not the Naval Submarine Base in Groton.

The proposal to close the country's first sub base -- where 90 years of undersea service have encompassed two world wars, the birth of nuclear-powered subs and shadowy missions against the Soviets -- has provoked probing questions: If this hometown of the submarine goes dark, what's in store for the Silent Service? What is the U.S. Navy's future under the sea?

And, foremost: Is the world moving beyond nuclear submarines?

The U.S. fast-attack fleet -- the hunters, which outnumber the nuclear-missile subs -- counted almost 100 boats in the 1980s. Since their Cold War height, the number has been cut almost in half, in step with the waning power of the enemy with whom the fleet was once closely matched. Navy projections for 30 years from now suggest there could be as few as 37 submarines.

Those who still believe in subs have searched hard for new missions in the war against terrorism. These days, it's about operating in the ``littorals," the shallow areas hugging the coastlines, said Lt. Cmdr. Jensin Sommer, spokeswoman for Commander Naval Submarine Forces in Virginia.

It's about putting special-operations commandos or missile attacks exactly where they are needed. It's about catching drug and weapons traffickers and listening in on communications.

That is a complex array of mission for boats originally designed with a simple aim: to hunt enemy ships and submarines. It was a job they excelled at in the deep-ocean cat-and-mouse played with the Soviet fleet. They tracked less sophisticated Soviet subs around the world, even in the enemy's own ports. A sideline developed, too, that drove submarines deeper into the espionage game: tapping underwater communications cables.

But when those missions faded, the Navy was left with a big fleet of submarines and an industrial base -- including Electric Boat in Groton -- that relied on the Navy's appetite for more.

Adm. Vern Clark found himself arguing last week for closing the base in Groton. But nine months earlier, the chief of naval operations stopped at the sub base and talked about the new roles for its submarines, ``to project more offensive punch with the Tomahawk [missile] capability and the surveillance capabilities the submarine forces bring to bear."

``This is what tomorrow is about for the U.S. Navy -- the ability to project credible combat power to the far corners of the earth," giving the president options ``around the world and around the clock," a Navy scribe reported Clark as saying.

Today's U.S. sub force -- all nuclear-powered -- has 54 fast-attack submarines of three classes: Los Angeles, Seawolf and the new Virginia class. There are 14 ballistic-missile subs, a number expected to hold steady. Four of those former ``boomers," as the ballistic-missile subs are called, are now under conversion to allow them to fire guided missiles and carry special-operations commandos.

All of these subs, among the most lethal weapons ever devised, are virtually undetectable. They prowl the world's seas like phantoms -- and predicting their future can be just as elusive.

The Arguments

The U.S. submarine fleet is being pulled by opposing currents. To maintain its numbers would require a big boost in the construction schedule, which now hovers at one Virginia-class boat per year. Without that increase, and with Los Angeles subs being decommissioned faster than Virginias are launched, the fleet won't sustain many more than 30 fast-attacks in the long run.

So, what's the right number for the fast-attack fleet?

Sub supporters point to a number of military studies and reports justifying an even larger fleet in the future, including a 1999 study released by the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff saying 76 fast-attacks would be needed by 2025 to work critical peacetime missions.

They refer to the fact that naval commanders who request submarine support are routinely turned down. They talk about the growth in sales of advanced diesel subs around the world, including fleets belonging to the remaining two members of President Bush's Axis of Evil: Iran and North Korea.

Russia is still in the sub game, too, with Akula-class boats that rival U.S. advancements. And China's fleet gets bigger and more advanced every year.

But opponents say the U.S. sub fleet is bloated and expensive. A 2002 report from the Congressional Budget Office said each of the latest submarines costs about $2.7 million for every day it conducts active operations, an average of 35.7 days a year.

Christopher Hellman, a defense analyst at the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, is no fan of the Virginia class subs, which he said have run up a price tag that is ``beyond stunning."

The last of the Seawolf class, the newly commissioned USS Jimmy Carter, came in over $3 billion following a major enhancement of the boat, and the two other Seawolf subs, the USS

Seawolf and USS Connecticut, cost about $2 billion each, according to the Center for Defense Information.

The Virginia was billed as the lower-cost alternative but failed to prove it with its $2.1 billion cost.

Meanwhile, the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission recommendations released this month by the secretary of defense said there is excess capacity in the seven U.S. sub bases: Groton; San Diego; Norfolk, Va.; Kings Bay, Ga.; Bangor, Wash.; Pearl Harbor, Hawaii; and Guam. The Navy's latest force structure plan released in recent weeks calls for a 21 percent reduction in the future sub fleet. For a fleet that has already shrunk so much, that leaves unused piers in bases on both coasts.

That led to Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's position that an old single-use base like Groton has declined in military value to the point where it's not worth keeping open.

The Mission

Would-be submariners walking into Groton's Naval Submarine School these days are too young to remember the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The new submariners enter a service that defense industry experts say struggles under two self-defeating paradoxes: It helped win a peace with the Soviets that chipped away its own relevance; and its devotion to secrecy undermines the chance that the public could redeem it.

Sommer knows she is playing into that old trap when she says of the sub force, ``We're actually contributing a whole lot. Unfortunately, we can't talk ... "

They can't talk. Submarines are extremely expensive, but the Silent Service can't talk openly enough to answer the question: What are you doing with the money?

``That's the $64,000 question," Hellman said.

He's not convinced the submarine's intelligence-gathering abilities are unique. And he's never seen confirmation of a special-operations mission. So there seems little to argue against his position: ``We can do with a smaller fleet."

``The Navy doesn't tell us much," Michael O'Hanlon, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute, echoed, saying that the sub force is the toughest part of the military to study. ``We have to guess."

At $2.7 millión per active day, is a sub still the best bet for surveillance? Is the money better spent on new satellite technology, or on the increasingly popular unmanned drone aircraft?

The Navy and its two big sub-building contractors -- Electric Boat and Northrop Grumman Newport News -- say their newest boats are a great fit for the war against terrorism -- especially the new Virginia-class sub, which the builders claim will get cheaper as construction is streamlined. It can pick up terrorist cellphone calls, they say, and find the newest mines and quietest submarines. It can broadcast up-to-the-second information back to base and get special-operations troops where they need to be.

``The Virginia-class submarine was designed after the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the

Cold War," said Becky Stewart, vice president of the sub program at Northrop Grumman, which builds one a year with Electric Boat. ``It was designed specifically for the future."

What is the future? Is it al-Qaida in the desert or a naval clash with China sparked by a wrestling match over Taiwan, or something outside the usual forecasts of doom?

Diesels, Anyone?

Eric Wertheim, the U.S. Naval Institute's editor of the Combat Fleets of the World reference, says shifting the Navy more toward fighting international terrorists may be shortsighted. Transformation is good, he said. But maintaining ``core capabilities" is vital.

``As a superpower, we have to do it all," he said.

In his view, thinking that U.S. forces will never again be threatened at sea is unwise. ``We have come to expect a best-case scenario," he said. So the submarines, the ``secret agents of the naval world," might seem unnecessary in the times they aren't desperately needed.

The risk, Wertheim said, is that ``you can't just build a submarine like you build extra airplanes. ... If we don't have them available, then it'll be too late."

Across the Pacific, the Chinese navy, with some help from Russia, is refurbishing its aging force of more than 60 subs with a mix of the latest diesel subs and newly designed nuclear subs -- including ballistic-missile boats. In the coming years, its fleet could be among the most potent in the world.

``That's a threat we haven't had to worry about for a long time," Wertheim said.

Former U.S. Secretary of the Navy John Lehman, in a recent pass through **New London,** talked about the Chinese navy and the reduction of U.S. forces. ``We're creating a vacuum in the Pacific," said Lehman, who preaches that ``shortsightedness creates the next war."

Also, a number of the most advanced sub-building nations have been improving diesels and selling them to the tiny navies of developing countries. Luckily, as O'Hanlon pointed out, they have so far gone mostly to friendly navies or those too small to be a threat.

Long ago, America gave up diesels for nuclear reactors -- freeing its subs from constant refueling and giving them almost infinite ability to stay submerged. Diesel boats had to come up for air to run their engines and recharge their batteries. But today's diesels have come a long way. Experts say they are quiet and can stay down for weeks. And they are available to anybody who can afford them.

It's ``certainly something that the Navy is concerned about," Sommer said. Extensive training has been done with the diesel subs of allies, to be ready if America ever has to fight such vessels for real.

All those diesels running around is another good reason to maintain the best submarine fleet, Wertheim said. ``As we become faced with smaller nations acquiring submarines, we have to be ready for any kind of threat."

So, should America take another look at diesels?

The navy's seeming reluctance ``may end up hobbling them in the long run," Hellman said. ``Because of the cost reasons, it behooves you to start looking at a force mix."

Sommer couldn't discuss whether the Navy would reconsider them, but both Electric Boat spokesman Dan Barrett and Stewart said the Navy hasn't asked for a new American diesel.

``Do we have the capability? Of course," Barrett said.

The same goes for Northrop Grumman. Stewart said, ``We'll build what the Navy requires and requests of us."

They are cheaper, yes, but diesels lack the oomph the Navy has come to expect from its subs, Wertheim said. ``We can make a 30-knot run to the other end of the world," he said. ``You can't do that with a diesel boat."

Lehman would like to see a blend of both worlds.

``We've gotten one-dimensional," he said. ``There's no high-low mix now," he added, arguing that the U.S. military needs to balance its technologies better, including in the sub fleet. He thinks the U.S. should get back to diesel submarines, mixing the cheaper and shorter-ranged diesels -- and lots of them -- with the nuclear boats.

``We still need 100 attack subs," he said. ``We've just got to be in a lot of difference places."

Whatever fuel is running the subs, Wertheim says there is always a place for operating under the oceans. He draws a parallel to a police force's undercover officers. The guys in uniform -- in this case, the surface ships -- are needed to advertise a police presence around the world. But sometimes somebody needs to get closer to the criminals, to mix with them under cover. To hang silently below the surface.

The U.S. military is well on its way to slashing deep into its undercover force. In 2035, the Navy estimates it will have between 37 and 41 fast-attack subs to rule the nearly three-quarters of the world covered by seas. In that time, the surface warship number is set to rise.

Wertheim cautions: ``There are times when stealth is more important than presence."

Subs are all about stealth. Even the culture surrounding them is secretive. The neighbors of Groton's Thames River base, for instance, have little idea where its 18 fast-attack subs are heading when they slip quietly down the river and out to sea.

What those future missions 20 years from now will be, whether launched from Groton or some other port, is anyone's guess.

``We don't know what the ocean of 2035 is going to look like," Hellman said.

And from Wertheim: ``The people who are doing some of this predicting seem to be so confident." But those who claim to see the future of war, he said, are truly ``toying with disaster."

Base Emotions -- And Hard Realities The Battle Over Military-Base Reductions Will Be Bitter, But There's No Denying The Need For Consolidation

Pittsburgh Post-Gazette (Pennsylvania)
May 22, 2005

Here's a handy rule you can live by: The government reacts to change far more often than it causes change. So when you apply that guideline to this month's base-closing controversy, you can pretty much be sure that the changes the government is causing -- closing nearly three dozen bases and realigning both regional economies and home economies as a result -- reflect changes that have been long under way in the wider world.

This is no consolation to the thousands the domestic military **realignment** will put out of work, nor to the communities who now must pick up the pieces. But military forces are designed to respond to changes in the world, and one generation's national-security concerns cannot be allowed to warp the next generation's security preparations.

Nowhere does this cruel reality hit harder than two places that, for decades, have stood as symbols of America's defense profile: Ellsworth Air Force Base in Rapid City, S.D., and the United States Submarine Base **New London** in Groton, Conn.

The losses in these two places are almost beyond calculation: more than 3,800 jobs in South Dakota (where Ellsworth is the second-largest employer) and more than 8,400 jobs in Connecticut (which will lose more military jobs than any other state). But the raw numbers tell only part of the story. We know here in the Pittsburgh area, which might lose the 911th Military Airlift Wing, the Charles E. Kelly Support Facility and the Marine Light Attack Helicopter Squadron, that each military family accounts for thousands of dollars of spending beyond the base. And the bases themselves have been the spine of these communities' identities for decades.

But the air base and the sub base in two very different parts of the United States stand, together, as symbols of a very different military profile the United States is taking in the years after the fall of Soviet communism and the beginning of the 21st-century age of terror.

These bases go back into history, Groton as far back as the Ulysses S. Grant administration (it became a sub base a year before the nation entered World War I), Ellsworth as far back as the first month of World War II (it became a missile base as the Cold War deepened). The first nuclear submarine was built at Groton, an important arm of the American nuclear force in the Cold War was based at Ellsworth.

Indeed, it was in the Cold War that both these bases came of age and came to the forefront. Air and sub power were at the heart of the American military effort during that long twilight struggle, years in which the phrase forward projection had a meaning that was at once comforting and menacing. Ellsworth and Groton were the places where that forward projection -- of long-range bombers, of wide-ranging quiet subs -- were based. America slept better because of the aviators and sailors whose families slept in South Dakota and Connecticut.

But this is a different time, with different challenges, requiring different responses. There still are threats to American security, but not ones that likely require as big a submarine fleet or intercontinental ballistic missiles (which haven't been part of the Ellsworth arsenal for more than a decade). There still is a role for long-range bombers and submarines, but not for as many.

"Generally we don't need the same military we needed 20 years ago," says Andrew J. Bacevich, a retired Army colonel now teaching at Boston University and director of the university's Center for International Relations. "We can maintain supremacy with a radically different kind of force.

We still need long-range bombers, but we can do more with less. We still have a role for subs, but mostly as land-attack platforms."

In the Cold War, the notion was that the last bomber from places like Ellsworth would be in the air before the first Soviet warhead detonated. That notion from the strategy of mutual-assured destruction crumbled with the Berlin Wall.

"A lot of the bombers were in places like South Dakota, because it was closer to the Soviet Union," says John Pike, the director of globalsecurity.org, a defense-policy group. "That was then. This is now, when we're not worried about ICBMs taking out our B-1s. The rationale for having lots of bomber bases has gone away."

In the Cold War, the submarine fleet was designed to trail Soviet subs behaving mysteriously in places they shouldn't be. Today almost the entire Russian fleet is tied up and rusting, and despite the worries about the emerging Chinese navy, there is no sub fleet besides the American with any meaningful military capacity in the seas today.

Today submarines are well-suited to search for mines, to land SEAL teams into hostile territory, to undertake surveillance activities and to fire Cruise missiles. But the size of the sub fleet is substantially smaller than it was only two decades ago. And the operations of submarine bases can be consolidated with the operations of other naval installations.

Community and political leaders in both South Dakota and Connecticut are mobilizing for battles of their own: the effort to reverse the decision of the base **realignment** and closure commission whose decisions prompt painful change only because they reflect geopolitical and strategic changes long in train. Sometimes these efforts win modest success, but no one in Rapid City or Groton can reverse how the world has changed -- even though both bases themselves have changed with the threat over the years, even though the Ellsworth bombers were involved in the battering of Afghanistan after Sept. 11, 2001, even though Groton evaded a less draconian cutback a dozen years ago.

Amid the grief and the worry it is hard to remember what bases are for. They're for protecting American security, not for protecting American jobs. That's a tough reckoning, and a tough verdict, but military men and women pride themselves on their toughness. They've shown it many times before, at Ellsworth, Groton, the Pittsburgh area and at so many other places, where this month it is almost impossible, and very bitter, to remember that in the real mission of the military they have succeeded beyond measure.

Submarine Base Rescue Effort Ramping Up

Connecticut Post (Bridgeport, CT)
Ken Dixon
May 21, 2005

HARTFORD -- Gov. M. Jodi Rell is looking for a few good suggestions.

Rell, scurrying to do whatever it takes to protect the U.S. Navy submarine base in **New London** from closure, said Friday that the state has created a Web site for people to offer ideas -- and even vent their frustrations -- to the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission.

"The members of the BRAC commission deserve to hear from the folks who matter most -- the people of Connecticut," Rell said. "I am asking people to take a few minutes and let the BRAC

commissioners know how they feel."

The new Internet site

"Everywhere I go, people have been asking me what they can do, how they can help, where they can volunteer," Rell said in a statement from her Capitol office. "They question -- and rightly so -- whether closing the base will actually save any money at all."

She said the new Web page includes a survey for businesses that was compiled by the state Department of Economic and Community Development. The findings will be kept confidential. The BRAC is not considering potential economic damage as a reason to keep bases open, but state officials are amassing all the opposition they can to overturn the closure plan. "If you believe the Department of Defense made a huge mistake, tell the commissioners," Rell said. "Your message can affect the final decision. Let your voice be heard."

After the news that the submarine base was on the proposed BRAC closure list, Rell has made it a main focus of her attention.

She has created a nine-agency group to scour the 1,000-page DOD recommendation for flaws and errors; met with business and community leaders in southeastern Connecticut; and planned strategies with the state's congressional delegation and legislative leaders.

Rell Picks Sub Base Strike Team; Assigns State Agencies To Challenge 1,000-Page Defense Department Plan

Hartford Courant (Connecticut)
May 19, 2005

Gov. M. Jodi Rell lined up a new assault team of state agency leaders Wednesday and ordered them to rip into the credibility of a report that recommends closing of the Naval Submarine Base in Groton.

``These agencies will go through every line of the 1,000-page recommendation from the Department of Defense, identify its weaknesses and come up with the ammunition we need to shoot it down," Rell said in a prepared statement.

The state's congressional delegation and Rell's so-called strike force are waiting for more detailed data that the military used to bolster its recommendation.

But state leaders already were questioning some of the military's assumptions about the value of the sub base and the costs of closing it. Gina McCarthy, commissioner of the state Department of Environmental Protection, said that the military's estimate of $23.9 million for environmental restoration at the sub base sounds unrealistic.

The 700-acre site contains 29 contaminated sites, many identified by the federal government as among the most polluted places in the country. Those sites include landfills and stockpiled material dredged from the Thames River to keep the river navigable. The dredged material is piled as high as 35 feet and contains solvents, heavy metals and other pollutants, McCarthy said.

Also, environmental officials do not know the extent of pollution in 13 of the sites, McCarthy said. The cost of assessing those sites, not including remediation, will easily run into the millions of dollars, she said.

``So when you're looking at 29 contaminated sites, 13 of which we just know they're there and have no idea what they cost, it will be staggering to see how you can come up with a $23 million figure," she said.

The Defense Department's report to the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission says that the base will have to be cleaned up whether it is closed or not, but there is a significant difference in continuing to cap and monitor contaminated sites and suddenly having 700 acres of land that will be subject to other kinds of uses, McCarthy said.

``They have to clean it up to a level where it's safe," she said. ``Some sites have been capped, but the challenge for us is if you're actually going to transfer that property and redevelop it, it is an entirely different question."

Brig. General Thad Martin, the interim commander of the Connecticut National Guard and another strike force member, said that he is fighting the base-closing recommendations on two fronts: the submarine base closing and the recommendation that the 17 A-10 warplanes at Bradley International Airport be moved to another base.

Martin said he is confident that he can find errors in the data that the military used to support those recommendations.

``I believe the key to success will be once we get specific documents to pore over and identify the shortfalls in the assessment process," Martin said.

Rell said that the strike force would look not only at flaws in the report on the submarine base, but also in the recommendations to consolidate submarine operations at bases in Virginia and Georgia.

``You can look at what was used to promote Virginia, what was used to promote Georgia and see if, in fact, some of the data in there was incorrect," Rell said. ``Don't be just looking at what our failings might have been, but what data they used to choose other locations."

Besides the state environmental protection and military departments, the strike force includes representatives of economic development, transportation, homeland security, labor and the Office of Policy and Management.

Military officials estimate that closing the submarine base will save about $1.6 billion over the next 20 years. They say it is part of a tightening of the nation's military that is necessary in the post-Cold War era.

But no single community in the country would be hit as hard as the one that relies on the Groton sub base. Closing the base and submarine school would cost an estimated 10,500 direct jobs and 6,000 other jobs throughout the **New London** area.

The base is one of 33 major facilities on the Pentagon's list. The commission has begun a series of hearings on the Pentagon's plan, and it will send a report to President Bush on its own recommendations by Sept. 8.

Bush will have until Sept. 23 to accept or reject the proposal in its entirety, and Congress will then have 45 legislative days to act.

Planned Base Closing Questioned;
Shutdown Of Conn. Sub Facility Would Burden Ga. Site, Chairman Says
Charlotte Observer (North Carolina)
Dave Montgomery
May 18, 2005

The chairman of the nation's base-closing review commission on Tuesday questioned the Navy's proposal to close the **New London** Submarine Base, suggesting that the massive transfer of personnel and resources to the Kings Bay Submarine Base in Georgia could overwhelm the Southern installation.

Closing the Connecticut submarine base is one of the largest and most controversial of nearly 180 proposed closures in a 2005 Pentagon base restructuring plan.

The nine-member Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission is scrutinizing the plan during four days of hearings, scheduled through Thursday.

After its four-month review of the Pentagon plan, the commission will draft a final base-restructuring plan for the president and Congress.

Top Navy officials, testifying before the commission, defended their recommendation.

Connecticut's two Democratic senators, Christopher Dodd and Joe Lieberman, held a news conference outside the hearing room to assail the proposal as a threat to national security.

"You're going to close this submarine base forever - no matter what threats this nation faces," Lieberman said.

Submarines and personnel from **New London** would be transferred to the Kings Bay submarine base and the Norfolk Naval Station in Virginia.

But commission Chairman Anthony Principi warned that communities near Kings Bay have "limited infrastructure" and may be ill prepared to absorb the influx.

More than 3,200 personnel would move from **New London** to Kings Bay, resulting in a projected 21 percent employment increase in St. Marys, a community adjacent to the base, Principi said.

Navy Secretary Gordon England, who's in line to become deputy defense secretary, said the Navy had carefully analyzed the region and felt confident that Kings Bay communities had adequate housing, schools, job opportunities and other resources to handle the transfer.

"In all of our moves," he said, "we looked at both ends of this."

Dodd disputed the Navy's assertion that the Connecticut base was less important militarily than the submarine bases in Virginia and Georgia.

He also asserted that the environmental cleanup at the vacated New England base will be enormous, saying that Navy officials who calculated the cost at $29 million were "living in Disneyland."

England and Adm. Vern Clark, chief of naval operations, said the Navy wants to close nine major installations and 46 smaller installations as the Navy shrinks the size of its fleet and moves toward lighter and more efficient ships. The service is also restructuring eight other installations.

The Navy already has cut its fleet of attack submarines in half and concluded that it can no longer justify three submarine bases, Clark said. There are currently about 50 attack submarines, he said, and the Navy plans to reduce the number to no more than 41.

Navy officials concluded that their best option was to close the **New London** base, which they said would produce a net savings of $1.58 billion over the next 20 years. There would be a one-time cost of $680 million for the transfer.

Other bases the Pentagon wants to close include Naval Station Ingleside near Corpus Christi, Texas; the Naval Air Station at Atlanta; and the Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base at Willow Grove, Pa.

Opinions/ Editorials

Fighting Closure With Facts
Hartford Courant (Connecticut)
May 19, 2005

Reaction to the state's potential loss of the U.S. Naval Submarine Base in Groton has been appropriately swift and unified.

As U.S. Sen. Chris Dodd noted after the Pentagon list of potential base closings was issued, it won't be easy to reverse the recommendations of Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld. Navy officials who want the base functions shifted to Norfolk, Va. and Kings Bay, Ga., are armed with graphs and charts to bolster their argument that the Groton-**New London** base lags behind the others in military value and ship-berthing capacity.

Nonetheless, Gov. M. Jodi Rell has done a good job of launching a no-stone-unturned, bipartisan effort to persuade the independent Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission that the Groton facility is critical to national defense. Her strategy of appointing a ``strike force" and fighting the recommendation by gathering facts rather than fulminating is the most likely to succeed.

Mrs. Rell has engaged business leaders in southeastern Connecticut, including the Electric Boat division of General Dynamics, which has a symbiotic relationship with the sub base. Pfizer Inc. also has a huge stake in the region's economic health.

This fact can't be lost on BRAC Chairman Anthony Principi, a former secretary of Veterans Affairs with the Bush administration and a vice president at Pfizer. Mr. Principi resigned his post Tuesday at the pharmaceutical manufacturer in order to give full attention to the base closing initiative, but it is a plus that he is familiar with the territory.

It also bodes well for a fair hearing that Gen. Lloyd Newton, a Connecticut resident and an executive at Pratt & Whitney, is on the BRAC panel.

Meanwhile, an analysis of the base closing's impact shows its chilling scope. Besides the loss of jobs -- 10,500 direct submarine jobs and 6,000 related jobs -- the impact would be felt beyond the **New London** area. There are more than 750 vendors statewide who rely on the submarine

industry.

The Pentagon has made it clear that economic fallout on various base locales should not dissuade the commission from approving its recommendations. But it is worth noting that the impact on Connecticut is greater than on all other base locations and that its workforce -- as well as base personnel -- has expertise without peer.

The federal Government Accounting Office must verify the Pentagon's projected savings of $48 billion over 20 years from the base closings and **realignment.** Some local experts, including University of Connecticut economist Fred Carstensen, rightly question whether closing the Groton base and relocating the submarine operations to Georgia and Virginia will save money at all. For one thing, the cost of environmental cleanup of 15 contaminated sites on the Groton base property is believed to be vastly underestimated at $23.9 million.

Mrs. Rell and company are reassuring that there is much grist for the ``Save Me" mill.

MEDIA AVAILABILITY

MEDIA ADVISORY

BRAC Commission Chairman, Anthony Principi and Commissioner, General Lloyd Newton (USAF Ret.), will visit Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in New Hampshire on Wednesday, June 1, 2005. We will be visiting the base throughout the afternoon and hold media availability immediately following the visit.

Also attending the visit will be representatives from both Maine and New Hampshire. The visits are closed to both the public and media.

Date & Time:
Wednesday, 1 JUNE at 4:30PM (Please arrive by 3:45PM).

LOCATION:
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard outside Gate #1.

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Suggested Talking Points for New England Installation Visits
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, New Hampshire

1. **The 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission is an independent, non-partisan, and non-political entity, established by Congress for the purpose of evaluating DoD's suggestions of bases for closure or realignment.**
    - The process followed by the BRAC Commission has been distinctly outlined by law. The Commission is following what is prescribed by statute in its determination of which factors to take into account.
    - The purpose of the Commission is to ensure that DoD reviewed all the legally-necessary components in the formulation of its suggestions to close or realign a military installation.
    - The Commission is completely non-political and non-partisan in nature, as the Commissioners were appointed by the President and key Congressional leaders from both parties. The staff was hired based upon the individual's competency and availability.
    - *The Commission recognizes that New England has been particularly affected by the current round of closures and realignments. As such, the Commission will review all recommendations to ensure that these decisions were made in accordance with established criteria.*

2. **The Commission was established by Congress to provide accountability to the public for the decisions to close or realign a military installation, and welcomes community input as an important factor in its decision-making process.**
    - The Commission is completely transparent, and all documents, with the exception of those sensitive to national security, are and will be made available for public access through both the website and the BRAC library.
    - While military value is the most important consideration, the Commission is also aware of the human impact that the decision to close or realign a base would have on a community and will take the economic, environmental, and other effects into account in its analysis of the recommendations put forth by DoD.
    - Community input is encouraged through the regional hearings and documentation provided by the public of facts that may have been overlooked by DoD in its legally-outlined, decision-making process are both helpful and crucial to the Commissioners decision-making process.
    - *The Commission recognizes the unique relationship that has developed between the residents of the base and the neighboring communities over the past two-centuries. The Commission certainly recognizes the value of the base both economically in the region and as a stalwart of our nation's defense infrastructure. These factors will be considered in the final decision-making process.*

3. **While other factors are taken into consideration by the Commission, military value is the most important.**
    - As DoD creates the strategy to best prepare our forces to face changing global threats, the Commission was created to ensure that DoD followed the process outlined by law in determining the military value of an installation.
    - While community impact is taken into account, the purpose of this round of BRAC is to strengthen and enable our troops to perform their duties of keeping the United States secure and military value will, by far, outweigh any other consideration.
    - *The Commission certainly recognizes the role and the commitment of the Shipyard to our nation's defense throughout its 205-year history. As such, the Commission will address the potential future role for the Shipyard in the new strategic paradigm in making a final decision on closure.*

2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission
Suggested Q's & A's
Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, New Hampshire

Installation Specific Questions-Generic

Q. When will the Pentagon release the documents/data used to justify the recommendation of closure? Why have they not done so immediately?
A. The Commission will not comment on tasking specific to the Pentagon. Be confident that as the Commission received documents from DoD, those documents will be made available to the public on its website: www.brac.gov.

Q. The regional hearing that covers Portsmouth, as well as other regionally-based installations, is scheduled for July 6th. Is the failure to provide the data used by the Pentagon for these recommendations a means to limit the states' ability to counter the recommendations?
A. The Commission will not comment on tasking specific to the Pentagon. However, the Commission does not believe that the Pentagon is deliberately hindering the States' ability to counter its recommendations.

Q. Recently, Portsmouth Naval Shipyard received a special citation from the Navy in recognition of its superior performance. Why would such a facility be recommended by the Pentagon for closure?
A. The statute establishes the criteria. As outlined by the statute, the Commission will place priority on military value; while also taking into consideration economic, environmental, and other effects that the closure or realignment of a base would have on the community surrounding that base. Information that is gathered in the analysis of a base, with the exception of information that is sensitive to national security, will be made accessible to the public. Part of what constitutes DoD's determination of military value is jointness, ease of mobility, and the base's strategic role in today's changing global threats.

Installation Specific Questions-Historic

Q. In previous rounds, roughly 15 percent of the Pentagon's recommendations have been overturned by the BRAC Commission. However, Pentagon officials are more confident in this current round and believe that there will be fewer overrides. Is the Commission finding this to be true?
A. It is premature to make any predictions on the findings of the Commission. However, be assured that the Commission will take ALL information into account in arriving at its final conclusions.

Q. The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is a 205-year old facility. As such, the facility has a very unique and long-standing relationship with the surrounding community.

Will the Commission take this into account in their final recommendation to the President?
A. The Commission understands the unique relationship fostered between military installations and the neighboring communities. This factor, as well as many others, will be taken into account in its final recommendations.

Installation Specific Questions-Strategic

Q. Given some of the current recommendations for closure, does New England's defense infrastructure play a lesser national security role? Why?
A. This is a question of the overall strategic direction of the U.S. military and would best be directed to the Department of Defense. DoD is evaluating how each military installation fits into the defense strategy to meet the changing global threat.

Q. How does the Commission consider the effects of the current BRAC round on military morale and future enlistment?
A. The first and most important factor is military value. After that, the economic effect on the surrounding community, the extent and cost of potential future savings, the ability of the community's infrastructure to support the base, and the environmental impact of the closure of the base will be considered.

The Commissioners will be sensitive to the needs in the community and will weigh those needs against the military value of the base.

Installation-Specific Questions-Political

Q. Is it your belief that the Pentagon produced these recommendations without political influence?
A. The Congress established the BRAC Commission to be an entirely non-partisan and non-political entity to independently evaluate whether DoD made its recommendations in accordance with the process outlined by law. The Commission will serve to provide accountability to the public and ensure that all decisions are based upon the criteria given by statute.

Q. Is the political climate (pro-military) in the South a determining factor in the trend to reposition military forces there?
A. The Commission's most important consideration is the military value of the base, but also takes into account the economic, environmental and other effects that the closure or realignment of a base would have on the surrounding community. The Commission is both completely transparent and completely non-partisan.

Q. Defense Secretary Rumsfeld has been successful in many of his military modernization efforts. However, BRAC is unique in that the process is independent of many of the powers of Congress that exist in other processes. Do you believe that Secretary Rumsfeld has taken advantage of this situation?

A. The BRAC Commission was established by Congress to follow a process, set out by law, to determine whether DoD had followed the necessary legal guidelines in the analysis which let to its suggestions.

Installation Specific Questions-Economic

Q. Estimates suggest that Maine will experience a 50% reduction in job growth if the Pentagon's recommendations are upheld. Does the Commission take into account the economic impact of base closure on the local community and the State?
A. In concert with many other factors, the Commission will take into account the economic impact of the Pentagon's recommendations on the local community.

Q. The Labor Department has suggested provision of grants up to $1 million for communities affected by BRAC. Can you speak more to these grant proposals?
A. The Commission is responsible for evaluating the decisions made by DoD, while DoD creates the strategies for enabling communities to continue to thrive after the closure of a base.

Q. Estimates state that 4,510 jobs are linked to the shipyard. The economic repercussions of realigning the station are enormous. Does the Commission understand this?
A. The Commission understands the unique relationship that exists between the base and the local community. That being said, the Commission will take into account the economic impact of the Pentagon's recommendations on the local community, while holding military value as the most important factor in its decision-making process.

Q. Bath Iron Works shipyard, a privately owned facility, currently holds contracts for destroyers. Will the Commission consider the economic ramifications of the closure of the shipyard on the Bath Iron Works shipyard?
A. The Commission understands the unique relationship that exists between the base and the local community and local businesses. Be confident that the Commission will take into account the economic impact of the DoD's recommendations.

Q. With regard to Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, the Pentagon estimates to spend $448 million to close the base before saving nearly $128 million annually within four years. How does this make any economic sense?
A. The Commission will utilize all information to make an accurate assessment of the economic impact of the Pentagon's recommendations.

Q. Can Norfolk, VA support the additional forces, missions, and personnel?
A. These are criteria that were required of the Pentagon's initial recommendation. The Commission will further review the Pentagon's initial assessment regarding realignment of forces.

Installation Specific Questions-Environmental

Q. Typically, shipyards have a record of leaving substantial amounts of environmental damage over time. Portsmouth Naval Shipyard has endured two centuries of heavy industrial use. Have studies been conducted by the Pentagon to estimate the cost of cleanup?

A. The DoD has the responsibility to maintain appropriate environmental conditions of a base, whether or not it is a candidate for closing. The law requires that the costs of the environmental restoration of a base that is closed, be factored into the decision of whether or not to actually close the base.

PORTSMOUTH NAVAL SHIPYARD
NEW HAMPSHIRE

National News Articles
Goodbye Guns, Hello Golf;
Base Closures
Maine, New Hampshire Delegation Request All Written Materials From Pentagon For Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Brunswick Naval Air Station, Dfas Limestone
Military Makeover
Pentagon's BRAC Recommendations Prove Contentious On Capitol Hill
Base Closures Throw New England Economic Forecasters For A Loop
Maine-New Hampshire Congressional Delegation Members To Present Case For Maine's Defense Facilities To Brac Commission Chair
Government Offers Grants To Communities Hurt By Base Closings
Maine, New Hampshire Still Seeking Full Data From Pentagon
Baldacci Enlists Veteran Allies In Base Closings Battle
Maine, New Hampshire Leaders Hope To Get Base Closing Data Tuesday

Local News Articles
Condos May Be Rising If Portsmouth Shipyard Falls;
The Naval Facility Might Not Be Closed, But Developers Still See 278 Prime Acres.
Base Closure Reports Awaited;
The State's Congressional Delegation Has Harsh Words For The Pentagon, Which Is Due To Release Documents.

Opinions/ Editorials

National News Articles

Goodbye Guns, Hello Golf;
Base Closures
The Economist
May 21, 2005

Losing a military base may be a golden opportunity

"SOME have asked", said Donald Rumsfeld this week, "why we are proposing any base closures during a time of war. The answer is because these changes are essential to helping us win this war." And, of course, it makes financial sense. Closing 33 big bases and cutting back another 150 facilities should save the Pentagon close to $50 billion over the next two decades.

Correct or not, the defence secretary's reasoning is about to be attacked by state and local governments across the country. They have until early September to convince the independent

Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission (BRAC) that their particular bits of America's vast military empire must be preserved from Rummy's axe. In the four previous BRAC rounds, the commission has approved 85% of the Defence Department's recommendations. In all likelihood, therefore, that means tough luck for politicians such as Senator Olympia Snowe of Maine, who describes the proposed closure of the **Portsmouth** naval shipyard, at a cost to the state of 4,510 jobs, as "nothing short of stunning, devastating and, above all, outrageous" (she has a point, since the navy secretary had just praised the shipyard for "a phenomenal record of cost, schedule, quality and safety performance").

But, after the first shock, will BRAC decisions really be devastating? One good place to look is Irvine, in southern California's Orange County. Back in 1993, the closure of the El Toro marine corps air base was seen as a disaster. Now it is going to be turned into America's biggest park—bigger than New York's Central Park, San Francisco's Golden Gate Park and San Diego's Balboa Park combined. And it will not cost Irvine's taxpayers a penny.

In an auction in February, Florida's Lennar Communities paid $649.5m for the base. The navy will use the money for the environmental clean-up of El Toro and other bases; and Lennar will pay Irvine $200m in development fees and another $200m in property assessments. In return, Lennar gets the right to build houses and a golf course on 16% of the site.

Irvine's residents are not alone in their good fortune. Denver's Lowry air force base, a victim of the 1991 BRAC round with the loss of 2,275 jobs, is now a residential, office and park area providing 5,666 jobs; some of its 3,000 homes sell for more than $1m. The former Fitzsimmons army medical centre near Denver, a casualty of the 1995 round, is now on track to become a bioscience park providing more than 18,000 jobs within the next five years.

The problem, however, is that even though almost 85% of the 129,649 civilian jobs lost on military bases in the past four BRAC rounds have now been replaced with new ones (not counting jobs created off the bases), recovery is an uneven business. One reason is geography. If the Cannon air force base in a remote part of New Mexico closes because of the present BRAC round, it will be a lot harder for the civilian neighbours than the proposed loss of the naval surface warfare centre at Corona, which sits just east of the Los Angeles sprawl, or the naval weapons station at Concord in the Bay Area, where the land is so valuable that the locals petitioned to be put on the BRAC list.

But perhaps the biggest reason is that the various branches of the armed forces are messy tenants. They leave behind unexploded munitions, toxic waste and polluted groundwater, all of which must be cleaned up at military expense before being handed over for civilian use.

This is costly: some $11.9 billion so far, according to a study released in January by the Government Accountability Office. It is also time-consuming. At its McClellan base, one of the many Californian victims of the 1995 BRAC round, the air force in 2000 found traces of plutonium mixed in with radium-contaminated rags and brushes; the clean-up will not be finished until 2034. As Mr Rumsfeld observed this week, "Change is never easy. In fact, Abraham Lincoln once compared reorganising the army to bailing out the Potomac river with a teaspoon."

Maine, New Hampshire Delegation Request All Written Materials From Pentagon For Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Brunswick Naval Air Station, Dfas Limestone
US Fed News
May 23, 2005

The office of Sen. Olympia J. Snowe, R-Maine, issued the following press release:

Maine and New Hampshire's Congressional Delegations today urged Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld to provide as soon as possible all materials in the care, custody or control of the Defense Department relevant to any portion of its analysis, consideration and/or recommendation that **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard, Brunswick Naval Air Station and the DFAS operation in Limestone, Maine be closed or realigned.

Below is the full text of the letter that was sent to the Pentagon today:

May 19, 2005

The Honorable Donald H. Rumsfeld

Secretary of Defense

The Pentagon

Washington, D.C. 20350

Dear Mr. Secretary:

So that we may properly assess the Department's basis for recommendation last week to close and/or realign three of Maine's military installations, please provide as soon as possible any and all writings and communications set down by handwriting, typewriting, printing, photocopying or other form of data compilation, including email, in the care, custody or control of the Department relevant to any portion of the Department's analysis, consideration and/or recommendation that **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard, Brunswick Naval Air Station and the DFAS operation in Limestone, Maine (hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Maine bases") be closed or realigned, respectively. Such writings shall include, but not be limited to, the Department's application of the following criteria to each of the Maine bases:

1. The current and future mission capabilities and the impact on operational readiness of the Department of Defense's total force, including the impact on joint war-fighting, training, and readiness as regards the Maine bases;

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 the Maine bases and the recommended receiving location(s);

3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements at the Maine bases and the recommended receiving locations to support operations and training;

4. The cost of operations and the manpower implications of the recommendations to close/realign the Maine bases;

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 at the Maine bases;

6. The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of the Maine bases, including New Hampshire communities;

7. The ability of both the Maine bases and the recommended receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions, and personnel; and

8. The environmental impact of closing/realigning the Maine bases, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management and environmental compliance activities.

For the purposes of this correspondence, Department is defined as the Department of Defense, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and all service components to include the Navy, Marine Corps, Army and Air Force.

Because time is of the essence, we appreciate your very prompt attention. Thank you.

Sincerely,

JUDD GREGG

United States Senator

OLYMPIA SNOWE

United States Senator

JOHN SUNUNU

United States Senator

SUSAN COLLINS

United States Senator

CHARLES BASS

United States Representative

THOMAS ALLEN

United States Representative

JEB BRADLEY

United States Representative

MICHAEL MICHAUD

United States Representative

cc: Sec. Anthony Principi, Chairman, Defense Base Closure and **Realignment** Commission

Hon. James Bilbray, Member

Hon. Philip Coyle, Member

ADM Harold Gehman, USN (ret), Member

Hon. James Hansen, Member

Gen. James Hall, USA (ret), Member

Gen. Lloyd Newton, USAF (ret), Member

Hon. Samuel Skinner, Member

Gen. Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (ret), Member

Military Makeover
U.S. News & World Report
Julian E. Barnes
May 23, 2005

After five years of preaching the necessity of a nimbler military, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld last week took perhaps the most important step in the quest to turn his vision of the future into reality.

The announcement that the Defense Department would propose closing 33 of the nation's 425 major bases sent shudders through communities from Kittery, Maine, to Clovis, N.M. While some cities like Corpus Christi, Texas, would probably little notice the economic impact of the closure, other places, like Rapid City, S.D., would surely feel the loss of their bases acutely. Although Rumsfeld and other officials acknowledged the economic turbulence to come, they emphasized that they were taking advantage of an opportunity to reorganize the armed forces and change the way the nation fights.

There have been four previous rounds of base **realignment** and closure--BRAC in Pentagon patois--since 1988, and they were all fundamentally about saving money by doing away with unneeded facilities. The government estimates it saved $ 29 billion between 1988 and 2003 by closing 97 major bases and scores of minor facilities. This time around the Pentagon certainly intends to save money--a projected $ 49 billion to $ 64 billion over two decades. But today reshaping the military is as important as reducing waste. With brigades of tanks stationed in Europe, overlapping domestic research facilities, underused naval stations, and duplicative training centers, Rumsfeld believes America's bases are still arrayed for yesterday's fight, not tomorrow's. "Current arrangements pretty much designed for the Cold War must give way to the new demands of war against extremists and other evolving 21st-century challenges," Rumsfeld said.

As a result, the Pentagon's list contained more reshuffling than outright closure. Fort Knox, Ky., for example, would lose its armor center and school to Fort Benning, Ga., which already has the Army's infantry school--but it would receive a new brigade and combat support units returning from overseas. Each service has a list of shuffled combat brigades, ships, and fighter squadrons.

"We got to ask ourselves: If we were king for a day, how would we redo the Air Force?" says Maj. Gen. Gary Heckman, who helped oversee that service's **realignment.**

No meddling. The **realignment** of bases provides Rumsfeld with perhaps his most important opportunity to reshape the military for years to come. Although the secretary has managed to kill off some weapons programs he regards as legacies of the Cold War, many of his attempts at modernization have been hampered by lawmakers. But the base closure system has been well designed to keep congressional meddling to a minimum. The Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission, appointed by President Bush, will now review the Pentagon recommendations and has until September to make changes, though major revisions are unlikely. President Bush then reviews the list and sends it to Congress, which must consider the proposal as a whole; if the legislators don't reject it within 45 days, the closure recommendations go into effect.

Still, there is sure to be congressional opposition. New England was particularly hard hit by the proposed loss of **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard in Maine and the New London submarine base in Connecticut. Those decisions will most likely spark a fight, despite Congress's limited ability to tinker with the list. The restrictions have increased the amount of grumbling about the process in recent years, and so this round of **realignment** is likely to be Rumsfeld's last. "You have one shot, and you are not going to have another for a decade," says Ken Beeks, vice president of Business Executives for National Security.

Rumsfeld believes America is ill-served by having heavy forces sitting in garrisons in Germany or even South Korea. Indeed, Rumsfeld began asking his regional commanders about American troops stationed overseas back in August 2001. "All of these questions Rumsfeld asked led us to the strong conclusion that globally we were in a Cold War posture," says Ray DuBois, the acting under secretary of the Army. "And you have to ask yourself: What sort of posture do we need for the next 20 years?"

Location. The essential belief inside Rumsfeld's Pentagon is that because of restrictions other nations put on U.S. troop movements, forces can move to a conflict from the United States as fast as they can from a foreign base--as long as they are positioned domestically near railheads and airports. The Pentagon plans to move about 70,000 troops stationed overseas back home, but there are some who have raised doubts. Last week, to the dismay of the Pentagon, a commission appointed by Congress released a report that questioned the details of the overseas withdrawal. Al Cornella, the commission chairman, said that he did not disagree with Rumsfeld's overall vision but added that the Pentagon is moving too fast. Before the military leaves Germany, Cornella says, the Pentagon must be sure it has enough ships and cargo planes to deploy troops from America quickly. "We will get one chance to do [this]," he said, "and we want to do it right."

The decision to redeploy American troops from Korea and Germany to domestic bases has blunted some of the pain of base closure. Some of the bases that have been considered for closure in earlier rounds, like Fort Riley, Kan., and Fort Carson, Colo., were designated by the Pentagon last week for expansion--because of large training areas and newly renovated railroad connections that allow rapid deployment. Another winner was Texas: Fort Bliss will receive troops coming home from Germany. Some could not resist pointing out that it also made for good politics to move troops back to Colorado, Texas, and Kansas. "Those are red states by the way, if you haven't noticed," says Bill Nash, a retired major general now with the Council on Foreign Relations. "This is a great opportunity to take care of your friends and lessen the impact of BRAC."

The closure list also reflects Rumsfeld's desire for an integrated military in which the Army,

Navy, and Air Force not only fight together but train side by side and share facilities. In years past, individual services have largely chosen which bases will close. This time around, Rumsfeld was determined to change the process. "The Rumsfeld people . . . are making the services work together," says Christopher Hellman, a military analyst with the Center for Arms Control and Nonproliferation.

And the final list reflects that emphasis. Walter Reed Army Medical Center would be largely shuttered and combined with the National Naval Medical Center to create a joint hospital. "Does it really matter what uniform a doctor wears?" Hellman asks. Pentagon officials also pointed to their proposal to create combined training centers for cooks and truck drivers at Fort Lee, Va. (at the expense of Lackland Air Force Base, Texas). Several Army and Air Force bases like Fort Dix and McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey and Fort Lewis and McChord Air Force Base in Washington State would consolidate their operations. And the 7th Special Forces Group would leave Fort Bragg, N.C., to work with Air Force Special Operations at Eglin Air Force Base, Fla.

In previous rounds, about 15 percent of the Pentagon decisions have been overturned by the BRAC commission. Pentagon officials believe this time there will be fewer overrides, in part because of new rules and in part because they believe the services have done a better job of evaluating what's needed. The next months will show whether that confidence is merited. But even if the list remains relatively unchanged, it will take years to see just how successful Rumsfeld's plan is. It is easy to talk about making the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines work together more closely. It is more difficult to make it happen.

Pentagon's BRAC Recommendations Prove Contentious On Capitol Hill

Inside the Navy
May 23, 2005

The Pentagon's proposals to close **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME; the New London submarine base in Groton, CT; and naval stations in Pascagoula, MS, and Ingleside, TX, are drawing loud complaints from members of Congress representing those states.

Some lawmakers, including Maine's senators, are also turning their attacks on the whole base-closure process, teaming up with Sen. John Thune (R-SD), who last week proposed a bill to delay the process. He offered his bill after the Pentagon announced its 2005 base-closure recommendations, a list that includes South Dakota's Ellsworth Air Force Base.

If the Base **Realignment** and Closure (BRAC) process continues unimpeded, the Pentagon's recommendations will be reviewed in the coming months by the Bush administration's BRAC commission. The panel will decide which recommendations to approve and whether to make any changes to the list. Based on that review, the commission is supposed to send the White House a report by Sept. 8.

By law, President Bush must approve or reject the commission's list by late September. The recommendations will become final if the president approves the commission's proposals and Congress does not object within 45 legislative days.

Thune's bill would delay the BRAC process until Congress considers various reviews, including the work of the Commission on Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States (which is separate from the BRAC Commission that is reviewing U.S. facilities) and the ongoing Quadrennial Defense Review.

Sens. Olympia Snowe (R-ME) and Susan Collins (R-ME) were among a handful of senators who joined Thune at a press conference May 19.

"I said last week that the Pentagon was dead wrong to recommend closing Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota," Thune said. "And today I'm here to say that I think the Pentagon is dead wrong for recommending we close a single domestic base while we're at war and before the completion of the overseas BRAC commission and the Pentagon's QDR." He acknowledged it would be an uphill fight to delay the next BRAC round.

Asked by Inside the Navy whether he would be offering such a bill had the Pentagon spared South Dakota's Ellsworth Air Force Base, Thune said, "Well, that's a hypothetical question. I would love to be here today having Ellsworth not made it on the list. But I think there's information that came out about this process that's fairly recent, fairly current. The overseas BRAC commission's report came out last week. I was not here for the vote on this two years ago. So I'm fairly, in terms of this round of BRAC, new to it."

He added, "I am persuaded, irrespective of what happens with my individual circumstance with Ellsworth Air Force Base that there are serious concerns . . . about the overall . . . threat assessment, the need to slow down until we know what those force structure needs are, until we know what that military strategy is going forward."

In addition to Snowe and Collins, other sponsors of the bill include Sens. Jeff Bingaman (D-NM), Pete Domenici (R-NM), Judd Gregg (R-NH), Tim Johnson (D-SD), Trent Lott (R-MS), Lisa Murkowski (R-AK), Ted Stevens (R-AK) and John Sununu (R-NH).

During the press conference, Snowe said that the Northeast would be hurt the most by the Pentagon's BRAC recommendations. She reiterated the point after the event.

"Maine is the second hardest hit and Connecticut is the first," she told ITN.

She noted the **Portsmouth** yard had recently received a special citation from the Navy in recognition of its service from Sept. 11, 2001, to Aug. 30, 2004. "The personnel of **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard and tenant activities consistently and superbly performed their mission while establishing a phenomenal record of cost, schedule, quality, and safety performance," the citation states.

The Navy's plan to close the submarine base in Groton, CT -- a proposal that has sparked criticism from Sen. Joe Lieberman (D-CT), Sen. Chris Dodd (D-CT), Rep. Rosa DeLauro (D-CT), Rep. Rob Simmons (R-CT), and Rep. Duncan Hunter (R-CA), the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee -- could be one of the most contentious in the 2005 BRAC process.

When the BRAC commission took testimony from top naval officials May 17, there was a fair amount of discussion about the sub base. Navy Secretary and acting Deputy Defense Secretary Gordon England, Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Vern Clark, Marine Corps Commandant Gen. Michael Hagee and Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Infrastructure Strategy and Analysis Anne Rathmell Davis testified before the commission.

BRAC commission Chairman Anthony Principi asked whether the facilities at Kings Bay, GA, would be adequate to accommodate the forces that would be moved there from Groton. England said it would cost $238 million to make the necessary changes at Kings Bay. The total cost of closing the base at Groton and upgrading Kings Bay would be $679 million, England said.

Closing the sub base is a perfect example of "very, very difficult choices" for the BRAC process, said Clark, who argued changed circumstances support closing Groton's base.

"A few years back we had almost 100 attack submarines," he said. "Our number is in the 50s now and I've testified and submitted documentation that my belief is the number in the future is going to be somewhere in . . . the low 40s. My number is 41."

That comment had Lieberman, who was sitting in the audience with Dodd, visibly shaking his head side-to-side in disagreement.

"We've got too much structure," Clark continued. "In order for us to have the Navy that we need to have in the future, we have got to redirect resources to the recapitalization process."

Clark said the Navy must approach BRAC by weighing strategic and military implications not merely for next year, but also looking ahead for the next 20 years. "The recommendation that we provided is the direction to get us where we think we need to be 20 years from now," said Clark.

During an impromptu session with reporters outside the hearing, Lieberman and Dodd vowed to fight the recommendation to close the submarine base, questioned the Navy's arguments and challenged the service's cost estimates.

"Communities that lose a base are almost like a spouse that got divorced," Rep. Gene Taylor (D-MS) told reporters at a media event last week. "There's a lot of resentment. They felt like, we did everything you asked. We were a good neighbor. And you're leaving us. You're just leaving us." That event was sponsored by Defense Today.

In other news, the commission raised the possibility of closing the Navy's air base in Oceana, VA, noting the facility already suffers from range encroachment.

Further, the Navy's plans to close and realign facilities in Texas have also drawn objections from lawmakers (see related article).

Base Closures Throw New England Economic Forecasters For A Loop
The Associated Press
Mark Jewell
May 23, 2005

Recommended military base closings in Maine and Connecticut have suddenly injected pessimism into forecasts that had predicted modest economic growth in coming years.

Most of the two states' New England neighbors enjoy a more mixed outlook, and the impact in Connecticut is expected to be less severe than in Maine because of the Constitution State's larger population and more diversified economy.

A Maine economist expects his state's job growth will be cut by half or more over the next five years if President Bush and Congress adopt recommendations to close the **Portsmouth** shipyard in Kittery and reduce the Brunswick Naval Air Station's mission and employment.

That prospect caused Charles Colgan, a professor at University of Southern Maine, to offer a caveat after presenting his modestly upbeat state economic forecast at Thursday's spring

conference of the New England Economic Partnership.

Colgan said he expected employment growth to average a little more than 1 percent per year through 2009, with the state's gross domestic product rising to an average 2.5 percent per year.

He then abruptly changed course, saying, "That's all probably going to change" because of the proposed base closings. He called the cuts a "dreaded monster" that "may eat much of the state's future economic growth" and result in "a decade of essentially no job growth in Maine."

As a result, a jobs target that Colgan initially predicted the state would reach in 2009 may not be achieved until 2013 or later.

Nearly 12,000 Maine jobs could be lost from the possible cuts at **Portsmouth** and Brunswick combined with the proposed closing of the Defense Finance and Accounting Center in Limestone.

Not counting indirect jobs losses in the communities, more than 6,600 jobs are expected to be lost - or about seven-tenths of a percentage point of the state's total employment.

Connecticut's more than 8,500 direct job losses from the closure of a submarine base in Groton and other smaller facilities amounts to about half a percentage point of the state's total employment.

Combined, the six New England states are expected to suffer 13,600 jobs losses, or about 47 percent of the total cuts nationwide from the military **realignment** in a region with just 5 percent of the total U.S. population.

Ross Gittell, the economic group's New England forecaster and an economist at the University of New Hampshire, said the regional impact will be softened somewhat by the gradual phase-in of the cuts and federal aid to help communities make it through economic transition.

Edward Deak, the group's Connecticut forecaster and an economist at Fairfield University, said it could be two years before job losses begin and six years before they are finished.

Connecticut faces a potentially big hit from the loss of the sub base because it is just up the Thames River from Electric Boat shipyard, a maker of nuclear submarines that could see a big drop in business.

The military cuts, combined with uncertainties about energy prices and instability in the state's insurance industry, have combined to form what Deak called an "instability trifecta" clouding the outlook for the state's economy despite its diverse job base.

Even before the military cuts are taken into account, Deak expected Connecticut to join Massachusetts in posting New England's lowest job growth over the next five years at an annual average gain of less than 1 percent.

In addition to the base closures, another question mark in Maine is the uncertain future of privately owned Bath Iron Works shipyard. The Navy is considering a plan to shift all new destroyer contracts to either BIW or a competing site in Mississippi instead of sharing the contracts between the two.

Maine political leaders will seek to derail the military's closure plans and keep the shipyard open,

but Colgan said, "The real battle has in effect already been lost in terms of the Maine economy."

Southeastern New Hampshire is expected to be hit hard by the closure of **Portsmouth** shipyard, just across the state's border with Maine. New Hampshire, home to many of the shipyard's workers, is expected to suffer nearly 1,900 direct job losses under the Pentagon's **realignment** plan and 1,200 indirect jobs losses.

Rhode Island is forecast to gain about 600 jobs, with Massachusetts posting a net gain of 500 jobs - a consequence of new jobs at Hanscom Air Force Base offsetting losses at other facilities including Otis Air National Guard Base.

The pace at which New England communities hit by the base closings recover depends largely on how quickly military land can be converted for use by private industry, economists said. Environmental cleanups must be completed at many of the bases before they can be redeveloped.

"For all of New England, it's going to be a long time getting back to where we were," said Dennis Delay, the regional economic group's New Hampshire forecaster.

Maine-New Hampshire Congressional Delegation Members To Present Case For Maine's Defense Facilities To Brac Commission Chair

US Fed News
May 24, 2005

The office of Sen. Olympia J. Snowe, R-Maine, issued the following press release:

Members of the Maine and New Hampshire Congressional Delegations will meet with Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission Chairman (BRAC) Anthony Principi at a Capitol Hill meeting on Friday, May 27 to underscore their case that the Department of Defense deviated from BRAC criteria and erred in recommending the **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard for closure, the Brunswick Naval Air Station for **realignment** and the Defense Finance Accounting Service (DFAS). Maine Gov. John Baldacci and New Hampshire Gov. John Lynch have been invited to the meeting.

"The bottom line is clear: these three facilities are a critical component of this nation's national security and homeland defense infrastructure. When the Defense Department releases the data to support its recommendations it will be serve to prove that the **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard, the Brunswick Naval Air Station and the Defense Finance Accounting Service deserve must stay open. As we all know, the Department of Defense erred in its decision to recommend them for closure, but that doesn't mean that the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission has to make the same mistake," said Senators Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins, and Representatives Tom Allen and Mike Michaud. "That is why we are meeting with Commissioner Principi on Friday where we will outline for him - in specific fashion - how the Department of Defense deviated from its own criteria. With this information in hand, he will be able to see for himself and make other BRAC Commissioners aware that Maine's defense infrastructure plays an integral role in protecting our nation."

Members of the joint delegation have yet to receive a response to their May 17 letter to Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld urging the expeditious release of essential data used to justify the recommend list of military facilities for closure.

Government Offers Grants To Communities Hurt By Base Closings
The Associated Press
Mary Clare Jalonick
May 24, 2005

The Labor Department said Tuesday it will provide up to $1 million in planning funds for communities that may lose civilian jobs due to military base closings.

Emily Stover DeRocco, assistant secretary for employment and training administration, sent a letter to state work force agencies outlining federal grants eligible to help communities plan for transition should bases in their areas end up on the final list of closings.

DeRocco said that in past rounds of base closings, "communities which undertook effective and timely planning successfully transitioned from a defense to a non-defense economy."

The Pentagon released its recommendations for closure and **realignment** May 13. An independent commission is now reviewing the list, and may make changes. The list then goes to President Bush before it is sent to Congress for approval.

DeRocco said the Labor Department believes the time between the recommendations and final congressional approval "is the most effective time to plan for the services necessary to assist affected workers and communities."

The letter says the grants should be awarded by June 30, and only communities that would be affected by the Pentagon's recommended list are eligible.

The department recommends that states use the money for training potentially displaced workers, staffing transition efforts, hiring consultants to deal with local agencies and developing long-range goals for economic development.

Though the limit for the first round of grants is $1 million per community, the department says more money will be eligible once Congress has made the final decision, probably in November. DeRocco said the awards will be granted based on the number and size of facilities affected, the potential economic impact and the ability of the work force already in place to deal with the transition.

Sen. John Thune, R-S.D., said the grants would be a "much-needed solace" if South Dakota's Ellsworth Air Force Base remains on the list. The Pentagon recommended the base be closed, moving 411 civilian jobs out of Rapid City.

Thune and lawmakers from other affected states, including Maine, are pushing President Bush and military officials to save their bases.

Republicans from the New York delegation lobbied Bush and adviser Karl Rove aboard Air Force One on Tuesday, asking him to save Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station.

Rep. Sherwood Boehlert said Bush told him: "'You're in the same position I was in in '95, you're making the same case and I hear you, but you've got to make that case to the commission.'"

Maine Sen. Susan Collins, a Republican, threatened Tuesday to subpoena hundreds of documents about proposed base closures after the Defense Department again failed to turn the data over to

Congress, the Portland Press Herald reported.

Maine's four-member congressional delegation considers the documents essential for challenging recommendations to close **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard in Kittery and halve the military contingent at Brunswick Naval Air Station. The Pentagon also wants to close a defense accounting center in Limestone.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Navy Secretary Gordon England promised last week to deliver the documents by last Friday. They had not arrived as of Tuesday, the Press Herald said.

In Texas, two members of the congressional delegation said the Army failed to consider 37,600 acres available for training at Fort Hood, Texas, when it recommended removing nearly 8,500 troops from the base by 2011. The Army had based its recommendation on a finding that Fort Hood did not have enough training space.

Democratic Rep. Chet Edwards and Republican Rep. John Carter said they met with Pentagon officials who confirmed the land was not taken into account.

Maine, New Hampshire Still Seeking Full Data From Pentagon
The Associated Press
May 24, 2005

Maine and New Hampshire senators received some data Tuesday used by the Pentagon to support its recommendation to close the **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard and to remove aircraft and slash personnel at Brunswick Naval Air Station.

But the data was incomplete and Maine Sens. Susan Collins and Olympia Snowe said the Pentagon's failure to provide all of the requested data was "tantamount to a new level of foot dragging" by the defense department.

The data that arrived Tuesday contained the Pentagon's conclusions, but it did not contain the actual numbers that were crunched to arrive at specific recommendations for the Maine bases, said Preston Hartman, a spokesman for Snowe.

"Without the full information and back up documentation from the Pentagon, we cannot analyze and asses what led to the Pentagon's recommendations on Maine's military facilities in this base closing round," the senators said in a statement.

Pentagon officials promised to provide the supporting documents to the nine-member Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission by Friday, but the documents didn't arrive.

Maine and New Hampshire officials say the lack of data has delayed preparation of arguments to refute the Pentagon proposal to close or realign bases.

"Every day that goes by is a day less that the congressional delegation and the affected communities can effectively challenge their assumptions and conclusions," Snowe and Collins said.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has proposed closing the **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard on the Maine-New Hampshire border and moving half of the active-duty military staff of Maine's Brunswick Naval Air Station to Florida. He also proposed closing a Defense Finance Accounting

Service facility in Limestone, Maine.

U.S. Rep. Michael Michaud, whose Maine district include the DFAS center, the proposal was particularly unfair to the people of northern Maine who already suffered from the closing of Loring Air Force Base in the early 1990s.

The current proposal "puts communities like Limestone in double jeopardy - facing a second closure at the hands of the Defense Department," said Michaud.

Maine and New Hampshire lawmakers plan to meet Friday with Anthony Principi, chairman of the commission that's reviewing the Pentagon's recommendations.

Principi has said the commission won't rubber-stamp the closure list, so bases could be added or removed. While a commission majority can remove a base from the list, it takes seven members to add a base.

At least two commissioners are scheduled to tour **Portsmouth** and Brunswick on June 2 and 3, and a regional hearing on the recommendations is scheduled for July 6 in Boston.

The commission must give its final list to President Bush by Sept. 8. Bush and Congress can then accept or reject the list in its entirety.

Baldacci Enlists Veteran Allies In Base Closings Battle

The Associated Press
Glenn Adams
May 24, 2005

Gov. John Baldacci on Tuesday appealed to veterans for help in persuading federal officials to reconsider closings and curtailments of Maine military installations, saying, "We need to attack these base closures on every front."

Flanked by representatives of a spectrum of veterans' organizations representing 148,000 Mainers, Baldacci called upon veterans to write letters and e-mails and attend public sessions on the closings to express their support for the Maine bases.

"Today, just days before this nation celebrates Memorial Day, I am asking every available vet to get behind this effort to let Washington know these bases must stay open," Baldacci said at a State House news conference.

The administration has cited figures showing that the closing of the **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard in Kittery, halving the active-duty military at Brunswick Naval Air Station and closing a Defense Finance Accounting Service facility in Limestone would result in a loss of 12,000 direct and indirect Maine jobs, and $465 million in economic losses.

Many of the shipyard employees are New Hampshire residents.

Baldacci said national security implications must be taken into account as well as the economic blow the curtailments would bring.

On Friday, Baldacci and New Hampshire Gov. John Lynch, along with both states' congressional delegations, plan to meet in Washington with Anthony Principi, chairman of the nine-member

commission that's reviewing the Pentagon's recommended base closures.

Baldacci sharply questioned the process used by the Defense Department in targeting the Maine bases. The Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission will review the list and submit a final list to President Bush by Sept. 8. Bush and Congress can then accept or reject the list in its entirety.

State officials say the BRAC commission's time to review documents supporting the curtailments has been cut short, undercutting the states' ability to challenge the selections.

"This really is not a model process. The flaws have been showing up since the beginning," said Baldacci. "It is not being done in a fashion that people can be proud of."

Maj. Gen. John "Bill" Libby, adjutant general of the Maine National Guard, said the base closure process in general has merit, "but is flawed as it applies to Maine."

Ronald Brodeur, Disabled American Veterans adjutant and Air Force veteran, recalled the plummeting morale among fellow airmen after the former Loring Air Force Base was ordered closed more than a decade ago.

Brodeur said the latest closings will harm efforts to draw young enlistees into the all-volunteer military. "This isn't going to help us at all," he said.

Peter Ogden, director of the state Bureau of Veterans Services, said the cutbacks would dampen Maine's efforts to attract retired veterans as residents. Maine has one of the nation's highest populations of veterans, he said.

Maine, New Hampshire Leaders Hope To Get Base Closing Data Tuesday

The Associated Press
May 24, 2005

Maine and New Hampshire congressional leaders hoped to receive data Tuesday used by the Pentagon to support its recommendation to close the **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard and to remove aircraft and slash personnel at Brunswick Naval Air Station.

But they're not happy by the delay. Maine Sen. Susan Collins said the delay "contradicts the plain letter of the law," and her Republican colleague, Sen. Olympia Snowe, accused the Pentagon of "state-of-the-art foot-dragging."

"It raises immediately the question about how did you arrive at these conclusions if it's so difficult to turn over this information that was used to make these decisions," Snowe said.

Pentagon officials promised to provide the supporting documents to the nine-member Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission by Friday, but the documents didn't arrive.

Maine and New Hampshire officials say the lack of data has delayed preparation of arguments to refute the Pentagon proposal to close or realign bases.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has proposed closing the **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard on the Maine-New Hampshire border and moving half of the active-duty military staff of Maine's

Brunswick Naval Air Station to Florida. He also proposed closing a Defense Finance Accounting Service facility in Limestone, Maine.

Maine and New Hampshire lawmakers plan to meet Friday with Anthony Principi, chairman of the nine-member commission that's reviewing the Pentagon's recommended base closures.

Principi has said the commission won't rubber-stamp the closure list, so bases could be added or removed. While a commission majority can remove a base from the list, it takes seven members to add a base.

At least two commissioners are scheduled to tour **Portsmouth** and Brunswick on June 2 and 3, and a regional hearing on the recommendations is scheduled for July 6 in Boston.

The commission must give its final list to President Bush by Sept. 8. Bush and Congress can then accept or reject the list in its entirety.

Local News Articles

Condos May Be Rising If Portsmouth Shipyard Falls;
The Naval Facility Might Not Be Closed, But Developers Still See 278 Prime Acres.
Portland Press Herald (Maine)
Seth Harkness
May 23, 2005

For generations, residents have seen Seavey Island as home to the region's economic anchor, the **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard. With the appearance of the shipyard on the Pentagon's list of military bases recommended for closure, another view of the 278-acre island situated at the mouth of the Piscataqua River begins to emerge - prime real estate.

Those closest to the shipyard are generally not yet ready to see things this way. They are concerned with fighting to keep the 205-year-old facility open rather than considering other uses for the site.

Beyond their initial instinct to protect the existing shipyard, however, many residents also recognize they may be presented with a rare, if unwanted, opportunity to participate in the large-scale redevelopment of a choice section of the New England coast.

Even those who are now focused on saving the shipyard say they can see how the site could have a broader appeal.

"It's a beautiful piece of property," said Kittery Town Council Chairwoman Ann Grinnell.

Discussing the future of Seavey Island is largely an exercise in imagination at this point. Beside the uncertain future of the shipyard itself, there are large unknowns regarding the environmental condition of the property after two centuries of heavy industrial use. Since access to the shipyard is controlled, few people other than those who work there are even familiar with the existing facilities and layout.

Nevertheless, many of the island's assets - its shipbuilding infrastructure, deepwater frontage on the Piscataqua, and views across the river to **Portsmouth** - are obvious, even if their possible uses

aren't. Where some people envision a transportation terminal, others see an industrial zone or a seaside park. Several real estate professionals say the market's solution would be high-end condominiums.

When she considers what Seavey Island might become without a shipyard, **Portsmouth** Realtor Betty LaBranche, who has sold real estate in the region for 25 years, looks to nearby New Castle, a neighboring island on the New Hampshire side of the river.

PRISON AS A CENTERPIECE

The most prominent building on New Castle is the historic Wentworth by the Sea, a once-again grand 19th-century hotel that had slid into disrepair by the 1980s. During the last 20 years, New Castle has experienced a resurgence with the construction of a marina, condominiums, clusters of expensive homes, and the restoration of the hotel under the Marriott Corporation.

LaBranche says she can imagine developers performing a similar transformation on Seavey Island, perhaps with one of the shipyard's most attractive buildings, an empty naval prison known as "The Castle," becoming the centerpiece of the project. The building caught the attention of a developer even before the yard's future was in doubt.

New Hampshire developer Joseph Sawtelle secured a lease from the Navy on the old brig in 1999 with plans to transform it into office space for technology companies. The project, which would have been the first commercial complex on an active Navy base, collapsed following a slump in the high-tech economy and Sawtelle's death in 2000.

The mammoth concrete building overlooking **Portsmouth** Harbor continues to occupy the thoughts of people considering alternative uses for Seavey Island, according to LaBranche.

"Waterfront is everything," she said. "Every time we're out on a boat and we look at the prison, everybody says, 'Wouldn't that be beautiful condos.' "

Even the lure of waterfront property would mean little, however, if Seavey Island turns out to be riddled with toxic contamination. Shipyards have notorious records for leaving their mark on the environment and the **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard is likely no exception.

Seavey Island was actually three smaller islands before they were joined with fill containing numerous industrial wastes, according to a report by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. The full extent of the environmental damage probably won't be known unless the yard closes and a full survey is done.

"The question is how much contamination is out there, and if there is a lot, is that going to give people the confidence to do residential," said **Portsmouth** developer Michael Kane. "It's like the ultimate in speculation."

If the shipyard closes and Seavey Island is redeveloped, the market will not be the only force shaping its transformation. The closure of other naval shipyards, such as those in Charleston, S.C., and Philadelphia in the mid -'90s, were accompanied by the creation of redevelopment authorities that allowed citizens and elected officials to help steer the process.

Should she find herself involved in these sort of deliberatons, Grinnell, the Town Council chairwoman, says one of her goals would be to ensure the island does not become a gated community for the wealthy. Kittery has 350 residents who work at the shipyard, she says, and

creating new jobs for those people has to be a priority in any redevelopment plan.

SIGNS OF ECONOMIC HEALTH

"I don't want it to be gobbled up by the rich for McMansions," she said. "We would not want all (residential) development. We need jobs."

Grinnell says she thinks the island is large enough to accommodate several uses - open space, housing, and industry - a view shared by several other residents.

"I would love to see multiple use," said Susan Tuveson, owner of Cacao Chocolates on Government Street, a few blocks from the yard's main entrance.

Whatever business could be cultivated on Seavey Island, Tuveson says she hopes it would contribute to the sights and sounds of the commercial waterfront. The blast of a ship's horn at night, the passage of boats in the harbor, even the piles of scrap metal on the opposite side of the river - these are an important part of living in Kittery as well as vital signs of the region's economic health, according to the the former attorney who moved to Kittery from Minneapolis eight years ago.

"It's a working port," she said. "We've got stuff coming in and stuff going out. This is a manifestation of a healthy economy."

While a discussion of the future of Seavey Island sends some residents' imaginations whirring with thoughts of a theme park, an oceanography institute or a cruise ship terminal, others who depend on the yard are unwilling or unable to step back and see it as a blank slate.

Tuveson's assistant in the chocolate business, Greta Evans of Kittery, whose husband is an engineer at the shipyard, says it is difficult to discuss the future of Seavey Island when her family's own future is in question.

"We're not even sure where we're going to be," she said.

If the yard does close, she and many others who depend on it are hoping it is bought by a private shipbuilding company that changes the name and little else. "I guess most people would like Electric Boat or something to come in," she said.

As appealing as this may sound, University of Southern Maine professor Charles Colgan says it is an unlikely scenario. The yard's specialized mission as a depot for overhauling nuclear submarines would make it difficult to convert the facility into a private shipbuilding business, he says, especially with the domestic shipbuilding industry ailing.

"I don't see how it would sustain itself as a shipyard," said Colgan, a professor of public policy. "There is simply no demand. The only ships we're building in this country are for the Navy and the Navy is cutting way back, as evidenced at Bath Iron Works."

Around Kittery, though, even residents who found it possible to talk about Seavey Island without a shipyard said nothing they could envision would be preferable to things remaining as they are.

"It's really too soon" to talk about redevelopment, Grinnell said. "We're still in shock down here."

Base Closure Reports Awaited;
The State's Congressional Delegation Has Harsh Words For The Pentagon, Which Is Due To Release Documents.
Portland Press Herald (Maine)
Bart Jansen
May 24, 2005

Members of Maine's congressional delegation expect to get more information about proposed military base closures today, but say it isn't soon enough. Lawmakers complained that the Pentagon's slow response will make it harder to contest plans to close **Portsmouth** Naval Shipyard in Kittery and relocate more than 2,400 jobs from Brunswick Naval Air Station.

"It's what we call state-of-the-art foot-dragging. It's a regrettable failure," said Sen. Olympia Snowe, R-Maine. "It raises immediately the question about how did you arrive at these conclusions if it's so difficult to turn over this information that was used to make these decisions."

Sen. Susan Collins, R-Maine, a member of the Armed Services Committee, said she expects the Pentagon to release more documents today. If the material is incomplete, she will use her influence to get more information, she said.

"It simply isn't fair and it contradicts the plain letter of the law for the Pentagon to be slow-walking this material," Collins said. "I think the Pentagon will come forth with some additional materials. But I think they will dribble it out, and if they're slow in giving it to us, it makes it tough for us to build the case."

Maine's and New Hampshire's congressional delegations - including Reps. Tom Allen and Mike Michaud, both D-Maine - are scheduled to meet Friday with Anthony Principi, chairman of the nine-member commission that is reviewing Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's recommended base closures.

Principi has said the commission won't rubber-stamp the closure list, so bases could be added or removed. While a commission majority can remove a base from the list, it takes seven members to add a base.

At least two commissioners are scheduled to tour **Portsmouth** and Brunswick on June 2 and 3, and a regional hearing on the recommendations is scheduled for July 6 in Boston. The commission must give its final list to President Bush by Sept. 8. Bush and Congress can then accept or reject the list in its entirety. "We need to be completely prepared," Collins said.

Rumsfeld has proposed closing the shipyard in Kittery and moving half of the active-duty military staff of the Brunswick Naval Air Station to Florida. In all, the state stands to lose 7,000 military and civilian jobs.

Pentagon officials promised to provide the supporting documents to the nine-member Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission by Friday, but the documents didn't arrive. Elected officials from states that are affected by the proposed closings hope to use the documents to poke holes in the Defense Department's rationale and overturn the recommended closings.

Portsmouth stands to lose 4,510 jobs as its functions are sent to Norfolk, Va. Brunswick would lose 2,420 jobs - about half of its work force - as its planes are moved to Jacksonville, Fla. Two

other closures would cost the state 354 jobs at the Defense Finance and Accounting Service in Limestone and seven jobs at the Naval Reserve Center in Bangor.

The initial closure list and supporting documentation estimated that the Pentagon would spend $448 million to close the Kittery yard and save $128 million annually within four years. For Brunswick, the Navy expects to spend $146 million to realign the base before saving nearly $35 million a year starting in four years.

Opinions/ Editorials

2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission
Suggested Talking Points for New England Installation Visits
Naval Air Station Brunswick, Maine

1. **The 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission is an independent, non-partisan, and non-political entity, established by Congress for the purpose of evaluating DoD's suggestions of bases for closure or realignment.**
    - The process followed by the BRAC Commission has been distinctly outlined by law. The Commission is following what is prescribed by statute in its determination of which factors to take into account.
    - The purpose of the Commission is to ensure that DoD reviewed all the legally-necessary components in the formulation of its suggestions to close or realign a military installation.
    - The Commission is completely non-political and non-partisan in nature, as the Commissioners were appointed by the President and key Congressional leaders from both parties. The staff was hired based upon the individual's competency and availability.
    - *The Commission recognizes that New England has been particularly affected by the current round of closures and realignments. As such, the Commission will review all recommendations to ensure that these decisions were made in accordance with established criteria.*

2. **The Commission was established by Congress to provide accountability to the public for the decisions to close or realign a military installation, and welcomes community input as an important factor in its decision-making process.**
    - The Commission is completely transparent, and all documents, with the exception of those sensitive to national security, are and will be made available for public access through both the website and the BRAC library.
    - While military value is the most important consideration, the Commission is also aware of the human impact that the decision to close or realign a base would have on a community and will take the economic, environmental, and other effects into account in its analysis of the recommendations put forth by DoD.
    - Community input is encouraged through the regional hearings and documentation provided by the public of facts that may have been overlooked by DoD in its legally-outlined, decision-making process are both helpful and crucial to the Commissioners decision-making process.
    - *The Commission recognizes the relationship that has developed between the residents of the base and the neighboring community. The Commission welcomes all input from the community regarding this relationship and will take all factors into account in its final recommendation.*

3. **While other factors are taken into consideration by the Commission, military value is the most important.**

- As DoD creates the strategy to best prepare our forces to face changing global threats, the Commission was created to ensure that DoD followed the process outlined by law in determining the military value of an installation.
- While community impact is taken into account, the purpose of this round of BRAC is to strengthen and enable our troops to perform their duties of keeping the United States secure and military value will, by far, outweigh any other consideration.
- *The Commission recognizes that the base is the only operational airfield on the East Coast equipped to handle the Navy's new P8. The Commission will consider this factor in its final recommendation.*

2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission
Suggested Q's & A's
Naval Air Station Brunswick

Installation Specific Questions-Generic

Q. When will the Pentagon release the documents/data used to justify the recommendation of closure? Why have they not done so immediately?
A. The Commission will not comment on tasking specific to the Pentagon. Be confident that as the Commission received documents from DoD, those documents will be made available to the public on its website: www.brac.gov.

Q. The regional hearing that covers Brunswick, as well as other Maine-based installations, is scheduled for July 6th. Is the failure to provide the data used by the Pentagon for these recommendations a means to limit the state's ability to counter the recommendations?
A. The Commission will not comment on tasking specific to the Pentagon. However, the Commission does not believe that the Pentagon is deliberately hindering the States' ability to counter its recommendations.

Installation Specific Questions-Historic

Q. In 1993 the Commission was successful in closing Loring Air Force Base. This had a negative impact on the community surrounding Loring AFB. Will the Commission consider the impact of the closing of Loring AFB in the current round of closures and realignments?
A. The statute establishes the criteria. As outlined by the statute, the Commission will place priority on military value, while also taking into consideration economic, environmental, and other effects that the closure or realignment of a base would have on the community surrounding that base. Information that is gathered in the analysis of a base, with the exception of information that is sensitive to national security, will be made accessible to the public.

Installation Specific Questions-Strategic

Q. Given some of the current recommendations for closure, does Maine's defense infrastructure play a lesser role in the national security of the nation?
A. The BRAC Commission was established to ensure that the recommendations made by the Department of Defense (DoD) were made in accordance with the law. The most important factor is military value, and the BRAC Commission will evaluate whether DoD properly took this into account as DoD has worked to make our military best able to handle the changing global threats.

Q. Brunswick Naval Air Station is the only operational airfield on the East Coast equipped to handle the Navy's new P8. Jacksonville does not have this capability. Realignment of this base is a strategic misjudgment, is it not?
A. In making a recommendation to close or realign a base, the first and most important factor is military value. After that, the economic effect on the surrounding community, the extent and cost of potential future savings, the ability of the community's infrastructure to support the base, and the environmental impact of the closure of the base will be considered.

DoD is seeking to establish more jointness in our military, ensure its mobility, and refine its ability to respond to all changing global threats. The Commission will determine whether DoD took all key factors into account, as prescribed by law, as it made its analysis.

Installation Specific Questions-Political

Q. Is it your belief that the Pentagon produced these recommendations without political influence?
A. The Congress established the BRAC Commission to be an entirely non-partisan and non-political entity to independently evaluate whether DoD made its recommendations in accordance with the process outlined by law. The Commission will serve to provide accountability to the public and ensure that all decisions are based upon the criteria given by statute.

Q. Congress is limited in its ability to filibuster the BRAC process. Given this, is it your contention that the current BRAC recommendations are pragmatic or partisan?
A. The Commission cannot comment on factors that may/may not have influenced the Pentagon's recommendations.

Q. Is the political climate (pro-military) in the South a determining factor in the trend to reposition military forces there?
A. The Commission was established by Congress as a non-partisan, non-political entity whose key consideration is military value, while it also takes into account the human impact that the closure or realignment of a base would have on the surrounding community. The Commission follows a transparent process, distinctly outlined by law, and is completely free from political considerations of any sort.

Installation Specific Questions-Economic

Q. Does the Commission take into account the economic impact of base closure on the local community?
A. While holding military value as the pre-eminent consideration, the Commission is aware of the human impact the closure or realignment of a military installation has on the community and will take that impact into account as it reviews the Pentagon's recommendations.

Q. The Labor Department has suggested provision of grants up to $1 million for communities affected by BRAC. Can you speak more to these grant proposals?
A. The task of the Commission is to ensure the suggestions made by DoD were made in accordance with the process proscribed by law. DoD will be working with communities to ensure the best possible outcomes and continued economic well-being after base closures or realignments.

Q. Brunswick Naval Air Station is the only operational airfield on the East Coast equipped to handle the Navy's new P8. Also, the base already has a new control tower, runway, barracks, and a hangar for the P8. Why realign a base that already has the necessary infrastructure given the Jacksonville, Florida would have to build these facilities?
A. Military value is the dominant consideration in the decisions made by the Commission. The Commission will ensure, through a transparent process outlined by law, that DoD has properly taken all key factors into consideration in its suggestions to close or realign a base for the purpose of making our military more efficient and ready to respond to changing global threats.

Q. Estimates state that 2,420 jobs are linked to the station. The economic repercussions of realigning the station are enormous. Does the Commission understand this?
A. While the Commission will take into account the economic effect that the closure or realignment of a military installation would have on the surrounding community, and is aware of the human impact of DoD's suggestions, the Commission's foremost consideration is military value. The Commission will determine whether DoD properly took the military value of a base into account in its recommendations as prescribed by law. The process of research and analysis, followed by the Commission, has been specifically outlined by law.

Q. With regard to Brunswick Air Station, the Navy expects to spend $146 million to realign the base before saving nearly $35 million a year starting in four years. How does this make any economic sense?
A. The Commission will utilize all information to make an accurate assessment of the economic impact of the Pentagon's recommendations.

Q. Can Jacksonville, Florida support the additional forces, missions, and personnel?
A. These are criteria that were required of the Pentagon's initial recommendation. The Commission will further review the Pentagon's initial assessment regarding realignment of forces.

NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK
MAINE

National News Articles
Maine, New Hampshire Leaders Hope To Get Base Closing Data Tuesday
Baldacci Enlists Veteran Allies In Base Closings Battle
Maine, New Hampshire Still Seeking Full Data From Pentagon
Government Offers Grants To Communities Hurt By Base Closings
Limits On Filibusters Are Already Pervasive
Maine-New Hampshire Congressional Delegation Members To Present Case For Maine's Defense Facilities To Brac Commission Chair

Local News Articles
Contact BRAC today
Collins Presses Pentagon For Data;
If Base Closure Documents Aren't Handed Over, Sen. Susan Collins Says She Will Subpoena Them.
Base Closure Reports Awaited;
The State's Congressional Delegation Has Harsh Words For The Pentagon, Which Is Due To Release Documents.
BRAC: The Red, The Blue And The Absent

Opinions/ Editorials
Pentagon Invites Strong Reaction By Not Sharing Base-Closing Data;
The Military Should Explain Why It Believes Maine's Bases Should Be Targeted.

National News Articles

Maine, New Hampshire Leaders Hope To Get Base Closing Data Tuesday
The Associated Press
May 24, 2005

Maine and New Hampshire congressional leaders hoped to receive data Tuesday used by the Pentagon to support its recommendation to close the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and to remove aircraft and slash personnel at **Brunswick** Naval Air Station.

But they're not happy by the delay. Maine Sen. Susan Collins said the delay "contradicts the plain letter of the law," and her Republican colleague, Sen. Olympia Snowe, accused the Pentagon of "state-of-the-art foot-dragging."

"It raises immediately the question about how did you arrive at these conclusions if it's so difficult to turn over this information that was used to make these decisions," Snowe said.

Pentagon officials promised to provide the supporting documents to the nine-member Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission by Friday, but the documents didn't arrive.

Maine and New Hampshire officials say the lack of data has delayed preparation of arguments to refute the Pentagon proposal to close or realign bases.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has proposed closing the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard on the Maine-New Hampshire border and moving half of the active-duty military staff of Maine's **Brunswick** Naval Air Station to Florida. He also proposed closing a Defense Finance Accounting Service facility in Limestone, Maine.

Maine and New Hampshire lawmakers plan to meet Friday with Anthony Principi, chairman of the nine-member commission that's reviewing the Pentagon's recommended base closures.

Principi has said the commission won't rubber-stamp the closure list, so bases could be added or removed. While a commission majority can remove a base from the list, it takes seven members to add a base.

At least two commissioners are scheduled to tour Portsmouth and **Brunswick** on June 2 and 3, and a regional hearing on the recommendations is scheduled for July 6 in Boston.

The commission must give its final list to President Bush by Sept. 8. Bush and Congress can then accept or reject the list in its entirety.

Baldacci Enlists Veteran Allies In Base Closings Battle

The Associated Press
Glenn Adams
May 24, 2005

Gov. John Baldacci on Tuesday appealed to veterans for help in persuading federal officials to reconsider closings and curtailments of Maine military installations, saying, "We need to attack these base closures on every front."

Flanked by representatives of a spectrum of veterans' organizations representing 148,000 Mainers, Baldacci called upon veterans to write letters and e-mails and attend public sessions on the closings to express their support for the Maine bases.

"Today, just days before this nation celebrates Memorial Day, I am asking every available vet to get behind this effort to let Washington know these bases must stay open," Baldacci said at a State House news conference.

The administration has cited figures showing that the closing of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, halving the active-duty military at **Brunswick** Naval Air Station and closing a Defense Finance Accounting Service facility in Limestone would result in a loss of 12,000 direct and indirect Maine jobs, and $465 million in economic losses.

Many of the shipyard employees are New Hampshire residents.

Baldacci said national security implications must be taken into account as well as the economic blow the curtailments would bring.

On Friday, Baldacci and New Hampshire Gov. John Lynch, along with both states' congressional delegations, plan to meet in Washington with Anthony Principi, chairman of the nine-member commission that's reviewing the Pentagon's recommended base closures.

Baldacci sharply questioned the process used by the Defense Department in targeting the Maine bases. The Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission will review the list and submit a final list to President Bush by Sept. 8. Bush and Congress can then accept or reject the list in its entirety.

State officials say the BRAC commission's time to review documents supporting the curtailments has been cut short, undercutting the states' ability to challenge the selections.

"This really is not a model process. The flaws have been showing up since the beginning," said Baldacci. "It is not being done in a fashion that people can be proud of."

Maj. Gen. John "Bill" Libby, adjutant general of the Maine National Guard, said the base closure process in general has merit, "but is flawed as it applies to Maine."

Ronald Brodeur, Disabled American Veterans adjutant and Air Force veteran, recalled the plummeting morale among fellow airmen after the former Loring Air Force Base was ordered closed more than a decade ago.

Brodeur said the latest closings will harm efforts to draw young enlistees into the all-volunteer military. "This isn't going to help us at all," he said.

Peter Ogden, director of the state Bureau of Veterans Services, said the cutbacks would dampen Maine's efforts to attract retired veterans as residents. Maine has one of the nation's highest populations of veterans, he said.

Maine, New Hampshire Still Seeking Full Data From Pentagon

The Associated Press
May 24, 2005

Maine and New Hampshire senators received some data Tuesday used by the Pentagon to support its recommendation to close the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and to remove aircraft and slash personnel at **Brunswick** Naval Air Station.

But the data was incomplete and Maine Sens. Susan Collins and Olympia Snowe said the Pentagon's failure to provide all of the requested data was "tantamount to a new level of foot dragging" by the defense department.

The data that arrived Tuesday contained the Pentagon's conclusions, but it did not contain the actual numbers that were crunched to arrive at specific recommendations for the Maine bases, said Preston Hartman, a spokesman for Snowe.

"Without the full information and back up documentation from the Pentagon, we cannot analyze and asses what led to the Pentagon's recommendations on Maine's military facilities in this base closing round," the senators said in a statement.

Pentagon officials promised to provide the supporting documents to the nine-member Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission by Friday, but the documents didn't arrive.

Maine and New Hampshire officials say the lack of data has delayed preparation of arguments to refute the Pentagon proposal to close or realign bases.

"Every day that goes by is a day less that the congressional delegation and the affected communities can effectively challenge their assumptions and conclusions," Snowe and Collins said.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld has proposed closing the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard on the Maine-New Hampshire border and moving half of the active-duty military staff of Maine's **Brunswick** Naval Air Station to Florida. He also proposed closing a Defense Finance Accounting Service facility in Limestone, Maine.

U.S. Rep. Michael Michaud, whose Maine district include the DFAS center, the proposal was particularly unfair to the people of northern Maine who already suffered from the closing of Loring Air Force Base in the early 1990s.

The current proposal "puts communities like Limestone in double jeopardy - facing a second closure at the hands of the Defense Department," said Michaud.

Maine and New Hampshire lawmakers plan to meet Friday with Anthony Principi, chairman of the commission that's reviewing the Pentagon's recommendations.

Principi has said the commission won't rubber-stamp the closure list, so bases could be added or removed. While a commission majority can remove a base from the list, it takes seven members to add a base.

At least two commissioners are scheduled to tour Portsmouth and **Brunswick** on June 2 and 3, and a regional hearing on the recommendations is scheduled for July 6 in Boston.

The commission must give its final list to President Bush by Sept. 8. Bush and Congress can then accept or reject the list in its entirety.

Government Offers Grants To Communities Hurt By Base Closings

The Associated Press
Mary Clare Jalonick
May 24, 2005

The Labor Department said Tuesday it will provide up to $1 million in planning funds for communities that may lose civilian jobs due to military base closings.

Emily Stover DeRocco, assistant secretary for employment and training administration, sent a letter to state work force agencies outlining federal grants eligible to help communities plan for transition should bases in their areas end up on the final list of closings.

DeRocco said that in past rounds of base closings, "communities which undertook effective and timely planning successfully transitioned from a defense to a non-defense economy."

The Pentagon released its recommendations for closure and **realignment** May 13. An independent commission is now reviewing the list, and may make changes. The list then goes to President Bush before it is sent to Congress for approval.

DeRocco said the Labor Department believes the time between the recommendations and final congressional approval "is the most effective time to plan for the services necessary to assist affected workers and communities."

The letter says the grants should be awarded by June 30, and only communities that would be affected by the Pentagon's recommended list are eligible.

The department recommends that states use the money for training potentially displaced workers, staffing transition efforts, hiring consultants to deal with local agencies and developing long-range goals for economic development.

Though the limit for the first round of grants is $1 million per community, the department says more money will be eligible once Congress has made the final decision, probably in November. DeRocco said the awards will be granted based on the number and size of facilities affected, the potential economic impact and the ability of the work force already in place to deal with the transition.

Sen. John Thune, R-S.D., said the grants would be a "much-needed solace" if South Dakota's Ellsworth Air Force Base remains on the list. The Pentagon recommended the base be closed, moving 411 civilian jobs out of Rapid City.

Thune and lawmakers from other affected states, including Maine, are pushing President Bush and military officials to save their bases.

Republicans from the New York delegation lobbied Bush and adviser Karl Rove aboard Air Force One on Tuesday, asking him to save Niagara Falls Air Reserve Station.

Rep. Sherwood Boehlert said Bush told him: "'You're in the same position I was in in '95, you're making the same case and I hear you, but you've got to make that case to the commission.'"

Maine Sen. Susan Collins, a Republican, threatened Tuesday to subpoena hundreds of documents about proposed base closures after the Defense Department again failed to turn the data over to Congress, the Portland Press Herald reported.

Maine's four-member congressional delegation considers the documents essential for challenging recommendations to close Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery and halve the military contingent at **Brunswick** Naval Air Station. The Pentagon also wants to close a defense accounting center in Limestone.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Navy Secretary Gordon England promised last week to deliver the documents by last Friday. They had not arrived as of Tuesday, the Press Herald said.

In Texas, two members of the congressional delegation said the Army failed to consider 37,600 acres available for training at Fort Hood, Texas, when it recommended removing nearly 8,500 troops from the base by 2011. The Army had based its recommendation on a finding that Fort Hood did not have enough training space.

Democratic Rep. Chet Edwards and Republican Rep. John Carter said they met with Pentagon officials who confirmed the land was not taken into account.

Limits On Filibusters Are Already Pervasive

Christian Science Monitor (Boston, MA)
Gail Russell Chaddock
May 24, 2005

With Congress poised to vote on the so-called nuclear option, one fact has been largely lost amid the debate: Restrictions on the use of filibusters are already in place on a host of matters, from budgets to resolutions granting war powers to the president.

Obviously, the question on the floor this week - judicial appointments - is unique. Democrats are eager to preserve their current ability to stall a vote, especially on nominees to the Supreme Court. And Republicans are just as eager to change the rules so that 51 Senators, rather than 60, can end debate on a nominee.

But the fight over judges is hardly as pure a contest over Senate traditions as many people believe. The use of filibusters to prolong debate, though revered by many as a tool for the Senate minority, has been progressively curtailed in recent years on a host of important issues.

One key reason: A rising belief in official Washington that the only way to get contentious legislation out of Congress is to rein in debate and amendment. The restrictions are also, in part, a holdover from the early 1970s, when a Democratic Congress sought to bolster the power of the legislative branch clout against an "imperial" (and Republican) presidency.

"When we talk about 'unlimited debate' in the Senate, we've already limited that unlimited debate over the last 30 years in a major way," says former Senate parliamentarian Robert Dove, now a professor at George Washington University. "We have on the books probably a couple of hundred laws that set up specific legislative vehicles that cannot be filibustered or only amended in a very restricted way."

Consider some big-ticket items now before Congress on which lawmakers have given up their rights to filibuster.

* The Pentagon's 2006 Base **Realignment** and Closure plan, which proposes closing 180 sites.

* The pending Central American Free Trade Agreement.

* President Bush's proposed $ 70 billion in tax cuts and $ 35 billion in mandatory spending cuts, protected by budget reconciliation.

* Drilling in the Arctic Regional Wildlife Refuge. The years-long effort by Republicans to pass this legislation may finally succeed this year, because this time it is protected from filibuster as part of the budget reconciliation.

The first curbs on extended debate came in 1917, after Congress refused to move to a vote on President Wilson's request to arm the merchant marine. Much of the impetus to rein in the filibuster in the 1960s and '70s came from liberal Democrats, whose main experience with extended debate had been as a hammer by conservative southerners to stop civil rights legislation.

"In the 1960s the word filibuster only meant one thing in the Senate, with very few exceptions," explains Mr. Dove. "Successful filibusters were filibusters against civil rights legislation. And if you were going to create an atmosphere in which civil rights legislation would get through more easily, you needed to change the cloture rule" - the votes needed to end debate.

In 1975, the Senate, led by liberal Democrats, lowered the bar to end debate again, from two-thirds of those present and voting (as many as 67 votes) to 60 votes. Tuesday's expected move, led by GOP conservative, would lower the bar for judicial nominations to a simple majority.

"We're in a year of romanticizing the filibuster, but it's important to remember there has often been a dislike of that tool," says Julian Zelizer, a congressional historian at Boston University.

A tide of self-limitation

In addition to periodically changing its rules for ending debate, Congress has written curbs on extended debate or amendment into specific laws in a bid to make the legislative process more efficient.

Laws that restrict debate include: the War Powers Act, the Budget Act of 1974, the Trade Act of 1974 (and subsequent "fast track" votes on trade), arms export controls, Federal Election Commission regulations, the Alaska Natural Gas Transportation Act of 1976, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (including the choice of Yucca Mountain as a national waste-disposal site), the 1991 act governing military-base closings, US participation in the World Trade Organization, and the Andean Counterdrug Initiative.

One lawmaker's travails

In between negotiating sessions with other moderates over how to avoid changing the filibuster rule, Sen. Susan Collins (R) of Maine has also been worrying about the blow her state is taking from a new round of proposed military-base closings. Earlier this month, the Pentagon proposed closing the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery as well as massive downsizing for the **Brunswick** Naval Air Station, among 180 sites nationwide.

"It's my top priority," she says. "The nation can't have all our bases in the South and Southwest." Yet base closings are one of the many areas where Congress has already waived its right to filibuster or even amend the list, once it is finalized by a base-closing commission.

Pragmatism, or partisanship?

Congress, essentially, has come to realize that some issues are so thorny that the normal congressional process doesn't work. Base closings is such an issue, given that few lawmakers will support shutting bases in their own districts.

Republicans leaders say the same principle applies this week. "We limited the filibuster when the Budget Act was passed, and the dome of the Capitol didn't crumble," says Bob Stevenson, a spokesman for Senate majority leader Bill Frist.

But critics say there's an important distinction: Today's sharp party split. "If you look at these areas that limit the filibuster individually, they had broad bipartisan support," says Ross Baker, a political scientist at Rutgers University in New **Brunswick,** N.J. "This is a change that's being forced through on very narrow, partisan support, and that's a big difference."

Maine-New Hampshire Congressional Delegation Members To Present Case For Maine's Defense Facilities To Brac Commission Chair

US Fed News

May 24, 2005

The office of Sen. Olympia J. Snowe, R-Maine, issued the following press release:

Members of the Maine and New Hampshire Congressional Delegations will meet with Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission Chairman (BRAC) Anthony Principi at a Capitol Hill meeting on Friday, May 27 to underscore their case that the Department of Defense deviated from BRAC criteria and erred in recommending the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard for closure, the **Brunswick** Naval Air Station for **realignment** and the Defense Finance Accounting Service (DFAS). Maine Gov. John Baldacci and New Hampshire Gov. John Lynch have been invited to the meeting.

"The bottom line is clear: these three facilities are a critical component of this nation's national security and homeland defense infrastructure. When the Defense Department releases the data to support its recommendations it will be serve to prove that the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, the **Brunswick** Naval Air Station and the Defense Finance Accounting Service deserve must stay open. As we all know, the Department of Defense erred in its decision to recommend them for closure, but that doesn't mean that the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission has to make the same mistake," said Senators Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins, and Representatives Tom Allen and Mike Michaud. "That is why we are meeting with Commissioner Principi on Friday where we will outline for him - in specific fashion - how the Department of Defense deviated from its own criteria. With this information in hand, he will be able to see for himself and make other BRAC Commissioners aware that Maine's defense infrastructure plays an integral role in protecting our nation."

Members of the joint delegation have yet to receive a response to their May 17 letter to Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld urging the expeditious release of essential data used to justify the recommend list of military facilities for closure.

Local News Articles

Contact BRAC today

Bangor Daily News (Maine)
May 25, 2005

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard is the Navy's designated lead shipyard for submarine overhaul, modernization and repair and holds multiple records for low coast and ahead of schedule performance. It's considered the "best" submarine shipyard in America.

Brunswick Naval Air Station is the only operational airfield on the East Coast equipped to handle the Navy's new P8 (the successor to the Orion P3 currently based there). The base has a new control tower, runway, barracks and a hanger for the P8. It's ready to take on the current needs of the department of defense.

The recommendation from the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission to move our operations from **Brunswick** to a base in Florida means Jacksonville would have to build these facilities. The decision by BRAC to close Portsmouth and realign **Brunswick** makes no logical sense. Strategically, which is what the military should really be focused on, BRAC's recommendations are the worst possible proposals for national security.

Economically, it will be devastating for Maine. Communities will be broken, businesses will close and relationships will be severed. America needs the good will of her people behind our military.

The governor and the congressional delegations from New Hampshire and Maine are fighting for our workers, our economies and our nation by presenting the case to the BRAC commission to keep these facilities open. The governor has made this fight his "top priority."

They understand the importance to the security of the world by keeping these facilities fully operational. Write letters to the BRAC commission at 2521 South Clark St., Suite 600, Arlington, Va. 22202. We need them to understand that their decision will affect the world, not just Maine.

Collins Presses Pentagon For Data;
If Base Closure Documents Aren't Handed Over, Sen. Susan Collins Says She Will Subpoena Them.
Portland Press Herald (Maine)
Bart Jansen
May 25, 2005

U.S. Sen. Susan Collins threatened on Tuesday to subpoena hundreds of documents about proposed military base closures after the Defense Department failed again to turn the data over to Congress. The Maine Republican escalated her rhetoric because the state's congressional delegation considers the documents essential for challenging the Pentagon's recommendations to close the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery and cut the military contingent in half at the **Brunswick** Naval Air Station.

Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and Navy Secretary Gordon England promised last week to deliver the documents by last Friday. They had not arrived as of Tuesday, and a call to the Pentagon seeking an explanation went unanswered.

The documents are important to lawmakers and community activists who are aiming to preserve the bases because members of the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission are scheduled to visit Portsmouth and **Brunswick** next week.

The commission will make the final recommendation on which bases to close.

Collins' subpoena threat is significant because it increases the potential for a confrontation between the legislative and executive branches over what information governing base closures must be released.

Previous attempts by Congress to obtain documents from the White House, on the subject of energy policy, met with resistance that went all the way to the U.S. Supreme Court.

"If necessary, I'm prepared to use the power that I have as chairman of the Homeland Security Committee to subpoena these documents," Collins said. "I hope it won't come to that. It would be very unfortunate if I felt forced to subpoena executive branch documents. But we must have this to make our case."

Sen. Olympia Snowe, R-Maine, said she is drafting legislation to halt this round of military base closures if the Pentagon doesn't produce the documents.

"I think it's a disservice to the people of Maine and the people of this country. It's unconscionable," Snowe said. "We're demanding it. It's a serious issue here. They're not turning over these documents. They're dragging their feet because they can keep the clock ticking."

Under Rumsfeld's recommendations, Portsmouth stands to lose 4,510 jobs as its functions are sent to Norfolk, Va.

Brunswick would lose 2,420 jobs - about half of its military work force - as its planes are moved to Jacksonville, Fla.

Other closures would cost the state 354 jobs at the Defense Finance and Accounting Service in Limestone and seven jobs at the Naval Reserve Center in Bangor.

U.S. Rep. Mike Michaud, a Maine Democrat, submitted his own legislation Tuesday to try to block the closure of the Limestone accounting center.

Nationwide, the Pentagon proposes closing 33 major military bases and realigning hundreds of others.

It was unclear when the Pentagon planned to release the documents, which contain detailed analyses, so-called Cobra studies, of costs and advantages of shifting military people and services from one base to another.

Elected officials from states that are affected by the proposed closings hope to use the documents to poke holes in the Defense Department's rationale and overturn the recommended closings.

Maine's and New Hampshire's congressional delegations are scheduled to meet Friday with Anthony Principi, the chairman of the nine-member commission that is reviewing Rumsfeld's recommendations.

Gov. John Baldacci said Tuesday that he and New Hampshire Gov. John Lynch will attend that meeting.

Baldacci joined Collins and Snowe in condemning the Pentagon's failure to provide the supporting documents in a timely manner, saying the Pentagon has released essential data in "very limited dribs and drabs."

"This really is not a model process," Baldacci said during a news conference at the State House in Augusta. "The flaws have been showing up from the beginning."

The commission must give its final list to President Bush by Sept. 8. Bush and Congress can then either accept or reject the list in its entirety.

Collins said her military aide is visiting the shipyard and is expected to bring back a binder of documentation. But she argued that much more is needed.

"I feel very firmly that the law is crystal clear that we're entitled to all the information - I reviewed the law again this morning - and that it's simply unfair for the Pentagon to be slow in turning this over," Collins said. "I hope that it will be turned over voluntarily, but if it isn't, I'm willing to consider the next step."

Baldacci said he is urging Maine's 148,000 veterans to fight the Maine recommendations by launching a campaign of letters, telephone calls and e-mails.

"We need to attack these base closures on every front," Baldacci said.

Base Closure Reports Awaited;
The State's Congressional Delegation Has Harsh Words For The Pentagon, Which Is Due To Release Documents.
Portland Press Herald (Maine)
Bart Jansen
May 24, 2005

Members of Maine's congressional delegation expect to get more information about proposed military base closures today, but say it isn't soon enough. Lawmakers complained that the Pentagon's slow response will make it harder to contest plans to close Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery and relocate more than 2,400 jobs from **Brunswick** Naval Air Station.

"It's what we call state-of-the-art foot-dragging. It's a regrettable failure," said Sen. Olympia Snowe, R-Maine. "It raises immediately the question about how did you arrive at these conclusions if it's so difficult to turn over this information that was used to make these decisions."

Sen. Susan Collins, R-Maine, a member of the Armed Services Committee, said she expects the Pentagon to release more documents today. If the material is incomplete, she will use her influence to get more information, she said.

"It simply isn't fair and it contradicts the plain letter of the law for the Pentagon to be slow-walking this material," Collins said. "I think the Pentagon will come forth with some additional materials. But I think they will dribble it out, and if they're slow in giving it to us, it makes it tough for us to build the case."

Maine's and New Hampshire's congressional delegations - including Reps. Tom Allen and Mike Michaud, both D-Maine - are scheduled to meet Friday with Anthony Principi, chairman of the nine-member commission that is reviewing Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's recommended base closures.

Principi has said the commission won't rubber-stamp the closure list, so bases could be added or removed. While a commission majority can remove a base from the list, it takes seven members to add a base.

At least two commissioners are scheduled to tour Portsmouth and **Brunswick** on June 2 and 3, and a regional hearing on the recommendations is scheduled for July 6 in Boston. The commission must give its final list to President Bush by Sept. 8. Bush and Congress can then accept or reject the list in its entirety. "We need to be completely prepared," Collins said.

Rumsfeld has proposed closing the shipyard in Kittery and moving half of the active-duty military staff of the **Brunswick** Naval Air Station to Florida. In all, the state stands to lose 7,000 military and civilian jobs.

Pentagon officials promised to provide the supporting documents to the nine-member Base

Realignment and Closure Commission by Friday, but the documents didn't arrive. Elected officials from states that are affected by the proposed closings hope to use the documents to poke holes in the Defense Department's rationale and overturn the recommended closings.

Portsmouth stands to lose 4,510 jobs as its functions are sent to Norfolk, Va. **Brunswick** would lose 2,420 jobs - about half of its work force - as its planes are moved to Jacksonville, Fla. Two other closures would cost the state 354 jobs at the Defense Finance and Accounting Service in Limestone and seven jobs at the Naval Reserve Center in Bangor.

The initial closure list and supporting documentation estimated that the Pentagon would spend $448 million to close the Kittery yard and save $128 million annually within four years. For **Brunswick,** the Navy expects to spend $146 million to realign the base before saving nearly $35 million a year starting in four years.

BRAC: The Red, The Blue And The Absent
Bangor Daily News (Maine)
Todd Benoit
May 21, 2005

Roughly between President Clinton's "Don't ask, don't tell" policy and September 2001, people who notice such things worried about an expanding cultural gap between military and civilian society. Some went so far as to call the gap a chasm, and seemed to be working themselves toward an abyss when the nation entered what became essentially a permanent state of war and the issue collapsed back to merely a gap, and not a very interesting one at that.

Before then, how-ever, the situation was considered serious. Defense Secretary William Cohen summarized in 1997: "One of the challenges for me is to somehow prevent a chasm from developing between the military and civilian worlds, where the civilian world doesn't fully grasp the mission of the military, and the military doesn't understand why the memories of our citizens and civilian policy-makers are so short, or why the criticism is so quick and so unrelenting."

The gap noticers should go back on at least ravine-alert status based on last week's Department of Defense base-closure announcement and, in particular, two maps provided by the **Brunswick** Naval Air Station Task Force in support of its home base. The first, from 1994, shows nine glowing dots representing active-duty military airfields across the Northeast; the second shows a single dot, in **Brunswick,** as of 2005. Eight of the nine are gone and **Brunswick,** though it won't close under the Department of Defense proposal, will be made puny, a base with two airstrips and no airplanes. A parallel BRAC dot, the last naval base in New England, is also scheduled for closure in Groton, Conn., with 8,460 military jobs lost.

You may see a political conspiracy in the Defense proposal sent to the Base **Realignment** and Closure Commission. Blue states, those that went for John Kerry, would lose a total of 28,000 military and civilian jobs through this plan, while red states, those that helped elect George Bush, would gain 15,000. But the losses merely follow the pattern of the BRAC rounds since 1988, during which New England active-duty personnel dropped from 30,600 to 12,700 - Maine lost half its number then, Massachusetts lost three-fourths, according to The Boston Globe. I don't see a conspiracy, but I do see bad policy for the military and for the rest of us.

Strategically, closing bases that have proven themselves over decades and are needed in an uncertain war on terrorism doesn't make sense, as Maine's congressional delegation has spent the week vigorously explaining. Less noticed is that the closure proposal ensures the generalized

military-civilian gap will be felt especially in this specific region because of the continuing reductions. The result of such a decision will be a military that is a mystery for too many of us in blue states who already know too little about it and a military that may become more suspicious of a region it barely inhabits.

This separation didn't begin with BRAC, with the 1990s or even the 1890s. Samuel P. Huntington, in his 1957 book "The Soldier and the State," traced it to post-Civil War. "Withdrawn from the mainstream of American life," he wrote, "realizing that their existence depended upon the probability or at least, the possibility of war, and that war was only likely if human nature contained a substantial streak of cussedness, the military found little in common with the doctrines of optimism and progress. By the turn of the century, when other professions, such as law and the ministry had thoroughly adjusted to the liberal climate, the military were alone in their uncompromising conservatism."

Liberal and conservative can live well together, indeed should live together to live well. This isn't easy, but by doing so, they come to appreciate each other's humanity and, for the most part, good intentions. Diversity may bring dissent, but a home team can count on a unified rooting section not only because, in the military's case, of the economic lift it provides, but because support comes naturally to the proximate.

If a cultural gap between military and civilian life already is a worrisome thing, there can be no advantage in ordering it widened in the areas where the gap may be already most apparent. One of the BRAC criteria asks whether existing and potential community infrastructure can "support forces, missions and personnel." It is a stretch to say community infrastructure includes the civilian knowledge, understanding and empathy for military personnel, but it is a stretch profitably and necessarily made. The military is, after all, overseen by civilians (even those from the Northeast) who must make, as the continued fighting in Iraq shows, life-and-death decisions on a tremendous scale.

The South, broadly, is not only warmer for year-round golf but warmer to an expansive military. A pro-military culture there creates even more comfort than its short-sleeve temperatures, so it wouldn't be surprising that the generals and admirals passing along recommendations to Secretary Rumsfeld, when confronted with a close call on base closure, chose to lean south much more often.

Segregating the military from a large part of the nation it is sworn to protect is clumsy policy, just as it is dangerous policy to segregate civilians from a military they must support, direct and, at some level, trust.

Opinions/ Editorials

Pentagon Invites Strong Reaction By Not Sharing Base-Closing Data; The Military Should Explain Why It Believes Maine's Bases Should Be Targeted.

Portland Press Herald (Maine)
May 26, 2005

It's important that Maine political leaders remain respectful of a base-closing process aimed at making our military stronger, but it's also important that process respects the needs of the politicians.

Right now, there's not a whole lot of respect coming out of the Pentagon.

The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, the Defense Department accounting operation in Limestone and the **Brunswick** Naval Air Station have been recommended to be closed or mothballed. Yet, Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld hasn't provided all the information that was used to make these determinations.

The data are critical to making the case to the Base **Realignment** and Closing Commission that it should revise the Pentagon's list. That the information is not available has been frustrating for Maine's congressional delegation and for Gov. Baldacci.

The problem is that the BRAC wants to give supporters of the Maine bases a hearing on July 6 in Boston. That doesn't leave a lot of time to review the Pentagon's reasons for putting the Maine bases on the list.

Sen. Susan Collins is threatening to use her position as chair of the Homeland Security Committee to subpoena the base-closing information - something that could trigger a separation of powers dispute with the White House. Sen. Olympia Snowe has submitted legislation, supported by Collins and others, to add a day onto the base closing time line for every day the Pentagon waits to release the sought-after data.

These approaches may seem heavy-handed, but in fact the Pentagon is inviting this kind of reaction with its refusal or inability to release the data. It's one thing to say that bases must close for the good of the nation, it's another to say they must close but not explain why.

Presumably the Pentagon knows why it recommended these bases be closed, so it's inexplicable and inexcusable that it won't share the data that led to those conclusions.

Public Interest Survey

SUBMARINE BASE NEW LONDON, CONNECTICUT

TOTAL PUBLIC COMMENTS (AS OF 5/27): 59

Economic Impact on Community: 29

Environment: 5

History: 10

Political Influence: 4

Military Value of Base: 22

**Economic impact and military value were paired as arguments in many comments.

PORTSMOUTH NAVEL SHIPYARD

TOTAL PUBLIC COMMENTS (AS OF 5/27): 22

Economic Impact on Community: 12

*Environmental Impact:*0

*Military Value:*15

Hurricanes: 1

*the military value comments were commonly linked to the bases efficiency standards.

NAVAL AIR STATION BRUNSWICK

TOTAL PUBLIC COMMENTS (AS OF 5/27): 1

Economic Impact on Community: 0

Environmental Impact: 0

Military Value: 1

*Town Capacity to Support:*0

R