DCN: 12376

Motion # 68-4A

DRAFT TECHNICAL CORRECTION
A Motion to Amend
Navy Recommendation 21,
Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, Pennsylvania, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, Pennsylvania,
appearing at Chapter II, Section 68 of the Bill.

Comment [m1]: Needs coord with Navy Team (Mike Delaney)

Deletes deactivation of 111th FW (ANG); establishes an ANG enclave; restricts reserve enclave.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Navy Recommendation 21, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, Pennsylvania, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, Pennsylvania, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language "Deactivate the 111th Fighter Wing (Air National Guard) and relocate assigned A-10 aircraft to the 124th Wing (Air National Guard), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, ID (three primary aircraft authorized); 175th Wing (Air National Guard), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, MD, (three primary aircraft authorized); 127th Wing (Air National Guard), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, MI (three primary aircraft authorized) and retired (six primary aircraft authorized)." and insert in its place "Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG)~~, the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 124th Wing (ANG), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, Idaho, the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 175th Wing (ANG), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, Maryland~~, ~~and the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 127th Wing~~

~~(ANG), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan,~~ to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 124th Wing (ANG), Boise Air Terminal Air Guard Station, Boise, Idaho
- Establish 18 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 175th Wing (ANG), Martin State Airport Air Guard Station, Baltimore, Maryland,
- Establish 24 PAA A-10 aircraft at the 127th Wing (ANG), Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan.

- If the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all personnel allotted to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG), including the unit's Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Pennsylvania Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the commonwealth.",
- that the Commission strike the language "Establish an enclave for the Army Reserve units remaining on or relocating to Willow Grove and the Air National Guard 270th Engineering Installation Squadron." and replace it with "Establish a contiguous enclave for the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) and the 270th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG) sufficient to

support operations of those units, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the former Naval Air Station as a civilian airport. The Army Reserve units not relocated from Willow Grove by this recommendation, as amended, and those relocated to Willow Grove by other recommendations, as amended, will be incorporated into the Armed Forces Reserve Center established by Army Recommendation 82. The property retained under Federal title to construct the AFRC shall be limited to the absolute minimum essential to construct that facility, shall be encompassed within the enclave established by the 111th Fighter Wing (ANG) and the 270th Engineering Installation Squadron (ANG), and shall be sited to minimize interference with the Air Guard enclave and joint civilian use of the former Naval Air Station as a civilian airport.";

- that the Commission defines the authority granted to the Army by the words "retain essential facilities to support activities of the Reserve Components" where they appear in Army Recommendation 82, to be limited to the property necessary to construct AFRC itself. Should the Secretary of the Army determine that access to more property would be beneficial, a joint use agreement should be executed to obtain a tenancy from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

AF

Technical Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation #6 (Chapter 10, Section 179a.)

Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, Maxwell Air Force Base, AL, and Lackland Air Force Base, TX, by relocating Air & Space Information Systems Research and Development & Acquisition to Hanscom Air Force Base, MA.

Commission Action

Struck recommendation as substantially deviating from the Final Selection Criteria 1 and 4 and the Force Structure Plan.

Proposed Report Language

"The Commission's recommendation to strike the Secretary's recommendation to relocate Air & Space Information Systems Research and Development & Acquisition to Hanscom AFB was not intended to preclude the Secretary from transferring personnel from Wright-Patterson AFB, Maxwell AFB and Lackland AFB to Hanscom AFB, who are engaged in research, development, acquisition, test and evaluation (R, D, A, T & E) functions as distinguished from operations sustainment and maintenance functions. The Secretary is free to use his existing authorities to transfer personnel involved in R,D,A, T&E activities to Hanscom AFB to the extent the Secretary deems necessary and compatible with the RDT&E missions currently carried on at that installation."

Rationale

The Commission's deliberations regarding Technical Joint Cross Service Group Recommendation #6, conducted on August 25, 2005, were uncertain and confusing. Led by Admiral Gehman, the dialogue among Commissioners and staff did not focus on the mission of the Air & Space Information Systems Research and Development & Acquisition at Lackland, Wright-Patterson, and Maxwell. Rather, the focus was on the functions performed by the personnel associated with these installations. The Commission subdivided personnel into two categories: 1) those involved in operational sustainment and maintenance of information technology for legacy systems and 2) those involved in R, D, A, T & E. It appears from the dialogue that Commissioner Gehman and other Commissioners intended for personnel in group (1) to remain at their respective bases and personnel in group (2) should be relocated Hanscom. The initial amendment introduced by Commissioner Gehman struck the relocation of these activities from Wright-Patterson and Lackland to Hanscom but allowed the relocation of these activities from Maxwell to Hanscom. Subsequently, pursuant to a second proposed amendment by Admiral Gehman, the Commission voted to strike the Secretary's recommendation entirely. Because both Commissioners and Commission staff intended to relocate RDT&E personnel from the three bases to Hanscom AFB, it would be appropriate for the Commission to clarify this point by affirming the Secretary's discretion to transfer such personnel. Without this language, the Commission would leave the matter in a confused and inconsistent state that could be interpreted by the Secretary as inhibiting his authority to transfer personnel from one or more of these bases should such transfer be necessary to carry out these important functions.

Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2005 10:14 AM

To: Lanman Phillip Lt Col SAF/IEBB; Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB

Cc: Callaghan Michael Ctr SAF/IEBB; Henderson, Robert, COL, OSD-ATL; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Bayert, Nicole, Ms, DoD OGC; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Subject: RE: AF Final Errata

All:

Thanks for the consolidation of errata.

We are reviewing these with GC and Commissioners as we speak - some are possible -some are not - initial comments below - more to come.

- Ref III. # 85 - The ASA facility is covered in #92:

  - ***1. Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO, and Atlantic City Air Guard Station, NJ (AF 25)***

    a. **Realign Otis ANGB, MA**. Distribute the fifteen F-15 aircraft assigned to the 102^{d} Fighter Wing's (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 253^{d} Combat Communications Group, and 267th Communications Squadron will remain in place at Otis, with 104th Fighter Wing at Barnes providing administrative support as the parent wing. An air sovereignty alert (ASA) facility will be constructed at Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA.[1] Firefighter positions from Otis will move to Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA.

[1] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT" and inserted in its place the language "Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA" to reflect the intent of the Commission. Because the air superiority fighter basing in that region was relocated from Otis ANGB to Barnes AGS, the ASA facility must also be relocated to Barnes AGS, rather than to Bradley Field.

- Ref III. # 64 - It is the intent of the Commission to retain the 8 C-130s at Pittsburgh
- Ref II. It is the intent of the Commission to direct the "contiguous enclaves"
- Ref II. # 68 - The sentence "Relocate Armed Forces...Base, FL." will be deleted in it's entirety.

From: Lanman Phillip Lt Col SAF/IEBB
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2005 8:25 AM
To: Henderson, Robert, COL, OSD-ATL; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague,

David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Bayert, Nicole, Ms, DoD OGC; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse
Cc: Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB; Callaghan Michael Ctr SAF/IEBB
Subject: AF Final Errata
Importance: High

Sir, Ma'am,

Please find the AF final errata attached. Call if you have any questions.

Very Respectfully,

// SIGNED //

PHILLIP T. LANMAN, Lt Col, USAF
"Hacker"
SAF/IEBB (BRAC)
phillip.lanman@pentagon.af.mil
703-692-9920 (DSN 222)

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence.

Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Lanman Phillip Lt Col SAF/IEBB
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2005 8:25 AM
To: Henderson, Robert, COL, OSD-ATL; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Bayert, Nicole, Ms, DoD OGC; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse
Cc: Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB; Callaghan Michael Ctr SAF/IEBB
Subject: AF Final Errata
Importance: High
Attachments: Compiled Errata Doc SAF IEBB 1 Sep 05 v3.doc

Sir, Ma'am,

Please find the AF final errata attached. Call if you have any questions.

Very Respectfully,

// SIGNED //

PHILLIP T. LANMAN, Lt Col, USAF
"Hacker"
SAF/IEBB (BRAC)
phillip.lanman@pentagon.af.mil
703-692-9920 (DSN 222)

IEBB Errata Sheet on Commission Recommendation
(1 Sep 05 v3 w/addenda since 28 Aug)

III. CRITICAL

- **Section 85, AF 14 (Bradley/Barnes)**
  Paragraph 3, change "The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission." to read "The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut. An Air Sovereignty Alert facility will be constructed at Barnes AGS MA."
  Justification: Commission moved F-15s to Barnes so it should host the ASA mission.

- **Section 103, AF 35 (Pope)**
  Page 64, Paragraph d, after "Realign Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS)." insert "Distribute the 8 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 911th Airlift Wing (AFRC) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorized (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission."
  Justification: Provides the necessary authority to remove the aircraft from Pittsburgh ARS to be distributed to other units per the intent of the commission.

II. SUBSTANTIVE

- **GENERAL:** The Commission staff placed a boilerplate for "contiguous enclaves" at many installations retaining flying missions. RECOMMENDATION: Commission staff delete all references to "contiguous enclaves" remaining at installations that retain a flying mission.

- **GENERAL:** Throughout ANG recommendations change, "Establish a contiguous enclave for the XXX Fighter wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport." to read, "Establish a contiguous enclave for the XXX Fighter wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport." [NOTE: Occurrences are listed in the table below.]
  Justification: Deleted statement may be misconstrued to oblige the AF or ANG to unintended requirements.

Section	Service Number	Page
68	DON 21	37
81	AF 8	43
95	AF 27	59
101	AF 33	64
103d	AF 35	66
106	AF 39	69
107	AF 40	71
110	AF 44	73
111	AF 45	74

- **Section 68, DON 21 (Willow Grove).**
  Page 35, line 5 change, "Relocate Armed Forces Reserve Center Expeditionary Combat Support manpower to Eglin Air Force Base, FL." **to read:** "Relocate **913th Airlift Wing Headquarters** and Expeditionary Combat Support manpower to Eglin Air Force Base, FL."
  Justification: "913th Airlift Wing Headquarters and Expeditionary Combat Support" was incorrectly translated into **"AFRC" (Air Force Reserve Command)** in the original report.

- **Section 68, DON 21 (Willow Grove).**
  Page 35: Commission is silent on 913th Airlift Wing retirement of C-130s at Willow Grove.
  Change to include: Distribute the C-130E aircraft assigned to the 913th Airlift Wing (AFRC) at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.
  Justification: This is the intent of the Air Force and is needed to support needed programmatic action.

- **Section 80, AF-7 (Kulis).**
  Page 41, line 6: The Commission recommends 3d Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 18 of 42 assigned F-15C/D aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing, Langley Air Force Base, VA and **6 to an Air National Guard unit. Correct to read:** The Commission recommends 3d Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 18 of 42 assigned F-15C/D aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing, Langley Air Force Base, VA and **distribute the remaining 6 PAA to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.**
  Justification: Lambert St Louis (ANG) was sending F-15Cs to Nellis (ANG to AD). With Great Falls now receiving F-15Cs, Air Force can redirect ANG F-15Cs slated for Nellis, from Lambert to Great Falls. The 6 the motion directs the USAF to send to the ANG would be sent to Nellis to balance that change. That keeps AD to AD, and Guard to Guard, one of the Air Force's rules of engagement (as much as possible). Great Falls will still receive 15 F-15s.

- **Section 95, AF-27 (Kellogg)**
  Page 59, paragraph a, add new second sentence between "...Commission." and "Establish a contiguous..." to read, "Firefighters will move to Selfridge in support the A-10s."

- **Section 101, AF-33 (Niagara)**
  Page 62, line 2 change: . . . Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and form an Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve associate wing with the 914th Airlift Wing, **to read:** . . . Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and form an enclave. Air Force Reserve units at Niagara are unaffected by this recommendation.
  Justification: Eight aircraft cannot support an associate wing at Niagara. In order to associate, the reserve C-130 qualified crews would have to be cut in order to assimilate Air National Guard crews that would then require training. An association would only have worked if numbers of aircraft were increased.

- **Section 103, AF-35 (Pope), d. Realign Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS), Pennsylvania.**
  Page 64, delete bolded wording: Establish a contiguous enclave at the Pittsburgh International Air Station (ARS), Pennsylvania sufficient to support continued operations of the reserve station units, **including flight operations,** and compatible with combined use of the civilian airport by

the Air Reserve, Air National Guard and civilian users. **Within that enclave, establish a Regional Joint Readiness Center (RJRC) at the Pittsburgh International Air Station with the mission of providing civil-military operations, homeland security and community-based medical support to the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security National Incident Management Plan and the National Response Plan. The enclave and RJRC will be staffed at the current manning level of the ARS.** The PAA and personnel allocations of Air National Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected by this recommendation.

Change to read (add bolded): Establish a contiguous enclave at the Pittsburgh International Air Station (ARS), Pennsylvania sufficient to support continued operations of the reserve station units compatible with combined use of the civilian airport by the Air Reserve, Air National Guard and civilian users. The PAA and personnel allocations of Air National Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected by this recommendation. **Establish a Reserve Wing HQ element at Langley AFB, VA to provide command and control for current Reserve operations in place and establish a Reserve HQ element at Offutt AFB, NE to provide command and control for one of the largest Reserve medical contingents and for additional programmed Reserve operations expanding in place. Move the 911th AW Aeromedical Squadron to Youngstown-Warren ARS, OH to gain synergy from being co-located with the aircraft needed for training and operational requirements.**

Justification:

Regional Joint Readiness Center (RJRC). This is an Air Force service future mission decision. The establishment of a Regional Joint Readiness Center (RJRC) may not be the best fit for this unit. Additionally, manning will ultimately be a result of the mission this unit ultimately assumes.

Reserve Wing HQ element. Personnel support and command and control is limited when 3 organizations on one base use different channels for approval authority. Establishing Wg HQ at Offutt and Langley will streamline management at these locations and ultimately enhance coordinated access to needed reserve augmentation.

Aeromedical. Youngstown-Warren is an hour and 15 minutes from Pittsburgh. Aero-medical units operate and deploy most efficiently when collocated with supporting aircraft. Supporting aircraft are needed to support monthly and annual training requirements and operational deployment schedules.

Co-locating a Reserve Aeromed with the aircraft limits the number of sorties flown to/from staging base, saving hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Operating a unit with flying requirements as a geographically separated unit is challenging and puts additional ops tempo on all parties.

Page 65, paragraph b, change, "Distribute 42 of the C-130 aircraft assigned..." to read "Distribute 39 of the C-130 aircraft assigned..."

Justification: The only aircraft leaving the Little Rock PAA inventory are those that retire or transfer to BAI. The correct number of those aircraft across all recommendations is 39.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence.

Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Haynes, Anthony R. Brig Gen NGB/CF [Anthony.Haynes@ngb.ang.af.mil]
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 2:48 PM
To: 'david.hague@wso.whs.mil'; 'kenneth.small@wso.whs.mil'
Cc: Ickes II, Charles V. Brig Gen NGB/CF; Heckman, Gary W. - AF VIP; 'Pease Fred SES SAF/IEB'
Subject: Commission report language

David / Ken,

The boilerplate language in at least 20 states that directs manpower remain in place or within the state to assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the state... while well intentioned has significant negative unintended consequences.

If removal of that language is not possible (our preferred solution), we would like to suggest replacing the boilerplate with the following:

... reassign sufficient aircrew and maintenance manpower authorizations to units gaining aircraft from this location. All other personnel assigned to the ___ Wing will remain in place pending assignment of a new federal mission. If no mission becomes available within a reasonable time period, manpower authorizations will be reallocated to the highest priority defense mission available based on current, established procedures.

Thanks for all your hard work on this.

Tony

R. Anthony Haynes, Brig. Gen.

ANG BCEG Assistant

Ph (703) 607-2387

DSN 327-2387

Fax (703) 607-3678

not meant to have personal new fiscal measures most adversely impact

Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 3:42 PM
To: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse
Subject: FW: BRAC Implications for ANG End Strength

Ken FYI. Per our discussion. Here is the view from the Guard folks on some of the issues raised by the bill language. Bottom line is there appears to be no way, short of changing the language, to actually implement BRAC without significant negative implications. The $10B estimate is probably on the low side as it does not include secondary/support costs but only the direct manpower cost. Nor does this input deal with the impact on personnel who may want to move with their unit but now can't. This language appears at present to strip some important protections from individuals involved. More to follow, still too early on if we'll need new COBRAs.

VR, Dave
David L. Johansen, Lt Col, USAF
Chief, Base Realignment & Closure Div
DSN: 222-9510 Comm: (703) 692-9510

-----Original Message-----
From: Fick, Donald Col - ANG-XP
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 2:40 PM
To: Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB; Bartell Dale R SGT MIARNG; Pease Fred SES SAF/IEB
Cc: Ickes Charles BrigGen NGB/CF; Haynes Anthony Brig Gen NGB/CF
Subject: FW: BRAC Implications for ANG End Strength

Dave,

Commission language in motions affecting 21 ANG units, in 20 states, says "This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the [state] Air National Guard." This is being interpreted to mean that even though Primary Aircraft Authorizations, and in some cases base facilities as well, are realigned, the end strength remains in place in the home state. It is unclear how the Air National Guard and Air Force would implement other directives in the BRAC language to stand up or robust units in other locations. The language that implies end strength should remain in state should be removed from the proposed BRAC law.

Courses of Action:

#1 - Take out the language restricting movement of ANG end strength

- allows Air Force and Air National Guard to manage their federal resources to stand up missions as directed
- follows standard programming procedure that has been practiced for the last 50 years

#2 - Leave end strength in state when PAA are moved and fund new/additional end strength in

the robusted or realigned locations

- drives a ~ $10B bill for the Congress to fund over 20 yrs
- exacerbates training pipeline issues already present in force structure realignment

#3 - Move Primary Aircraft Authorizations but do not fund additional end strength requirements for the gaining units
* creates a less capable Air Force by in effect removing additional force structure beyond that retired or realigned in BRAC

* aircraft sit in locations where they cannot be properly maintained
1 insufficient crews available for the aircraft where they are located
* Air Expeditionary Force (AEF) rotations would become unsupportable for the entire AF due to increased personnel tempo

* at same time end strength left behind is un-aligned and under-utilized due to lack of Federal mission

#4 - End strength stays in state but is unfunded
* no Federal funding applied, creates "tiered readiness" similar to the Army National Guard, incapable of timely support of AF missions

* manpower NOT ready to go when called - a hollow force
* states now have taken control of Federal resources without a defined mission
* Future Total Force missions do NOT match up with every state

Example of the problem the current language presents. We understand what the BRAC commission was trying to accomplish and it would work in the case of Indiania but not South Carolina as shown below.

STATE: Indiania Terre Haute loses aircraft. Ft. Wayne goes from 15 to 18 PAA In this case the manpower for the increase to Ft. Wayne can come from Terre Haute, as the language specifies that manpower remains within the state.

STATE: South Carolina McEntire goes from 15 PAA to 24 PAA. There is no provision with the current language to increase their manpower. The jets would go with no end strength to operate or maintain. They would only be funded for their current 15 PAA and would not be able to provide the capability 24 aircraft provide.

As you can see, this is probably not the intent of the BRAC commission.

Hope this helps, good luck on your mission!

Ficko

IEBB Errata Sheet on Commission Recommendation
(31 Aug v3 w/addenda since 28 Aug)

III. CRITICAL

- **GENERAL:** Throughout the ANG recommendations change all "enclave" references to read, "Distribute...place. If the State of XXXX decides to change the organization, composition and location of the XXX [Type] Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force~~, all other personnel allotted to the XXX [Type] Wing will remain in place and~~ it will assume a mission relevant to the security interest of the State of XXX and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to ...mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the ~~Indiana~~ Air National Guard of the United States. The distribution...of the state." **Justification:** The National Guard Bureau must be able to assign the manpower positions commensurate with the mission. [NOTE: Occurrences are listed in the table below.]

Section	Service Number	Page
68	DON 21	36
81	AF 8	43
83	AF 11	46
85	AF 14	47
88	AF 17	49
90	AF 20	52 (a and b)
92	AF 23	55
93	AF 24	56
94	AF 25	57 (a and b)
95	AF 27	59
97	AF 28A	61
106	AF 39	69
107	AF 40	71
110	AF 44	73
111	AF 45	74
116	AF 51	78

- **Section 85, AF 14 (Bradley/Barnes)**
  Paragraph 3, change "The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission." to read "The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut. An Air Sovereignty Alert facility will be constructed at Barnes AGS MA." **Justification:** Commission moved F-15s to Barnes so Barnes logically should host the ASA mission.

- **Section 94, AF 25 (Otis)**
  Page 55, Section a, line 7, change, "...facility will be constructed at Bradley International Airport..." to read, "...facility will be constructed at Barnes Airport Air Guard Station, MA..."
  Justification: Clarity. All aircraft are being removed from Bradley. Barnes will have F-15 aircraft for alert duty.

- **Section 92, AF 23 (Andrews)**
  Page 54, Paragraph d, after "...by relocating the 137th Airlift Wing (ANG) to Tinker Air Force Base and associate with the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR)." insert "The Expeditionary Combat Support elements of the 137th Airlift Wing will remain in place at Will Rogers."
  Justification: This is in line with the DoD recommendation to the commission. The commission amendments did not change the location of the ECS. Moving the ECS to Tinker would significantly increase the cost of the action.

- **Section 100, AF-32 (Cannon)**
  Page 63, paragraph a, delete entire paragraph,
  ~~a. Unless after a review of the strategic situation extant on March 15, 2009, the Secretary of Defense determines not later than April 15, 2009 that there is a continuing need for the installation, **close Cannon Air Force base, NM.** No earlier than April 15, 2009, regardless of the finding of the review, disestablish the 27th Fighter Wing and distribute its aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission.~~

  and replace with language voted on in Commission, as proposed by Mr. Skinner:

  "**Realign Cannon AFB, New Mexico** by disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing and distributing its aircraft to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission; two, after disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing, the Air Force shall establish an enclave at Cannon AFB, NM which enclave shall remain open until Dec 31, 2009, during which time the Secretary of Defense shall seek other missions for possible assignment to Cannon AFB, NM. If the Secretary designates a mission for Cannon AFB during this period, the enclave status would revert to the status appropriate for the designated mission. If the Air Force does not find a mission for Cannon AFB by Dec 31, 2009, Cannon AFB and the enclave shall be closed. Nothing in this directive shall prohibit the State of New Mexico and the Department of Defense from entering into an agreement to close the enclave at Cannon AFB earlier than Dec 31, 2009."
  Justification: Language in the draft Bill is not that which was agreed to and approved in Commission.

- **Section 103, AF 35 (Pope)**
  Page 64, Paragraph d, after "Realign Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS)." insert "Distribute the 8 C-130 aircraft assigned to the 911th Airlift Wing (AFRC) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorized (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission."
  Justification: Provides the necessary authority to remove the aircraft from Pittsburgh ARS to be distributed to other units per the intent of the commission.

- **Section 105, AF 38 (Hector)**
  Issue: Inserts FTF action into the recommendation as part of BRAC (redesignating the 119 FW as UAW Wing) and expanding the MILCON scope of the Armed Force Reserve Center (Section 36, Army 73) to include the UAV ops functions. Is this within the power of the commission to do? Whose MILCON to-do is this? ANG or Army? This insert is inconsistent with Commission's Additional Statement with their Recommendation "to keep the Commission out of business that is purely programmatic"
  Page 68, paragraph 105a, change to read, " Realign Hector International Airport Air Guard Station, ND. ~~With the consent of the State of North Dakota, as expressed in the Governor's August 4th letter to the Commission, and consistent with Air Force plans, the 119th Fighter Wing (ANG) will be redesignated as an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle wing; the Armed Forces Reserve Center planned for construction on Hector Field will be expanded to include sufficient facilities to accommodate at minimum the UAV ground control and intelligence analysis functions and expeditionary combat support elements, including fire, crash and rescue services, of the 119th Wing (ANG), in addition to the units already identified in Army Recommendation 73, **Reserve Component Transformation in North Dakota**; and the Air Force will retain, adapt or construct appropriate facilities on Grand Forks Air Force Base appropriate to launch, recover, maintain and support the Unmanned Aerial Vehicles assigned to the 119th Wing (ANG). The Commission explicitly rejects the language contained in justification to the recommendation by the Secretary of Defense that there will be 'no flying mission backfill' at Hector Field.~~[1]–The wing's expeditionary combat support elements remain in place.

---

[1] By Motion 105-4A, the Commission struck the language the Commission strike the language "The 119th Fighter Wing's F-16s (15 aircraft) retire," and insert in its place "With the consent of the State of North Dakota, as expressed in the Governor's August 4th letter to the Commission, and consistent with Air Force plans, the 119th Fighter Wing (ANG) will be redesignated as an Unmanned Aerial Vehicle wing; the Armed Forces Reserve Center planned for construction on Hector Field will be expanded to include sufficient facilities to accommodate at minimum the UAV ground control and intelligence analysis functions and expeditionary combat support elements, including fire, crash and rescue services, of the 119th Wing (ANG), in addition to the units already identified in Army Recommendation 73, Reserve Component Transformation in North Dakota; and the Air Force will retain, adapt or construct appropriate facilities on Grand Forks Air Force Base appropriate to launch, recover, maintain and support the Unmanned Aerial Vehicles assigned to the 119th Wing (ANG). The Commission explicitly rejects the language contained in justification to the recommendation by the Secretary of Defense that there will be 'no flying mission backfill' at Hector Field."

The Commission also made an additional statement that "This motion, even though it deletes the language "the 119th Fighter Wing's F-16s retire," does not preclude the Air Force from executing the already programmed retirement of the aircraft currently based at Hector Field. All that deletion is intended to do is to ensure flexibility for the Air Force and to keep the Commission out of business that is purely programmatic, outside the realm of the Base Closure Act. If the Air Force isn't permitted to retire those aircraft as programmed, this action wouldn't make any sense."

Establish a contiguous enclave for the 119th Fighter Wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with joint use of the Hector International Airport Air Guard Station ND.

If the State of North Dakota decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 119th Fighter Wing (ANG) to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force it will assume a mission relevant to the security interest of the State of XXX and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.

This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Ohio Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 179th Airlift Wing (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

- **Section 108, AF 41 (Portland)**
  Page 70, Section b, Delete entire section, "...Realign the 142nd Fighter Wing (ANG)..."
  Justification: Clarity. All F-15 aircraft are remaining at Portland per ANG basing slides approved by the Commission.

- **Section 108, AF 41 (Portland)**
  General: The Commission voted on amendment 108-4A (AF 41) and approved the recommendation, as amended, unanimously. The amendment, as written, addresses only paragraph 108a and ignores paragraph 108b (disposition of F-15s). In the aural testimony the language called for striking paragraph b AND amending paragraph a to read as shown in the amendment 108-4A.
  Page 72, Paragraph b, strike entire paragraph, amend paragraph a as stated in the Draft Bill.
  Justification: Commission intended the F-15s to remain and the recommendation as written in the amended bill moves them out of Portland.

- **MEDICAL JOINT CROSS SERVICE GROUP**
- **Section 179, McChord Air Force Base, WA (Med 9)**

  a. Realign McChord Air Force Base, WA, by reorganizing clinical facilities under Madigan Army Medical Center, Fort Lewis, WA. McChord Air Force Base clinical facilities will managed as directed by the Commander, Madigan Army Medical Center.[2]

  Justification: Accuracy: Madigan will manage the clinical facilities and use them to deliver care at the McChord/Lewis Joint base. AF and Army will jointly determine the level of staffing of the combined facilities. There is no need to establish command and control relationships in law.

- **Section 172, San Antonio Regional Medical Center, TX (Med 10)[3]**

  a. Realign Naval Air Station Great Lakes, IL, Sheppard Air Force Base, TX, Naval Medical Center Portsmouth, Naval Medical Center San Diego, CA, by relocating the existing basic and specialty enlisted and officer medical trainingat Sheppard AFB to Fort Sam Houston, TX.

  Justification: Accuracy. The medical officer training at Shepard was included in the transfer and should be specified.

- **Section 103, Pope Air Force Base, NC, Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, PA, and Yeager Air Guard Station, WV (35)**

  a. Realign Pope Air Force Base (Air Force Base), NC. Realign Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina. Distribute the 25 C-130E aircraft assigned to the 43d Air Lift Wing and the 36 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 23d Fighter Group to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

  - Establish 16 PAA C-130H aircraft at Pope Army Air Field, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.
  - Establish 48 PAA A-10 aircraft at Moody Air Force Base, Georgia.

  Transfer real property accountability to the Army. The Air Force will establish an Air Support Operations Group to provide unity of command of Air Force units on Pope Army Air Field, mission execution planning, and management of efficient loadout of Fort Bragg assets.[4]

Deleted: medical
Deleted: functions
Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
Deleted: medical
Deleted: functions
Deleted: be reorganized and relocated as
Formatted: Bullets and Numbering
Deleted: , medical officer training
Deleted: .
Deleted: ; disestablish the 43d Medical Group and establish a medical squadron

---

[2] By Motion 171-4B, the Commission struck the language "**Realign McChord Air Force Base, WA**, by relocating all medical functions to Fort Lewis, WA." and inserted in its place "**Realign McChord Air Force Base, WA**, by reorganizing medical functions under Madigan Army Medical Center, Fort Lewis, WA. McChord Air Force Base medical functions will be reorganized and relocated as directed by the Commander, Madigan Army Medical Center."

[3] By Motion 172-1, the Commission found the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[4] By Motion 103-4D, the Commission struck the text of paragraph "a", which read "**Realign Pope Air Force Base (Air Force Base), NC**. Distribute the 43d Airlift Wing's C-130E aircraft (25 aircraft) to the 314th Airlift Wing, Little Rock Air Force Base, AR; realign the 23d Fighter Group's A-10 aircraft (36 aircraft) to Moody Air Force Base, GA; transfer real property accountability to the Army; disestablish the 43d Medical Group and establish a medical squadron.", and inserted in its place, "**Realign Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina**. Distribute the 25 C-130E aircraft assigned to the 43d Air Lift Wing and the 36 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 23d Fighter Group to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 16 PAA C-130H aircraft at Pope Army Air Field, Fort Bragg, North Carolina.
- Establish 48 PAA A-10 aircraft at Moody Air Force Base, Georgia.

Transfer real property accountability to the Army; disestablish the 43d Medical Group and establish a medical squadron. The Air Force will establish an Air Support Operations Group to provide unity of command of Air Force

Justification: Redundant in that the real property, including the medical facilities are under Bragg's control. The AF and Army will joint staff the facilities and staffing will be jointly determined. No need to determine in law the command and control of the medical organization.

---

units on Pope Army Air Field, mission execution planning, and management of efficient loadout of Fort Bragg assets."

Comments to JCSG Recommendations Affecting AF Installations, Errata to 30 Aug Draft Revised Bill

- **Section 143, Consolidate/Co-locate Active and Reserve Personnel & Recruiting Centers for Army and Air Force (H&SA 33)**
  Page 93, Paragraph b, add the following text changes as highlighted in red below:

  b. Close Buckley Annex and realign the Air Reserve Personnel Center (Buckley Annex), CO, by relocating the Air Reserve Personnel Center to Buckley Air Force Base, Denver CO,[5] relocating the Individual Mobilization Augmentee operational management functions to Robins Air Force Base, GA, and consolidating them with the Air Force Reserve Command at Robins Air Force Base, GA, and relocating remaining tenants on Buckley Annex to Buckley Air Force Base, Denver, CO.

  Justification: These changes to the language are required to completely close the Buckley Annex as was costed in the most recent version of the revised recommendation by the Commission. The actions that close Buckley Annex and move ARPC to Buckley AFB along with the additional tenants at the Annex were captured in COBRA provided to the Commission last week. The proposed language mimics the COBRA analysis.

- **Section 179, Consolidate Air and Space C4ISR Research, Development & Acquisition, Test & Evaluation (Tech 6)**

  Page 120, paragraph a: This Recommendation was cancelled by the BRAC Commission on 25 Aug during the afternoon session. (The vote was 7 to 1 in favor of cancellation). There was a proposal by Commissioner Skinner to modify the amendment to transfer "purely research" personnel, but he then agreed with Commissioner Newton that this small move of personnel (under threshold) could be accomplished outside of BRAC. Commissioner Gehman read the motion to strike:

  > ***"The Secretary of Defense substantially deviated from the final selection criteria 1 and 4, and the force structure plan. The Commission moves to strike this Recommendation and find this consistent with the final selection criteria and force structure plan."***

~~**b. Realign Maxwell Air Force Base, AL, by relocating Air & Space Information Systems Research and Development & Acquisition to Hanscom Air Force Base, MA.**~~[6]

RECOMMENDED LANGUAGE:

179a. (Delete)[204]

Footnote 204:
By motion 179-4a, the Commission struck Recommendation 179a, which read, **"Realign Wright-Patterson Base Ohio, Maxwell AFB, AL and Lackland AFB, TX** by relocating Air And Space Information Systems Research Development and Acquisition to Hanscom AFB, MA".
-**Justification:** These changes to the language are required to document the final direction approved by the Commission during final deliberations and voting as reflected in the Commission transcripts.

---

[6] By Motion 179-4A, the Commission struck the language "~~**Realign Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH, Maxwell Air Force Base, AL, and Lackland Air Force Base, TX**, by relocating Air & Space Information Systems Research and Development & Acquisition to Hanscom Air Force Base, MA.~~" and replaced it with the language "~~**Realign Maxwell Air Force Base, AL**, by relocating Air & Space Information Systems Research and Development & Acquisition to Hanscom Air Force Base, MA.~~"

- **Section 7. Red River Army Depot, Texas (Army 16)**
  Page 3-4, paragraph a, the Draft Commission bill has contradictory information on these two pages. The language requires the relocation of storage and distribution functions from Red River to Oklahoma City while the footnotes say to strike this language--see Red Highlights. Recommend striking the language as the Commission stated in the footnote and transfer the MILCON bill of $40.6M for Tinker AFB from the Red River Army Depot, Texas (Army 16) to the Supply, Storage, and Distribution Management Reconfiguration (S&S 13) Recommendation as identified on page 117 of the Draft Commission Bill.

  a. Realign Red River Army Depot, TX.[7|8] Relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Missiles to Letterkenny Army Depot, PA. Disestablish the supply, storage, and distribution functions for tires, packaged Petroleum, Oil, and Lubricants, and compressed gases. ~~Relocate the storage and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot to the Defense Distribution Depot, Oklahoma City, OK.~~
  Justification: These changes to the language are required to document the final direction approved by the Commission during final deliberations and voting as reflected in the Commission transcripts, and to properly align these relocation costs to the COBRA associated with S&S-13 (page 117) Recommendation.

[7|8] By Motion 7-4A, the Commission struck the language "**Close Red River Army Depot, TX**. Relocate the storage and demilitarization functions of the Munitions Center to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK. Relocate the munitions maintenance functions of the Munitions Center to McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, OK, and Blue Grass Army Depot, KY. Relocate the depot maintenance of Armament and Structural Components, Combat Vehicles, Depot Fleet/Field Support, Engines and Transmissions, Fabrication and Manufacturing, Fire Control Systems and Components, and Other to Anniston Army Depot, AL. Relocate the depot maintenance of Powertrain Components, and Starters/Generators to Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA. Relocate the depot maintenance of Construction Equipment to Anniston Army Depot, AL, and Marine Corps Logistics Base Albany, GA. Relocate the depot maintenance of Tactical Vehicles to Tobyhanna Army Depot, PA and Letterkenny Depot, PA." and replaced it with the language "**Realign Red River Army Depot, TX.**", and struck the language "Relocate the storage and distribution functions and associated inventories of the Defense Distribution Depot to the Defense Distribution Depot, Oklahoma City, OK."

II. SUBSTANTIVE

- **GENERAL:** The Commission staff placed a boilerplate for "contiguous enclaves" at many installations retaining flying missions. RECOMMENDATION: Commission staff delete all references to "contiguous enclaves" remaining at installations that retain a flying mission.

- **GENERAL:** Throughout ANG recommendations change, "Establish a contiguous enclave for the XXX Fighter wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport." to read, "Establish a contiguous enclave for the XXX Fighter wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport." [NOTE: Occurrences are listed in the table below.]
  Justification: Deleted statement may be misconstrued to oblige the AF or ANG to unintended requirements.

Section	Service Number	Page
68	DON 21	37
81	AF 8	43
95	AF 27	59
101	AF 33	64
103d	AF 35	66
106	AF 39	69
107	AF 40	71
110	AF 44	73
111	AF 45	74

- **Section 68, DON 21 (Willow Grove).**
  Page 35, line 5 change, "Relocate Armed Forces Reserve Center Expeditionary Combat Support manpower to Eglin Air Force Base, FL." **to read:** "Relocate **913th Airlift Wing Headquarters** and Expeditionary Combat Support manpower to Eglin Air Force Base, FL."
  Justification: Air Force Reserve provided "**913th Airlift Wing Headquarters** and Expeditionary Combat Support" to Air Force BRAC. That was translated into **"AFRC" (Air Force Reserve Command)** and given to Navy. Navy word search for corrections before original was submitted did a "remove and replace" on AFRC with a "replace all" to change to **"Armed Forces Reserve Center."** The remove and replace changed AFRC to read "Armed Forces Reserve Center."

- **Section 68, DON 21 (Willow Grove).**
  Page 35: Commission is silent on the retirement of the 913th Airlift Wing C-130s at Willow Grove.
  Change to include: Distribute the C-130E aircraft assigned to the 913th Airlift Wing (AFRC) at Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, PA to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Justification: This is the intent of the Air Force and is needed to support needed programmatic action.

- **Section 80, AF-7 (Kulis).**
  Page 41, line 6: The Commission recommends 3d Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 18 of 42 assigned F-15C/D aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing, Langley Air Force Base, VA and **6 to an Air National Guard unit. Correct to read:** The Commission recommends 3d Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 18 of 42 assigned F-15C/D aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing, Langley Air Force Base, VA and **distribute the remaining 6 PAA to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.**
  Justification: Lambert St Louis (ANG) was sending F-15Cs to Nellis (ANG to AD). With Great Falls now receiving F-15Cs, Air Force can redirect ANG F-15Cs slated for Nellis, from Lambert to Great Falls. The 6 the motion directs the USAF to send to the ANG would be sent to Nellis to balance that change. That keeps AD to AD, and Guard to Guard, one of the Air Force's rules of engagement (as much as possible). Great Falls will still receive 15 F-15s.

- **Section 80, AF 7 (Kulis)**
  Page 41, paragraph 80b, delete, "(see Air Force recommendation for Ellsworth Air Force Base and Dyess Air Force Base)"
  Justification: Ellsworth recommendation was stricken.

- **Section 81, AF-14 (Ft Smith)**
  Page 43, line 15, delete last sentence, "The Home Station Training Site moves to Savannah , Georgia."
  Page 43, paragraph 3 (three occurrences), change, "186th" to read "188th"

- **Section 88, AF 16 (Boise)**
  Page 49, remove the sub-bullet:
  - Establish 6 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG), Cheyenne, Wyoming. The 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG) will create an active duty / ANG association at Cheyenne.

  And replace with:
  - "Establish 12 PAA C-130 aircraft at the 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG), Cheyenne, Wyoming. The 153rd Airlift Wing (ANG) will create an active duty / ANG association at Cheyenne.

  Justification: Clarity. Identifies the total number of C-130 aircraft that will be assigned to the associate unit at Cheyenne.

- **Section 95, AF-27 (Kellogg)**
  Page 59, paragraph a, add new second sentence between "...Commission." and "Establish a contiguous..." to read, "Firefighters will move to Selfridge in support the A-10s."

- **Section 101, AF-33 (Niagara)**
  Page 62, line 2 change: . . . Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and form an Air National Guard/Air Force Reserve associate wing with the 914th Airlift

Wing, **to read:** . . . Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements, will remain in place and form an enclave. Air Force Reserve units at Niagara are unaffected by this recommendation.
Justification: Eight aircraft cannot support an associate wing at Niagara. In order to associate, the reserve C-130 qualified crews would have to be cut in order to assimilate Air National Guard crews that would then require training. An association would only have worked if numbers of aircraft were increased.

- **Section 103, AF-35 (Pope)**
  Page 64, section d, line 4: Within that enclave, establish a Regional Joint Readiness Center (RJRC) at the Pittsburgh International Air Station with the mission of providing civil-military operations, homeland security and community-based medical support to the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security National Incident Management Plan and the National Response Plan. The enclave and RJRC will be staffed at the current manning level of the ARS.
  Recommendation: Remove this line from the recommendation.
  Issue: This is an Air Force service future mission decision. The establishment of a Regional Joint Readiness Center (RJRC) may not be the best fit for this unit. Additionally, manning will ultimately be a result of the mission this unit ultimately assumes.

- **Section 103, AF-35 (Pope), "d. Realign Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS), Pennsylvania."**
  Page 64, delete bolded wording: Establish a contiguous enclave at the Pittsburgh International Air Station (ARS), Pennsylvania sufficient to support continued operations of the reserve station units, **including flight operations,** and compatible with combined use of the civilian airport by the Air Reserve, Air National Guard and civilian users. Within that enclave, establish a Regional Joint Readiness Center (RJRC) at the Pittsburgh International Air Station with the mission of providing civil-military operations, homeland security and community-based medical support to the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security National Incident Management Plan and the National Response Plan. **The enclave and RJRC will be staffed at the current manning level of the ARS.** The PAA and personnel allocations of Air National Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected by this recommendation.
  Change to read (add bolded): Establish a contiguous enclave at the Pittsburgh International Air Station (ARS), Pennsylvania sufficient to support continued operations of the reserve station units compatible with combined use of the civilian airport by the Air Reserve, Air National Guard and civilian users. Within that enclave, establish a Regional Joint Readiness Center (RJRC) at the Pittsburgh International Air Station with the mission of providing civil-military operations, homeland security and community-based medical support to the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security National Incident Management Plan and the National Response Plan. The enclave and RJRC will be staffed at the current manning level of the ARS. The PAA and personnel allocations of Air National Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected by this recommendation. **Establish a Reserve Wing HQ element at Langley AFB, VA to provide command and control for current Reserve operations in place and establish a Reserve HQ element at Offutt AFB, NE to provide command and control for one of the largest Reserve medical contingents and**

for additional programmed Reserve operations expanding in place. Move the 911th AW Aeromedical Squadron to Youngstown-Warren ARS, OH to gain synergy from being co-located with the aircraft needed for training and operational requirements.
Justification: Personnel support and command and control is limited when 3 organizations on one base use different channels for approval authority. Establishing Wg HQ at Offutt and Langley will streamline management at these locations and ultimately enhance coordinated access to needed reserve augmentation.

Co-locating a Reserve Aeromed with the aircraft limits the number of sorties flown to/from staging base, saving hundreds of thousands of dollars annually. Operating a unit with flying requirements as a geographically separated unit is challenging and puts additional ops tempo on all parties.

- **Section 108, AF 41 (Portland)**
  Page 70, section a., line 8 change: . . . the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Holloman AFB, NM.
  Correct to read: the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to **Tinker AFB, OK.**
  Justification: Correctness. This unit was never intended to go to Holloman AFB. It was always destined for Tinker AFB, OK.

- **Section 108, AF-41 (Portland)**
  Page 70, section b., line 6 change: The 304th Rescue Squadron (AFR) at Portland is realigned to McChord Air Force Base, WA, with no aircraft involved.
  to read and include in section a, end of the paragraph: The 304th Rescue Squadron (AFR) at Portland is realigned to **Davis Monthan** Air Force Base, AZ, with no aircraft involved
  Justification: This is a reserve squadron that is not part of the 142d Fighter Wing (ANG). Reason to send to Davis Monthan, AZ, is that the 305th Rescue Group, (Air Force Reserve Command) can better incorporate the 304th Rescue Squadron into their mission.

- **Section 108, AF-41 (Portland)**
  Page 70, footnote 123, line 12 change: . . . the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Holloman AFB, NM.
  to read: . . .the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to **Tinker AFB, OK.**
  Justification: Correctness. This unit was never intended to go to Holloman AFB. It was always destined for Tinker AFB, OK.

- **Section 108, AF 41 (Portland)**
  Page 72, paragraph 108a, change, "Operations and maintenance manpower for four PAA aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Holloman AFB, NM." to read, "Operations and maintenance manpower for four PAA aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Tinker AFB OK."
  Justification: Holloman written in error.

- **Section 103, #35 (Pope)**
  Page 65, paragraph 103a, replace, "Air Support Operations Group" with "air mobility operations group."

Justification: Accuracy. An Air Support Operations Group (ASOG) already exists at Pope/Ft Bragg. The mission of the ASOG is to coordinate combat air forces strike missions with ground units and does not assist in mobility and deployment operations. To meet the intent of the commission and address the concern of the commissioners about deploying army units from Ft Bragg, we propose the creation of an air mobility operations group designed by the Air Force, that will coordinate deployment operation planning and implementation.

Page 65, paragraph b, change "Distribute 42 of the C-130 aircraft assigned..." to read "Distribute 39 of the C-130 aircraft assigned..."
Justification: The only aircraft leaving the Little Rock PAA inventory are those that retire or transfer to BAI. The correct number of those aircraft across all recommendations is 39.

- **Section 115, AF 50 (Richmond/Des Moines)**
  Page 2, bullet 2, add sub-bullet to read, "Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 132d Fighter Wing Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station IA (ANG)."
  Justification: Language about Des Moines inconsistent with language in Commission recommendation on Great Falls which establishes 18 PAA unit at 132d Fighter Wing / Des Moines. Des Moines retains F-16s, they are just increasing from 15 to 18 PAA.

- **Section 89-4A, AF 18 (Mt Home, Nellis, Elmendorf)**
  Issue: No reference to the 366 FW's F-16s. Specifies "Distribute **the** F-16 aircraft assigned to the 57th Fighter Wing ..." No specific reference on number F-16s at Nellis like they did with Luke AFB... implies all F-16s Recommend language say "Distribute F-16 aircraft assigned to the 57th Fighter Wing..."
  Page 48, change wording of first sentence: Distribute the F-15C/D aircraft assigned to the 366th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) . . .
  Correct to read (bold indicates insert): Distribute the F-15C/D **and F-16** aircraft assigned to the 366th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) . . .
  Justification: This gives the USAF the ability to add 5 F-16s to Nellis AFB, per original recommendation.

- **Section 105-4A, AF 38 (Hector)**
  Page 2, bullet 2, delete bullet.
  Justification: Language referred to is not part of the actual recommendation (it is part of the "Justification" section in the DOD Report) and is not part of the law.

- **115. Richmond Air Guard Station, VA, and Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station, IA (AF 50)**

  Page 74, section b, change: Distribute the 15 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 132d Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

  Correct to read: Establish an 18 PAA F-16 wing at the 132d Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base

Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Rationale: Meets the intent of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission regarding
  98. Great Falls that established an 18 PAA wing at Des Moines (third sub-bullet).

III. ADMINISTRATIVE

- **Section 81, AF- 8 (Forth Smith/Luke)**
  Page 41, para a, line 13-15, strike, "Establish a contiguous enclave...Georgia."
  Justification: Language written as a direct result of the base previously being recommended as an enclave.

- **Section 81, AF 8 (Fort Smith/Luke)**
  Page 41, para a, line 16-24, strike, "If the State of Arkansas decides...to the emerging mission."
  Justification: Language written as a direct result of the base previously being recommended as an enclave.

- **Section 89, AF 18 (Mountain Home/Nellis/Elmendorf)**
  Page 1, section a., sub-bullet 2, change, "Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 169th Fighter Wing (ANG), McEntire Air Guard Station, South Carolina.
  " to read, " Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft ANG/active duty association at the 169th Fighter Wing (ANG), McEntire Air Guard Station, South Carolina."
  Justification: Mission better suited as an association.

- **Section 92, AF-23 (Will Rogers AGS, OK)**
  Page52, para d, Replace "by relocating the 137th Airlift Wing (ANG) to Tinker Air Force Base and associate with the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR)" to read "by relocating the 137th Airlift Wing (ANG) including the Aeromedical Squadron and the Aerial Port Squadron to Tinker Air Force Base and associate with the 507th Air Refueling Wing (AFR)"
  Justification: Both the Aeromedical Squadron and the Aerial Port Squadron must have aircraft to train on to maintain proficiency. C-21s at Will Rogers are not adequate for this training.

- **Section 94, AF- 25 (Otis ANGB/Lambert/Atlantic City)**
  Page 55, para b, line 5, add new 2nd sentence to read, "...Commission. The 131st Fighter Wing Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place."
  Justification: Language allows for previously intended recommendation enclave composition and maintains consistency of language written with other Air National Guard stations identified as enclaves. Corrects the 157th to 131st.

- **Section 94, AF- 25 (Otis ANGB/Lambert/Atlantic City)**
  Page 55, para a, line 7, change, "...constructed at Bradley International..." **to read,** "...constructed at Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA."

Justification: Commission moved F-15s to Barnes so Barnes logically should host the ASA mission.

- **Section 98, AF 30 (Great Falls AGS)**
  Page 60, para a, line 12, strike sentence, "The wing's expeditionary...remain in place."
  Justification: Language written as a direct result of the base previously being recommended as an enclave.

- **Section 108, AF 41 (Portland AGS)**
  Page 70, para b [as amended with above], strike the paragraph
  Justification: Commission voted to amend DoD's recommendation for the 177th Fighter Wing (ANG), Air Guard Station, Portland, OR, from enclave status to maintain its 15 PAA F-15C aircraft operations.

- **Section 104, AF-37 (Grand Forks)**
  Page 3, line 2, change, 184th to 190th

- **Section 115, AF-51 (Fairchild)**
  Page 2, first bullet, first sub-bullet, change to read, "establish the 141st Air Refueling Wing as an associate flying wing of the 92nd Air Refueling Wing, Fairchild AFB, Washington, with the ~~92nd~~ 141st Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary..."

- **Section 102, AF 34 (Schenectady)**
  Page 62, Paragraph a, replace "Establish 10 Primary Authorized Aircraft (PAA) (L)C-130H at the 109th Airlift Wing (ANG), Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, NY." with "Establish 6 Primary Authorized Aircraft (PAA) LC-130H, and 4 Primary Authorized Aircraft (PAA) C-130H at the 109th Airlift Wing (ANG), Schenectady County Airport Air Guard Station, NY. Additional LC-130 aircraft that are funded by federal agencies other than DoD are not affected by this recommendation."
  Justification: Clarifies total number of C-130 and LC-130 aircraft assigned at Schenectady.

- **Section 81-4A, AF 8 (Fort Smith/Luke)**
  Page 1, bullet 2, sub-bullet 1, change, "...37 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 56th Fighter Wing at Luke..." to read, "37 of the F-16 aircraft assigned to the 56th Fighter Wing at Luke..."
  Justification: Clarity. Luke/56 FW has more than 37 active duty F-16 aircraft assigned.

- **Section 81-4A, AF 8 (Fort Smith/Luke)**
  Page 2, bullet 2 (throughout), change all references to the "186th Fighter Wing" to "188th Fighter Wing."
  Justification: Correctness.

- **Section 88-4A, AF 16 (Boise)**
  Page 2, line 1, change, "...Mississippi..." to read, "Idaho."
  Page 1, bullet 2, sub-bullet 1, add new last sentence so bullet reads, "...The 153d Airlift Wing (ANG) will create an active duty / ANG association at Cheyenne. The Air Force will programmatically assign additional aircraft to create the association."

- **Section 103, AF 35 (Pope)**
  Page 64, Paragraph d, replace "**Realign Pope Air Force Base (Air Force Base), NC. Realign Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina.**" with "**Realign Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina.**"
  Justification: Removes extra words.

- **Section 107-4A, AF 40 (Springfield Beckley)**
  Throughout change, "132d Fighter Wing" to "178th Fighter Wing."

- **Section 98-4A, AF 30 (Great Falls)**
  Pages 1 and 2, sub-bullets, change, "...Wing..." to "...Fighter Wing..."

  Page 1, sub-bullet 1, change, "Great Fall" to "Great Falls"

- **Section 96, AF 28 (Duluth)**
  Page 1, bullet 2, make last sentence into sub-bullet,
  - "Establish 15 PAA F-16 ...Air Guard Station."

  Justification: Consistent with other recommendations.

- **Section 99, AF 31 (Reno)**
  Page 60, Paragraph a, change "Distribute" to "Maintain"
  Justification: The number of aircraft assigned to Reno does not change.

- **Section 98. Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT (AF 30)**
  Page 60, throughout section, change: include "Fighter" between wing number and wing
  Correct to read: 120th Fighter Wing; 187th Fighter Wing; 132d Fighter Wing
  Rationale: Correctness.

- **Section 98. Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, MT (AF 30)**
  Page 60, first bullet, change: . . .Great Fall International . . .
  Correct to read: . . .Great **Falls** International

- **Section 107. Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH (AF 40)**
  Page 68, throughout section change: "132d Fighter Wing" to "178th Fighter Wing"

- **Section 128. Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, OH (AF 40)**
  a. Realign Moody Air Force Base, GA
  Page 81, line 8, change (error bolded): . . . Introduction to Fighter **Fundaments** Training for Instructor Pilots . . .
  Correct to read: . . . Fundamen**tals** . . .

Air National Guard Administrative

- **Section 81, AF- 8 (Forth Smith/Luke)**
  Page 41, para a, line 26, change, "...186th..." to read, "188th."
  Justification: Accuracy.

- **Section 89, AF- 18 (Mountain Home AFB/Nellis AFB/Elmendorf AFB)**
  Page 48, para a, line 2, strike, "(ANG)"
  Page 48, para a, bullet 1, change, "...the 125th Wing (ANG),..." **to read,** "...the 125th Fighter Wing (ANG),..."
  Page 48, para b, line 2, strike, "(ANG)"
  Justification [All]: Accuracy.

- **Section 90, AF 20 (Capital - Hulman)**
  Page 49, section a., sub-bullet 1, change, "183d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport..." to read "122d Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport..."
  Justification: Correctness.

- **Section 96, AF 31 (Duluth)**
  Page 58, para a, Change, "Establish 8 PAA C-130 Aircraft...." To read " Maintain 8 PAA C-130 Aircraft....."
  Justification: The number of aircraft assigned to Duluth does not change.

- **Section 98, AF 30 (Great Falls)**
  Page 60, para a, line 2, Change, "120th Wing" To read " 120th Fighter Wing"
  Page 60, para a, bullet 1, Change, "120th Wing" To read " 120th Fighter Wing"
  Page 60, para a, bullet 2, Change, "187th Wing" To read " 187th Fighter Wing"
  Page 60, para a, bullet 3, Change, "132d Wing" To read " 132d Fighter Wing"
  Justification: Correctness

- **Section 103, AF 35 (Pope AFB, NC ....)**
  Page 63, Main Heading, Change, "35" to read "AF 35"
  Justification: Consistency

- **Section 103, AF 35 (Pope AFB, NC ....)**
  Page 63, para a, line 2, Change, "43d Air Lift Wing" To read " 43d Airlift Wing"
  Justification: Correctness
  Page 64, Sub-Heading c, Bullet 1, Change, "Establish 8 PAA C-130 Aircraft ....." to read "Maintain 8 PAA C-130 Aircraft ....."
  Justification: The number of aircraft assigned to Yeager does not change.

- **Section 104, AF 37 (Grand Forks)**
  Page 66, paragraph b, line 6, change, "The 184th Air Refueling Wing ...." to read "The 190th Air refueling Wing....."
  Justification: Accuracy of disposition of KC135E model aircraft.

- **Section 110, AF 44 (Nashville, TN)**
  Page 71, Bullet 1, Change, "Establish 8 PAA C-130 Aircraft ...." To read "Maintain 8 PAA C-130 Aircraft....."
  Justification: The number of aircraft assigned to Greater Peoria does not change.
  Page 71, Bullet 2, Change, "Establish 8 PAA C-130 Aircraft ...." To read "Maintain 8 PAA C-130 Aircraft....."
  Justification: The number of aircraft assigned to Louisville does not change.

- **Section 116, AF 51 (Fairchild)**
  Page 75, paragraph a, line 15, change, " ...., with the 92d's Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support....." to read "....., with the 141st Air Refueling Wing's Expeditionary Combat Support...."
  Justification: Accuracy of disposition of 141st ARW ECS assets..

Frank, David, Dan - below are my initial reactions. 8/29/ @1:1
Where a ? appears, I'd need more time to review.
In the interim, I'd appreciate your recms
Charlie

IEBB Errata Sheet on Commission Recommendation

I. ADMINISTRATIVE

- **Section 102-4A, AF 34 (Schenectady)**
  Page 1, bullet 2, change, "Establish 10 Primary Authorized Aircraft…" to read "Maintain 10 Primary Authorized Aircraft…" OK

- **Section 81-4A, AF 8 (Fort Smith/Luke)**
  Page 1, bullet 2, sub-bullet 1, change, "...37 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 56th Fighter Wing at Luke…" to read, "37 of the F-16 aircraft assigned to the 56th Fighter Wing at Luke…" OK
  Justification: Clarity. Luke/56 FW has more than 37 active duty F-16 aircraft assigned.

- **Section 81-4A, AF 8 (Fort Smith/Luke)**
  Page 2, bullet 2 (throughout), change all references to the "186th Fighter Wing" to "188th Fighter Wing." OK
  Justification: Correctness.

- **Section 88-4A, AF 16 (Boise)**
  Page 2, line 1, change, "...Mississippi..." to read, "Idaho."
  Page 1, bullet 2, sub-bullet 1, add new last sentence so bullet reads, "...The 153d Airlift Wing (ANG) will create an active duty / ANG association at Cheyenne. The Air Force will programmatically assign additional aircraft to create the association." ?

- **Section 107-4A, AF 40 (Springfield Beckley)**
  Throughout change, "132d Fighter Wing" to "178th Fighter Wing." ?

- **Section 98-4A, AF 30 (Great Falls)**
  Pages 1 and 2, sub-bullets, change, "...Wing..." to "...Fighter Wing..." OK

  Page 1, sub-bullet 1, change, "Great Fall" to "Great Falls" OK

- **Section 96, AF 28 (Duluth)**
  Page 1, bullet 2, make last sentence into sub-bullet,
  - "Establish 15 PAA F-16 ...Air Guard Station." ?

  Justification: Consistent with other recommendations.

II. SUBSTANTIVE

- **GENERAL:** The Commission staff placed a boilerplate for "contiguous enclaves" at many installations retaining flying missions. RECOMMENDATION: Commission staff delete all sentences for "contiguous enclaves" to remain at installations with flying missions. No
- **GENERAL:** Throughout ANG recommendations change, "Establish a contiguous enclave for the XXX Fighter wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including

flight operations, compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport." to read, "Establish a contiguous enclave for the XXX Fighter wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport." **Justification:** Deleted statement may be misconstrued to oblige the AF or ANG to unintended requirements. OK

- **Section 108-4A, AF 41 (Portland)**
  Page 1, bullet 2, change, "Operations and maintenance manpower for four PAA aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Holloman AFB, NM." to read, "Operations and maintenance manpower for four PAA aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Tinker AFB OK."
  Justification: Holloman written in error. If correct, OK

- **Section 103-4D ARMY 35 (Ft Bragg)**
  Page 2, bullet 3 replace, "Air Support Operations Group" with "air mobility operations group."
  Justification: Accuracy.
  (Note from Cirillo: Be careful here – Adm G and Gen H want more than mobility support they want some unit to run all air operations) Be guided by Adm G and Gen H. NO.

Section 115-4A, AF 50 (Richmond/Des Moines)

Page 2, bullet 2, add sub-bullet to read, "Establish 18 PAA f-16 aircraft at the 132d Fighter Wing Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station IA (ANG)."
Justification: Language about Des Moines inconsistent with language in Commission recommendation on Great Falls which establishes 18 PAA unit at 132d Fighter Wing / Des Moines. Des Moines retains F-16s, they are just increasing from 15 to 18 PAA. ?

- **Section 89-4A, AF 18 (Mt Home, Nellis, Elmendorf)**
  Issue: No reference to the 366 FW's F-16s. Is intent to keep F-16s at Mt Home, or oversight? ?

  Issue: Specifies "Distribute **the** F-16 aircraft assigned to the 57th Fighter Wing ..." No specific reference on number F-16s at Nellis like they did with Luke AFB... implies all F-16s Recommend language say "Distribute F-16 aircraft assigned to the 57th Fighter Wing..." OK

- **Section 105-4A, AF 38 (Hector)**
  Page 2, bullet 2, delete bullet.
  Justification: Language referred to is not part of the actual recommendation (it is part of the "Justification" section in the DOD Report) and is not part of the law. ?

III. CRITICAL

- **GENERAL:** Throughout the ANG recommendations change all references to read, "Distribute...place. If the State of XXXX decides to change the organization, composition

and location of the XXX [Type] Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force~~, all other personnel allotted to the XXX [Type] Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interest of the State of XXX and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force~~, including but not limited to ...mission. This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the ~~Indiana~~ Air National Guard of the United States. The distribution...of the state." **Justification:** The National Guard Bureau must be able to assign the manpower positions commensurate with the mission. **(Cirillo Note: OBVIOUSLY A MAJOR ISSUE NEEDING RESOLUTION)**

Need to be consistent with intent of Commissioners intent. Davis Language to apply.

- **Section 103-4D ARMY 35 (Ft Bragg)**
  Page 2 bullet 3, replace, "The Air Force will provide sufficient permanent flying assets to ensure satisfaction of XVIII Airborne Corp, 82d Airborne Division, and other units based at Fort Bragg" with "The Air Force, through established airlift tasking processes of USTRANSCOM and the Joint Airborne/Air Transportability Training (JA/ATT) program, will provide sufficient airlift support to the XVIII Airborne Corp, 82d Airborne Division, and other units based at Fort Bragg."
  Justification: Accuracy. Clarifies that airlift requirements shall be met with fly-in assets, and assets based at Pope, per established joint mobility processes. Current wording implies that the Air Force will base airlift assets at Ft Bragg to provide Ft Bragg with complete organic lift capability. This mandate, as currently written, would require basing strategic lift (C-17, C-5) assets, in addition to tactical lift (C-130) assets at Pope Army Airfield.
  (Cirillo Note: Again be careful – these changes must be run through Commissioners Hill, Newton and Gehman)

Again. Run these 3 Comm's tomorrow

- **Section 103-4D, AF 35 (Pope)**
  Page 2, bullet 5
  After "Realign Pittsburgh International Airport (IAP) Air Reserve Station (ARS), Pennsylvania." Insert "Distribute 8 C-130 aircraft assigned to Pittsburgh IAP ARS, Pennsylvania to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission."
  Justification: Wording consistent with other recommendations where aircraft are removed and an enclave is created.

I believe this to be Commissioners intent.

- **Section 108-4A, AF 41 (Portland)**
  General: The Commission voted on amendment 108-4A (AF 41) and approved the recommendation, as amended, unanimously. The amendment, addresses only paragraph 108a and ignores paragraph 108b (disposition of F-15s). For the original recommendation see page 40 of 88, Section 108, in the "Bill." The approved recommendation, as amended, is the amended paragraph a and the original paragraph b which realigns the fighter wing by "distributing its F-15 aircraft to the 177th Fighter Wing (ANG) Atlantic City NJ (six aircraft) and the 159th Fighter Wing (ANG), New Orleans ARS LA (nine aircraft..."
  RECOMMENDATION: Commission amend motion 108-4A, page 1, bullet 1 delete the first 9 lines to "...Vandenburg Air Force Base, CA." and add a new first sentence to read, "that the Commission strike the text of the entire recommendation". **(Cirillo note: Looks like a vote required here?)**

?

- **Section 85-4A, AF 14 (Bradley/Barnes)**
  Page 2, sub-bullet 2, change "The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission." to read "The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut. An Air Sovereignty Alert facility will be constructed at Barnes AGS MA."
  Justification: Commission moved F-15s to Barnes so Barnes logically should host the ASA mission. **(Cirillo note: Revote need?)**

  No. Can't do of BRAC

- **Section 113-2, AF 47 (Hill)**
  Issue: Strikes entire Hill recommendation.
  - Where is replacement motion to move F-16s to Homestead/Carswell consistent w/ Commission charts for AFRC F-16s?
  - Are LANTIRN and F110 CIRFs now included elsewhere, or are they also struck? ?

  Impact:
  - F-16 SQ sizes at Homestead/Carswell
  - LANTIRN CIRF does not happen
  - F-110 CIRF does not happen

  Recommendation: Commission clarify intent on Homestead/Carswell and add LANTIRN and F110 CIRF language under "technical corrections" authority.

- **Section 105-4A, AF 38 (Hector)**
  Issue: Inserts FTF action into the recommendation as part of BRAC (redesignating the 119 FW as UAW Wing) and expanding the MILCON scope of the Armed Force Reserve Center (Section 36, Army 73) to include the UAV ops functions. Whose MILCON to-do is this? ANG or Army? This insert is inconsistent with Commission's Additional Statement with their Recommendation "to keep the Commission out of business that is purely programmatic" ?

Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 7:49 PM
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: FW: ANG RECOMMENDATIONS

Andy -- two more recommendations to add the blurb to: 90 and 92. Thks. David

---

From: Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Wednesday, August 31, 2005 7:45 PM
To: Napoli, Andrew, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hill, Christine, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: ANG RECOMMENDATIONS

Andy -- The blurb below needs to go in the findings for recommendation 68, 81, 83, 85, 88, 93, 97, 101, 106, 107, 110, 111, 115, and 116.

This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenace personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence.

On Oceana -- we will make a change to the recommendation and add a footnote to it first thing tomorrow.

David

Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB

Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2005 2:46 PM

To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Cc: Callaghan Michael Ctr SAF/IEBB; Henderson, Robert, COL, OSD-ATL; Bayert, Nicole, Ms, DoD OGC; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Flinn, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Lanman Phillip Lt Col SAF/IEBB; Potochney, Peter, Mr, OSD-ATL; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Saxon, Ethan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Desiderio, John, Mr, OSD-ATL

Subject: RE: AF Final Errata

Sir, copy.

On Little Rock the correct number for the DoD recommendation is 18.

Regarding Pittsburgh, we may be missing something but our review of the transcripts show the C-130 Bases (AFRES) slide shows Pittsburgh to have "0" aircraft. The transcript leaves the aircraft at Yeager but establishes an enclave at Pittsburgh. We read the statement that the ANG PAA and personnel allocations remaining unchanged to refer to the KC-135s at the Pittsburgh AGS. We had similar language in our recommendation to make it clear that we were talking about the right component at co-located locations.

If 8 C-130s go back into Pittsburgh you'll have to tell us what the intent of the commission is on where the 8 that go to Pope (as part of the 16 PAA total) should come from. We'll need to source the 8 C-130s from another AFRES unit. We understand that the intent of the commission is to maintain the same proportionality between the AD/ANG/AFRES. To keep the same proportionality they should come from AFRES.

Also, we ran our COBRA on the understanding that there would be an 16 PAA AFRC/AD associate unit at Pope AFB. We'll need to run another cobra with this change. We'll need the answers to the issues above to do that.

VR, Dave
David L. Johansen, Lt Col, USAF
Chief, Base Realignment & Closure Div
DSN: 222-9510 Comm: (703) 692-9510

-----Original Message-----
From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2005 12:31 PM
To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Lanman Phillip Lt Col SAF/IEBB; Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB; Potochney, Peter, Mr, OSD-ATL; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Saxon, Ethan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Cc: Callaghan Michael Ctr SAF/IEBB; Henderson, Robert, COL, OSD-ATL; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Bayert, Nicole, Ms, DoD OGC; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Flinn, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: AF Final Errata

...and the rest:

- back to III. # 103 (not 64 as noted below) - A review of the Transcript and Motion verified that the Reserve C-130s stayed in place at Pittsburgh - the intent is as stated below and will be clarified in the "Findings".

- Ref II. # 80 and # 95 - Commission intent is as stated.
- Ref II. # 101 - action fixed
- Ref II. # 103 - Actions regarding Res HQ Unit and Aero medical are being considered as Findings comments by Commissioners during review
- Ref II. # 103 (p. 65) - As requested, we corrected the 42 C-130s to the stated 39. Our 42 included the 3 ea C-130Js that moved to Quonset and the Channel Islands.

One further note - In our Guard Lay-Down plan for C-130s at Little Rock we showed the Air Force numbers would have left 18 but the Commission only left 9. Upon further review, it appears the Air Force would have left 14 vice the 18 used. Please comment as to the correct number.

In addition - here is the ANG FTF language - inserted as noted:

...insert this language into the end of the "Commission Findings" for each of the 16 indicated Recommendation Sections:

68, 81, 83, 85, 88, 90, 92, 93, 97, 101, 106, 107, 110, 111, 115, and 116

"This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence."

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2005 10:14 AM
To: Lanman Phillip Lt Col SAF/IEBB; Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB
Cc: Callaghan Michael Ctr SAF/IEBB; Henderson, Robert, COL, OSD-ATL; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Bayert, Nicole, Ms, DoD OGC; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: AF Final Errata

All:

Thanks for the consolidation of errata.

We are reviewing these with GC and Commissioners as we speak - some are possible -some are not - initial comments below - more to come.

- Ref III. # 85 - The ASA facility is covered in #92:

  - ***1. Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO, and Atlantic City Air Guard Station, NJ (AF 25)***

a. **Realign Otis ANGB, MA**. Distribute the fifteen F-15 aircraft assigned to the 102d Fighter Wing's (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 253d Combat Communications Group, and 267th Communications Squadron will remain in place at Otis, with 104th Fighter Wing at Barnes providing administrative support as the parent wing. An air sovereignty alert (ASA) facility will be constructed at Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA.[1] Firefighter positions from Otis will move to Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA.

---

[1] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT" and inserted in its place the language "Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA" to reflect the intent of the Commission. Because the air superiority fighter basing in that region was relocated from Otis ANGB to Barnes AGS, the ASA facility must also be relocated to Barnes AGS, rather than to Bradley Field.

- Ref III. # 64 - It is the intent of the Commission to retain the 8 C-130s at Pittsburgh
- Ref II. It is the intent of the Commission to direct the "contiguous enclaves"
- Ref II. # 68 - The sentence "Relocate Armed Forces...Base, FL." will be deleted in it's entirety.

From: Lanman Phillip Lt Col SAF/IEBB
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2005 8:25 AM
To: Henderson, Robert, COL, OSD-ATL; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Bayert, Nicole, Ms, DoD OGC; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse
Cc: Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB; Callaghan Michael Ctr SAF/IEBB
Subject: AF Final Errata
Importance: High

Sir, Ma'am,

Please find the AF final errata attached. Call if you have any questions.

Very Respectfully,

// SIGNED //

PHILLIP T. LANMAN, Lt Col, USAF
"Hacker"
SAF/IEBB (BRAC)
phillip.lanman@pentagon.af.mil
703-692-9920 (DSN 222)

IEBB Errata Sheet on Commission Recommendation

I. ADMINISTRATIVE

- **Section 102-4A, AF 34 (Schenectady)**
  Page 1, bullet 2, change, "Establish 10 Primary Authorized Aircraft…" to read "Maintain 10 Primary Authorized Aircraft…"

- **Section 81-4A, AF 8 (Fort Smith/Luke)**
  Page 1, bullet 2, sub-bullet 1, change, "...37 F-16 aircraft assigned to the 56th Fighter Wing at Luke…" to read, "37 of the F-16 aircraft assigned to the 56th Fighter Wing at Luke…"
  Justification: Clarity. Luke/56 FW has more than 37 active duty F-16 aircraft assigned.

- **Section 81-4A, AF 8 (Fort Smith/Luke)**
  Page 2, bullet 2 (throughout), change all references to the "186th Fighter Wing" to "188th Fighter Wing."
  Justification: Correctness.

- **Section 88-4A, AF 16 (Boise)**
  Page 2, line 1, change, "...Mississippi..." to read, "Idaho."
  Page 1, bullet 2, sub-bullet 1, add new last sentence so bullet reads, "...The 153d Airlift Wing (ANG) will create an active duty / ANG association at Cheyenne. The Air Force will programmatically assign additional aircraft to create the association."

- **Section 107-4A, AF 40 (Springfield Beckley)**
  Throughout change, "132d Fighter Wing" to "178th Fighter Wing."

- **Section 98-4A, AF 30 (Great Falls)**
  Pages 1 and 2, sub-bullets, change, "...Wing..." to "...Fighter Wing..."

  Page 1, sub-bullet 1, change, "Great Fall" to "Great Falls"

- **Section 96, AF 28 (Duluth)**
  Page 1, bullet 2, make last sentence into sub-bullet,
  - "Establish 15 PAA F-16 ...Air Guard Station."

  Justification: Consistent with other recommendations.

II. SUBSTANTIVE

- **GENERAL:** The Commission staff placed a boilerplate for "contiguous enclaves" at many installations retaining flying missions. RECOMMENDATION: Commission staff delete all sentences for "contiguous enclaves" to remain at installations with flying missions.
- **GENERAL:** Throughout ANG recommendations change, "Establish a contiguous enclave for the XXX Fighter wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit, including

flight operations, compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport." to read, "Establish a contiguous enclave for the XXX Fighter wing (ANG) sufficient to support operations of that unit compatible with joint use of the Air Guard Station as a civilian airport." **Justification:** Deleted statement may be misconstrued to oblige the AF or ANG to unintended requirements.

- **Section 108-4A, AF 41 (Portland)**
  Page 1, bullet 2, change, "Operations and maintenance manpower for four PAA aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Holloman AFB, NM." to read, "Operations and maintenance manpower for four PAA aircraft from the 939th Air Refueling Wing will realign to Tinker AFB OK."
  Justification: Holloman written in error.

- **Section 103-4D ARMY 35 (Ft Bragg)**
  Page 2, bullet 3 replace, "Air Support Operations Group" with "air mobility operations group."
  Justification: Accuracy.
  (Note from Cirillo: Be careful here – Adm G and Gen H want more than mobility support they want some unit to run all air operations)

Section 115-4A, AF 50 (Richmond/Des Moines)

Page 2, bullet 2, add sub-bullet to read, "Establish 18 PAA f-16 aircraft at the 132d Fighter Wing Des Moines International Airport Air Guard Station IA (ANG)."
Justification: Language about Des Moines inconsistent with language in Commission recommendation on Great Falls which establishes 18 PAA unit at 132d Fighter Wing / Des Moines. Des Moines retains F-16s, they are just increasing from 15 to 18 PAA.

- **Section 89-4A, AF 18 (Mt Home, Nellis, Elmendorf)**
  Issue: No reference to the 366 FW's F-16s. Is intent to keep F-16s at Mt Home, or oversight?

  Issue: Specifies "Distribute **the** F-16 aircraft assigned to the 57th Fighter Wing ..." No specific reference on number F-16s at Nellis like they did with Luke AFB... implies all F-16s Recommend language say "Distribute F-16 aircraft assigned to the 57th Fighter Wing..."

- **Section 105-4A, AF 38 (Hector)**
  Page 2, bullet 2, delete bullet.
  Justification: Language referred to is not part of the actual recommendation (it is part of the "Justification" section in the DOD Report) and is not part of the law.

III. CRITICAL

- **GENERAL:** Throughout the ANG recommendations change all references to read, "Distribute...place. If the State of XXXX decides to change the organization, composition

- **Section 85-4A, AF 14 (Bradley/Barnes)**
  Page 2, sub-bullet 2, change "The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission." to read "The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut. An Air Sovereignty Alert facility will be constructed at Barnes AGS MA."
  Justification: Commission moved F-15s to Barnes so Barnes logically should host the ASA mission. **(Cirillo note: Revote need?)**

- **Section 113-2, AF 47 (Hill)**
  Issue: Strikes entire Hill recommendation.
    - Where is replacement motion to move F-16s to Homestead/Carswell consistent w/ Commission charts for AFRC F-16s?
    - Are LANTIRN and F110 CIRFs now included elsewhere, or are they also struck?

  Impact:
    - F-16 SQ sizes at Homestead/Carswell
    - LANTIRN CIRF does not happen
    - F-110 CIRF does not happen

  Recommendation: Commission clarify intent on Homestead/Carswell and add LANTIRN and F110 CIRF language under "technical corrections" authority.

- **Section 105-4A, AF 38 (Hector)**
  Issue: Inserts FTF action into the recommendation as part of BRAC (redesignating the 119 FW as UAW Wing) and expanding the MILCON scope of the Armed Force Reserve Center (Section 36, Army 73) to include the UAV ops functions. Whose MILCON to-do is this? ANG or Army? This insert is inconsistent with Commission's Additional Statement with their Recommendation "to keep the Commission out of business that is purely programmatic"

Confusion over bill

correction of motion ~~#~~

voted earlier

had reference later —

Part of F-15 PAA to AF Res

Motion # ~~81~~-4A
113

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 47,
Hill Air Force Base, UT, Edwards Air Force Base, CA, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Luke Air Force, AZ, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV
appearing at Chapter III, Section 113 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 47, Hill Air Force Base, UT, Edwards Air Force Base, CA, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, Luke Air Force, AZ, and Nellis Air Force Base, NV he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1 and 3 and the Force Structure Plan.
- that the Commission strike the entire recommendation and insert in its place
    - "Distribute the fifteen F-16 aircraft assigned to the 419th Fighter Wing (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission;
    - Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 482nd Fighter Wing, Homestead Air Reserve Base, FL.

- Establish 24 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 301st Fighter Wing, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX.
- That the Commission leaves in-place at Hill Air Force Base the AFMC F-16s.
- that the Commission realigns Edwards Air Force Base, CA, Mountain Home Air Force Base, ID, and Luke Air Force Base AZ, by relocating base-level LANTRIN intermediate maintenance to Hill, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for Low Altitude Navigation and Targeting Infrared for Night (LANTRIN) pods at Hill Air Force Base.
- the Commission realigns Carswell Air Reserve Station, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Fort Worth, TX and Nellis Air Force Base, NV, by relocating base-level F110 Engine Intermediate Maintenance to Hill Air Force Base, establishing a Centralized Intermediate Repair Facility (CIRF) for F110 Engines.

Motion # 114-1

A Motion to Approve
Air Force Recommendation 49,
Langley Air Force Base, Virginia,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 114 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move that the Commission find that Air Force Recommendation 49, Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

KG

Motion # 113-2

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 47,
Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, and Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 113 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 47, Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, and Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

115, Richmond, Air Guard Station, Virginia, Air Force 50. Number 105 Hector International Airport, Air Guard Station, North Dakota. Number 38, Number 96, Duluth International Airport, Air Guard Station, Minnesota, Air Force 28. Are there any questions.

Mr. Skinner: I would ask we also just vote separately on 90-4(a) please?

Chairman Principi: Is that the Kellogg?

Mr. Skinner: No that's Capital Air Guard Station. If you just vote on all the others, then we'll vote on that separately, if that's all right.

Chairman Principi: Which number was that, Secretary?

Mr. Skinner: 90-4(a).

Chairman Principi: 90-4(a). Okay. I move the approval -

General Hill: Mr. Chairman, excuse me, can we have a discussion. Excuse me, you tabled, we're going to discuss separately, all right.

Chairman Principi: I move the approval of motion 113-2, Hill Air Force Base, 107-4(a) Springfield Beckley. 89-4(a) Mountain Home. 115-4(a) Richmond International. 98-4(a) Great Falls. 94-4(a) Otis. Kellogg we're going to vote on separately correct?

Mr. Skinner: Kellogg can be included. 95-4(a) can be

included. We're just voting separately on 94-4(a).

Chairman Principi: 95-4(a), 81-4(a) Fort Smith. 90-4(a) - no we're setting this one aside. We're voting on Capital separately. I'm going to table 90-4(a). 105-4(a) Hector. 96-4(a) Duluth. Is there a second.

Mr. Coyle: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

[A show of one hand].

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of eight hands].

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response].

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight in favor, none opposed, one recusal. The motion is approved.

Chairman Principi: I now move motion 111-4(a) Ellington Air Guard Station, Texas.

Mr. Hansen: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment. And I would move that we dispense with the reading of this entire thing and I'll just say where it plugs in, if that's all right with your permission?

Chairman Principi: Yes sir.

Mr. Hansen: Mr. Chairman, this is Ellington Air Guard Station in Texas, and just before the third dot going down on the left side, we insert the words establish 15 primary

aircraft authorization PAA F-16 aircraft at the 147th Fighter Wing, Air National Guard at Ellington Air Guard Station, Texas and if I could speak to the motion briefly.

Let me say this, I was the member who visited that area, and boy my thoughts went back to 9-11 at the time. After we did a post mortem in Congress we kept saying, why wasn't somebody there and available to do something when rogue aircraft were coming that way. We finally the young man who flew an F-16 toward Pennsylvania, and as I recall it was unarmed. But quite a mess, and as you go down there and you get into the Houston area, I was amazed to find that's the fourth largest city in America and also the industry there is petrochemicals. I mean we flew over in a helicopter, and that was just all there was. And as I was talking to the Secretary of State and the Mayor, and a few other folks there it would seem to me that if there's one place that I could put my finger on and say what's the number place that if a rogue aircraft came in and you had trouble it would really cause a huge amount of trouble it would have to be Houston, Texas. Boy that could just bring America to its knees almost. And those folks down there, they all brought that up and they pointed to those F-16s, and they - admittedly their old ones, their Block 25, they're not the new Block 50s or anything but their capable and their pilots are absolutely awesome.

Motion # 113-2

A Motion to Strike
Air Force Recommendation 47,
Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, and Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 113 of the Bill.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 47, Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air Force Base, Idaho, Luke Air Force Base, Arizona, and Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 1, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the recommendation; and
- that the Commission find this change is consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

115, Richmond, Air Guard Station, Virginia, Air Force 50. Number 105 Hector International Airport, Air Guard Station, North Dakota. Number 38, Number 96, Duluth International Airport, Air Guard Station, Minnesota, Air Force 28. Are there any questions.

Mr. Skinner: I would ask we also just vote separately on 90-4(a) please?

Chairman Principi: Is that the Kellogg?

Mr. Skinner: No that's Capital Air Guard Station. If you just vote on all the others, then we'll vote on that separately, if that's all right.

Chairman Principi: Which number was that, Secretary?

Mr. Skinner: 90-4(a).

Chairman Principi: 90-4(a). Okay. I move the approval -

General Hill: Mr. Chairman, excuse me, can we have a discussion. Excuse me, you tabled, we're going to discuss separately, all right.

Chairman Principi: I move the approval of motion 113-2, Hill Air Force Base, 107-4(a) Springfield Beckley. 89-4(a) Mountain Home. 115-4(a) Richmond International. 98-4(a) Great Falls. 94-4(a) Otis. Kellogg we're going to vote on separately correct?

Mr. Skinner: Kellogg can be included. 95-4(a) can be

included. We're just voting separately on 94-4(a).

Chairman Principi: 95-4(a), 81-4(a) Fort Smith. 90-4(a) - no we're setting this one aside. We're voting on Capital separately. I'm going to table 90-4(a). 105-4(a) Hector. 96-4(a) Duluth. Is there a second.

Mr. Coyle: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

[A show of one hand].

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of eight hands].

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response].

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight in favor, none opposed, one recusal. The motion is approved.

Chairman Principi: I now move motion 111-4(a) Ellington Air Guard Station, Texas.

Mr. Hansen: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment. And I would move that we dispense with the reading of this entire thing and I'll just say where it plugs in, if that's all right with your permission?

Chairman Principi: Yes sir.

Mr. Hansen: Mr. Chairman, this is Ellington Air Guard Station in Texas, and just before the third dot going down on the left side, we insert the words establish 15 primary

aircraft authorization PAA F-16 aircraft at the 147th Fighter Wing, Air National Guard at Ellington Air Guard Station, Texas and if I could speak to the motion briefly.

Let me say this, I was the member who visited that area, and boy my thoughts went back to 9-11 at the time. After we did a post mortem in Congress we kept saying, why wasn't somebody there and available to do something when rogue aircraft were coming that way. We finally the young man who flew an F-16 toward Pennsylvania, and as I recall it was unarmed. But quite a mess, and as you go down there and you get into the Houston area, I was amazed to find that's the fourth largest city in America and also the industry there is petrochemicals. I mean we flew over in a helicopter, and that was just all there was. And as I was talking to the Secretary of State and the Mayor, and a few other folks there it would seem to me that if there's one place that I could put my finger on and say what's the number place that if a rogue aircraft came in and you had trouble it would really cause a huge amount of trouble it would have to be Houston, Texas. Boy that could just bring America to its knees almost. And those folks down there, they all brought that up and they pointed to those F-16s, and they - admittedly their old ones, their Block 25, they're not the new Block 50s or anything but their capable and their pilots are absolutely awesome.

unanimous. The motion is adopted.

Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

General Newton: I think that covered 'em all. That covers it for F-15s. Let's go to the F-16s next.

Mr. Small: F-16s, please?

Mr. Cirillo: If you'd like, I would like to -- I could read the sections that are involved in this one. There are many of them, as you know. I think you have a -- items in front of you.

General Newton: Let's to the Air Reserves first.

While you're looking at that, I'll give some explanation. This is another one where we agreed with the recommendation by the Secretary of Defense. I might comment on a couple of these.

At Luke Air Force Base, where the Reserves flew F-16s, Luke Air Force Base is a very large F-16 base for the Active Force. They've trained all of the Air Force's F-16 pilots there -- the Active Air Force F-16 pilots there. So, this unit can associate themselves with the Active units there at Luke Air Force Base.

And, at Hill Air Force Base, where we have a wing of F-16s, and we also had Air Reserve Forces who flew F-16s, they are in the process right now of creating an associate unit, and they were doing that when we visited them, during

regional hearings. And so, again, we agreed with the recommendation of the Secretary.

We also agreed with Homestead, at 24, and Carswell, slash, Fort Worth, Texas, at 24.

Mr. Cirillo: We might want to go to section 113.

General Newton: I'm sorry?

Mr. Cirillo: We might want to go to section 113 -- 113, which is Hill Air Force Base, Utah. And it includes Reserve action.

General Newton: Louder for me, please.

Mr. Cirillo: Section 113, which is Air Force 47, which is entitled Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air Force Base, and Luke Air Force Base. And that includes Homestead Air Reserve Base. It's Air Force 47 in your bill, which is in the front of the motion book.

Admiral Gehman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Chairman Principi: Yes.

Admiral Gehman: Mr. Cirillo --

Mr. Cirillo: Yes?

Admiral Gehman: -- Air Force 113, entitled Hill Air Force Base, but it also includes Luke, Homestead, Carswell, Fort Worth. As I understand it is -- section 113 does what is on the left-hand slide here. Is that correct? Which, in a sense -- which essentially supports the Department of

Defense recommendation.

Mr. Cirillo: Mr. Small?

Mr. Small: Sorry, I was -- I apologize.

Admiral Gehman: Well, section 113 --

Mr. Small: That's correct. I'm told the answer is correct, sir.

Admiral Gehman: -- 113 is one recommendation, but it does all four of those things on the left-hand side, and the result of our action is to support the Secretary of Defense's recommendation.

Mr. Small: Yes.

Admiral Gehman: Just wanted to help my colleagues to know what they're voting on.

Mr. Cirillo: It also does some maintenance activities for the CIRF, for the LANTIRN pod, for the --

General Newton: Yeah, but we're fine. We did not change -- we did not change any of that. It's all as the Secretary recommended it.

Chairman Principi: So, is there a motion to --

Mr. Bilbray: Mr. Chairman, I have to recuse myself on this one for Nellis Air Force Base.

General Newton: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that the Commission accept the Air Force -- I mean, I'm sorry, the Secretary's recommendation for section 113 of the bill, Air Force 47 for Luke Air Force Base, Hill Air

Force Base, Homestead Air Force Base.

Is Carswell and Fort Worth in that one, as well?

Mr. Small: Yes, sir, all are in this one.

General Newton: As well as Carswell and Fort Worth, Texas.

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

Admiral Gehman: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

Mr. Bilbray: Mr. Chairman, I have Homestead. I -- but I understand, under our procedures we're talking about, I will vote affirmative, but I will be taken out of the Homestead vote, total vote. Is that correct, or should I just not vote on this?

Chairman Principi: You should not vote.

Mr. Bilbray: All right.

Chairman Principi: All right. Are there --

Mr. Skinner: I have a --

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

Mr. Skinner: -- question.

Chairman Principi: I'm sorry.

Mr. Skinner: No, I just have a question I want to make sure that I understand, as well. We're not voting on the entire group. We're just voting on portions of 'em. Is that right?

Chairman Principi: We're voting on --

General Newton: This particular one, we're voting on the Air Reserve over on this side, sir.

Mr. Skinner: Okay.

General Newton: And they were all in one section.

Mr. Skinner: Good. Okay, thank you.

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of five hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: We have one recusal, I believe. Four recusals? Four recusals.

Ms. Sarkar: Could you hold up your hands if you've been recused from this vote, please?

Mr. Coyle: Mr. Chairman, I had understood, going into this situation, that -- let me take a particular example. There are two people, two jobs, affected at Edwards Air Force Base in this recommendation. I had understood that Counsel was going to treat those locations -- in this case, those two jobs at Edwards Air Force Base -- as individual recusals on that part of the motion, but not on the entire motion.

Mr. Bilbray: That's what I understood, too. That's why I asked you, Mr. Chairman, whether or not -- otherwise, you don't have enough votes to pass it.

Chairman Principi: Commissioner Coyle, you can vote.

Does that answer all the questions?

Ms. Sarkar: Well, Mr. Chairman, could you show me again who is being recused, other than Commissioner Bilbray, whom I've noted?

Chairman Principi: Congressman Hansen.

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We're ready for the vote, sir, thank you for your indulgence.

Mr. Skinner: I think we only need --

Chairman Principi: Let's vote again.

All in favor of the motion?

[A show of six hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your indulgence. The vote is six in favor, none against, and three abstentions. Therefore, the motion is passed.

Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

General Newton: Mr. Chairman, I think that completes the Air Reserve F-16s.

I'd like to go to the Air National Guard F-16s, which are on the -- which are on the screen. And I'd like to take these -- can you tell me --

Chairman Principi: Excuse me. Excuse me, General

Newton. Counsel asked for a ten-minute recess.

General Newton: Yes, sir.

[Recess.]

Chairman Principi: The hearing will come to order.

As you can imagine, this is a very, very complex subject, very detailed. It involves the movement of a significant number of aircraft. And a number of technical issues have arisen during the course of our deliberations this afternoon on the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve. And to ensure that we have all of these technical issues correct and complete, we are going to stand in recess until 7:00 p.m. this evening.

In the interest of transparency and openness, we are conducting these deliberations in the public view, and we want to make sure it's clear and correct and that the motions are in order. And, accordingly, we will spend the next three hours working through these details so that when we reconvene at 7:00 p.m., we will be able to go through the list of weapons systems and get through this process this evening.

So, the Commission will be in recess until 7:00 p.m.

[Whereupon, at 4:10 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

STAFF DRAFT CORRECTIONS

Motion # 66-4A

A Motion to Amend
Navy Recommendation 19,
Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, Missouri,
appearing at Chapter II, Section 66 of the Bill.

Directs the relocation of Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to a facility in the Federal City project in New Orleans, LA, if the Federal City project is constructed on or before September 30, 2008.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Navy Recommendation **19**, ~~Naval Support Activity New Orleans, Louisiana~~, **Marine Corps Support Activity Kansas City, MO**, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria **2**, ~~3~~, **4 and 5** and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language "Relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA," and insert in its place the language "If the State of Louisiana obtains funding and commences construction of the Federal City project proposed for the Naval Support Activity West Bank property on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate **Marine Corps Reserve Support Command** element of Mobilization Command to that facility on the Naval Support Activity West Bank property, New Orleans, LA., **and consolidate with Headquarter, Marine Forces Reserve. The remaining tenants will be retained as stated in the DoD recommendation.** If the State of Louisiana fails to ~~construct an appropriate Federal City facility~~ **do so** on or before

September 30, 2008, then relocate Marine Corps Reserve Support Command element of Mobilization Command to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA,", and;

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

STAFF DRAFT CORRECTION

Motion # 64-4A

A Motion to Amend
Navy Recommendation 15,
Naval Support Activity New Orleans, Louisiana,
appearing at Chapter II, Section 64 of the Bill.

Directs the relocation of Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to the Federal City project, if constructed on or before September 30, 2008.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Navy Recommendation 15, Naval Support Activity New Orleans, Louisiana, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criteria 2, 3, 4 and 5 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language "Close Naval Support Activity New Orleans" and insert in its place the language "Realign Naval Support Activity New Orleans",
- that the Commission strike the language "Relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA." and insert in its place the language "If the State of Louisiana obtains funding and commences construction of the Federal City project proposed for the Naval Support Activity West Bank property on or before September 30, 2008, then relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to the Naval Support Activity West Bank property, New Orleans, LA. **The remaining tenants will be relocated as stated in the original DoD recommendation.** If the State of Louisiana fails to do so on or before September 30, 2008, then Relocate Headquarters, Marine Forces Reserve to Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base New Orleans, LA." , and;

STAFF DRAFT CORRECTION

- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Motion # 85-4A

48

A Motion to Amend
Air Force Recommendation 14,
Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT, Barnes Air Guard Station, MA, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI, Shaw Air Force Base, SC, and Martin State Air Guard Station, MD,
appearing at Chapter III, Section 85 of the Bill.

Adjusts distribution of aircraft to reconcile substantial deviations in this and related recommendations.

Offered by: _____

Seconded by: _____

Approved Disapproved

I move:

- that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force Recommendation 14, Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT, Barnes Air Guard Station, MA, Selfridge Air National Guard Base, MI, Shaw Air Force Base, SC, and Martin State Air Guard Station, MD, he substantially deviated from Final Selection Criterion 1 and the Force Structure Plan;
- that the Commission strike the language in paragraph "a" Chapter III, Section 85 of the Bill: "The A-10s assigned to the 103d Fighter Wing will be distributed to the 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA (nine aircraft) and retirement (six aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission." and insert in its place "Distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) at Bradley Field, Connecticut and the 15 A-10 aircraft at the 104th Fighter Wing (ANG), Barnes Air Guard Station, Massachusetts to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment

recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

- Establish 18 PAA F-15 aircraft at the 104th Fighter Wing (ANG), Barnes Air Guard Station, MA.
- The 103d Fighter Wing (ANG) Expeditionary Combat Support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley Field, Connecticut and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission.

go to Barnes?

Establish an analog at Bradley Field

- If the State of Connecticut decides to change the organization, composition and location of the 103d Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the Future Total Force, all other personnel allotted to the 103d Fighter Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Connecticut and consistent with the integration of the unit into the Future Total Force, including but not limited to air mobility, C4ISR, Information Operations, engineering, flight training or unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retrained in skills relevant to the emerging mission.
- This recommendation does not effect a change to the authorized end-strength of the Connecticut or the Massachusetts Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 103d ~~and 104th~~ and 104th Fighter Wings (ANG) is based upon a resource-constrained determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national security requirements in other locations and is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state or the commonwealth." and;
- that the Commission find this change and the recommendation as amended are consistent with the Final Selection Criteria and Force Structure Plan.

[A show of nine hands].

Chairman Principi: All opposed.

[No response].

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, if I may report out the vote. The vote was unanimous. The motion is approved. And for further clarification, did you have a second to this motion.

Mr. Coyle: I sec

Mr. Cirillo: The

Reserve Centers.

Ms. Sarkar: Than

suffix, 76-something y

Chairman Principi

Ms. Sarkar: Mr.

amendment simply as am

assigned a number to it

General Hill: 76-

Ms. Sarkar: Thank

Chairman Principi:

Commissioners to author

they are truly eminentl

technical nature to the

changes to conform. To substantive issues and resolve conflicts. These are all of a technical nature, and to conform the substantive issues and resolve conflicts.

motion allowing corrections

Admiral Gehman: I second that.

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of nine hands].

Chairman Principi: All opposed.

[No response].

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous your motion is passed.

Chairman Principi: That really completes -

Mr. Cirillo: There's one more Mr. Chairman, I believe, with regard to section 186, which is tech 19.

Chairman Principi: What is the amendment? I thought create and integrated weapons an armament specialty site for armaments and ammunition.

Mr. Van Saun: For clarification, I can give you a quick run down for the motion. This creates and integrated weapon arm, and specialty site for guns and ammunition. It's a clarifying motion, you passed the amendment yesterday, the language that we passed was unclear of exactly the moves intended by the Commission and the staff. The amendment before you clarifies that language to make sure that the right pieces end up in the right places. It's three components that were removed from the DoD recommendation in that amendment. One component was the special operations gun folks. And in Crane Indiana, one component was a large gun over water piece at Dahlgren, and

the other component was the energetic specialized. The energetics need to stay, a large component stays in China Lake because they make big explosions there. A small part was goes to the part existing in Indian Head needs to stay in Indian Head, and the part of done of energetics in Picayune New Jersey, needs to stay in Picayune the rest of the motion was carried to create the integrated weapons and armament specialty site for guns and ammunition.

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

General Newton: Second.

Chairman Principi: All in favor.

[A show of nine hands].

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response].

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote was unanimous, the motion succeeds.

Chairman Principi: Are there are any further motions or amendments to come this evening?

Mr. Cirillo: That would be all that we have.

Chairman Principi: Are there any other motions?

[No response].

Chairman Principi: The Commission will stand in recess until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. For those Commissioners who can be here we will close out the business of the Commission and offer closing statements and

UNAUTHENTICATED

we should be completed.

General Newton: Mr. Chairman I'd like to have just one comment, and I want to align myself with you and just really say thanks to the staff, this is probably the last opportunity we may have in public to say thanks to the entire staff, they've done an extraordinary job for all of us and for the nation. And certainly have kept us on track during this process and I just want to say thanks to them on behalf of all of colleagues.

[Applause].

Chairman Principi: Thank you General Newton, your thoughts are shared by everyone. I plan to go on at some length tomorrow to thank the staff. I would expect they will all be here tomorrow morning. I hope as many Commissioners as can be, but I know some need to return to their homes. Are there any other closing comments by any Commissioners?

Mr. Skinner: Yes Mr. Chairman, I will not be here tomorrow, so I just want to take this opportunity to thank you for your leadership. You have been called to duty again after four wonderful years of service, in the last four for our country, and you certainly lead the Commission and the membership as well as the staff, and I think all of us in this country owe you a round of applause as well. Thank you.

UNCORRECTED

[Applause].

Chairman Principi: Thank you very much. Thank you. I thank my fellow Commissioners. It's been an extraordinary privilege to serve with you on this Commission, it truly has been. Thank you all. Good night. Tomorrow morning, 9:00 a.m.

[Whereupon the meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.]

UNCLASSIFIED

Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2005 12:31 PM

To: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Lanman Phillip Lt Col SAF/IEBB; Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB; Potochney, Peter, Mr, OSD-ATL; Sillin, Nathaniel, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Saxon, Ethan, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Cc: Callaghan Michael Ctr SAF/IEBB; Henderson, Robert, COL, OSD-ATL; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Bayert, Nicole, Ms, DoD OGC; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Flinn, Michael, CIV, WSO-BRAC

Subject: RE: AF Final Errata

...and the rest:

- back to III. # 103 (not 64 as noted below) - A review of the Transcript and Motion verified that the Reserve C-130s stayed in place at Pittsburgh - the intent is as stated below and will be clarified in the "Findings".
- Ref II. # 80 and # 95 - Commission intent is as stated.
- Ref II. # 101 - action fixed
- Ref II. # 103 - Actions regarding Res HQ Unit and Aero medical are being considered as Findings comments by Commissioners during review
- Ref II. # 103 (p. 65) - As requested, we corrected the 42 C-130s to the stated 39. Our 42 included the 3 ea C-130Js that moved to Quonset and the Channel Islands.

One further note - In our Guard Lay-Down plan for C-130s at Little Rock we showed the Air Force numbers would have left 18 but the Commission only left 9. Upon further review, it appears the Air Force would have left 14 vice the 18 used. Please comment as to the correct number.

In addition - here is the ANG FTF language - inserted as noted:

...insert this language into the end of the "Commission Findings" for each of the 16 indicated Recommendation Sections:

68, 81, 83, 85, 88, 90, 92, 93, 97, 101, 106, 107, 110, 111, 115, and 116

"This recommendation directing aircraft movement and personnel actions in connection with Air National Guard installations and organizations is designed to support the Future Total Force. The Commission expects that the Air Force will find new missions where needed, provide retraining opportunities, and take appropriate measures to limit possible adverse personnel impact. The Commission's intent is that the Air Force will act to assign sufficient aircrew and maintenance personnel to units gaining aircraft in accordance with current, established procedures. However, the Commission expects that all decisions with regard to manpower authorizations will be made in consultation with the governor of the state in which the affected Air National Guard unit is located. Any manpower changes must be made under existing authorities, and must be made consistent with existing limitations. Some reclassification of existing positions may be necessary, but should not be executed until the Air Force and the state have determined the future mission of the unit to preclude unnecessary personnel turbulence."

From: Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2005 10:14 AM
To: Lanman Phillip Lt Col SAF/IEBB; Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB
Cc: Callaghan Michael Ctr SAF/IEBB; Henderson, Robert, COL, OSD-ATL; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC;

Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Bayert, Nicole, Ms, DoD OGC; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse; Cook, Robert, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Subject: RE: AF Final Errata

All:

Thanks for the consolidation of errata.

We are reviewing these with GC and Commissioners as we speak - some are possible -some are not - initial comments below - more to come.

- Ref III. # 85 - The ASA facility is covered in #92:

  - ***1. Otis Air National Guard Base, MA, Lambert St. Louis International Airport Air Guard Station, MO, and Atlantic City Air Guard Station, NJ (AF 25)***

    a. **Realign Otis ANGB, MA.** Distribute the fifteen F-15 aircraft assigned to the 102d Fighter Wing's (ANG) to meet the Primary Aircraft Authorizations (PAA) requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. The 253d Combat Communications Group, and 267th Communications Squadron will remain in place at Otis, with 104th Fighter Wing at Barnes providing administrative support as the parent wing. An air sovereignty alert (ASA) facility will be constructed at Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA.[1] Firefighter positions from Otis will move to Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA.

---

[1] As a technical correction, the Commission deleted the language "Bradley International Airport Air Guard Station, CT" and inserted in its place the language "Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA" to reflect the intent of the Commission. Because the air superiority fighter basing in that region was relocated from Otis ANGB to Barnes AGS, the ASA facility must also be relocated to Barnes AGS, rather than to Bradley Field.

- Ref III. # 64 - It is the intent of the Commission to retain the 8 C-130s at Pittsburgh
- Ref II. It is the intent of the Commission to direct the "contiguous enclaves"
- Ref II. # 68 - The sentence "Relocate Armed Forces...Base, FL." will be deleted in it's entirety.

From: Lanman Phillip Lt Col SAF/IEBB
Sent: Thursday, September 01, 2005 8:25 AM
To: Henderson, Robert, COL, OSD-ATL; Cirillo, Frank, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Small, Kenneth, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; Bayert, Nicole, Ms, DoD OGC; RSS dd - WSO BRAC Clearinghouse
Cc: Johansen David L LtCol SAF/IEB; Callaghan Michael Ctr SAF/IEBB
Subject: AF Final Errata
Importance: High

Sir, Ma'am,

Please find the AF final errata attached. Call if you have any questions.

Very Respectfully,

// SIGNED //

PHILLIP T. LANMAN, Lt Col, USAF
"Hacker"
SAF/IEBB (BRAC)
phillip.lanman@pentagon.af.mil
703-692-9920 (DSN 222)

DATE

Chris –
as keeper of the motions, does this letter make sense to you.
Rand

The Honorable Michael W.Wynne
Chairman, Infrastructure Steering Group
(Address) Defense Pentagon
Washington D.C. 20301

Dear Secretary Wynne:

I am sending this letter to clarify language contained in BRAC amendments 186-4a and 186-4d concerning DoD Tech-19, Create an Integrated Weapons & Armaments Specialty Site for Guns and Ammunition.

The purpose of amendments 186-4a and 186-4d was to leave existing energetics activities in place at Picatinny Arsenal, Naval Surface Weapons Center Indian Head and Naval Air Weapons Station China Lake. The language included in the Commission's recommendation for Tech-19 does not intend to consolidate these activities in any one location, nor is it the Commission's intent to create a separate "Center of Excellence" for energetics.

Picatinny Arsenal will become the DoD Gun and Ammunition "Center of Excellence" as described in the DoD Tech-19 recommendation and as modified by our recommendations.

Sincerely,

9/8

Chris said looks good

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

Cc: Congressman Rodney P. Frelinghuysen

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

9/22 - phone con w/ Brett - no obligation to retransmit to Congress no copy to Hill

September 22, 2005

George W. Bush
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Further examination of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission report transmitted to you on September 8, 2005, has revealed the need for additional modifications. The changes are necessary for accuracy and clarity.

no need to communicate to Hill

A new version of Appendix O, Economic Impact of Commission Final Deliberations, is attached at enclosure (1). Some sections of the original version of the appendix contain mixed, and therefore misleading, economic data from 2003 and 2005. Other sections do not accurately reflect realignment and closure actions taken by the Commission. The original economic data received from the Department of Defense is reflected in the new version in instances where the Commission made no change to the Department of Defense recommendation. Where the Commission made a change to a Department of Defense recommendation that altered its economic impact, the Commission has recalculated the impact based on current economic data.

The corrections below are required in Appendix Q.

- In Recommendation 21, page Q-9, Appendix Q, change the subparagraphs to remove the repeated "a" designation.

- In footnote 102, page Q-33, Appendix Q, delete the word "Airlift" in the fifth bullet where it is repeated.

- Beginning in the fourth line of footnote 104, page Q-35, Appendix Q, delete the language "'The A-10s assigned to the 103^{d} Fighter Wing will be distributed to the 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA (nine aircraft) and retirement (six aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission.' and insert in its place".

- In footnote 133, page Q-47, Appendix Q, delete the language "the Commission strike the text of the entire recommendation and inserted in its place".

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, The Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret),The Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

- In footnote 153, page Q-56, Appendix Q, replace the word "altitute" with the word "altitude".

- On page Q-58, Appendix Q, delete footnote 159 (footnote 160 was deleted earlier). Renumber footnotes 161 through 268 as footnotes 159 through 266.

- In Recommendation 132, paragraph l, page Q-64, Appendix Q, replace the words "Amy Review Boards" with the words "Army Review Boards Agency".

- On page Q-67, Appendix Q, correct the formatting of the heading for Recommendation 135 by deleting the figures "2.".

- In footnote 187, page Q-68, Appendix Q, replace the abbreviation "UT" with the abbreviation "OK".

- On page Q-73, Appendix Q, correct the formatting of the heading for Recommendation 147 by replacing the figure "3." with the figures "147".

- On page Q-85, Appendix Q, insert the number for Recommendation 176.

These changes correct what are mostly editing errors. They do not alter the substance of the report and they accurately reflect the Commission's intent. As with previous changes, the electronic version of the Report posted on the Commission website will be corrected to reflect these changes.

Respectfully yours,

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

Enclosure
(1) New version of Appendix O

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

September 22, 2005

George W. Bush
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Further examination of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission report transmitted to you on September 8, 2005, has revealed the need for additional modifications. The changes are necessary for accuracy and clarity.

A new version of Appendix O: Economic Impact of Commission Final Deliberations, is attached at enclosure (1). Several sections of the original version of the appendix contain mixed, and therefore misleading, economic data from 2003 and 2005. Other sections do not accurately reflect realignment and closure actions taken by the Commission. The original economic data received from the Department of Defense is reflected in the new version in instances where the Commission made no change to the Department of Defense recommendation. Where the Commission made a change to a Department of Defense recommendation that altered economic impact, the Commission has recalculated the impact based on current economic data and modified Appendix O accordingly.

The corrections below are required in Appendix Q: Commission's Final Recommendations.

- In Recommendation 21, page Q-9, Appendix Q, change the subparagraphs to remove the repeated "a" designation.

- In footnote 102, page Q-34, Appendix Q, delete the word "Airlift" in the fifth bullet where it is repeated.

- Beginning in the fourth line of footnote 104, page Q-35, Appendix Q, delete the language "'The A-10s assigned to the 103^{d} Fighter Wing will be distributed to the 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA (nine aircraft) and retirement (six aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission.' and insert in its place".

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, the Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret), the Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), the Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

- In footnote 133, page Q-47, Appendix Q, delete the language "the Commission strike the text of the entire recommendation and inserted in its place".

- In footnote 153, page Q-56, Appendix Q, replace the word "altitute" with the word "altitude".

- On page Q-58, Appendix Q, delete footnote 159 (footnote 160 was deleted earlier). Renumber footnotes 161 through 268 as footnotes 159 through 266.

- In Recommendation 132, paragraph l, page Q-65, Appendix Q, replace the words "Amy Review Boards" with the words "Army Review Boards Agency".

- On page Q-67, Appendix Q, correct the formatting of the heading for Recommendation 135 by deleting the figure "2.".

- In footnote 187, page Q-68, Appendix Q, replace the abbreviation "UT" with the abbreviation "OK".

- On page Q-73, Appendix Q, correct the formatting of the heading for Recommendation 147 by replacing the figure "3." with the figures "147".

- On page Q-85, Appendix Q, insert the number for Recommendation 176.

The corrections reflected below are required in Appendix T: Maps and Charts.

Map Name and Page	Original (erroneous) Map Designation	Corrected Map Designation
United States Northeastern Seaboard (pg T-2)	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA was incorrectly listed as a closure (red circle).	Otis Air National Guard Base, MA is now correctly listed as a realignment (blue diamond).
United States Southeastern Seaboard (pg T-3)	The locations of Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico and the Ramey USARC, Puerto Rico, were incorrectly transposed.	Fort Buchanan, Puerto Rico and the Ramey USARC are now correctly located.
United States Great Lakes Region (pg T-4)	Whitehall Memorial USARC, OH (closure) was incorrectly listed twice, while DFAS Columbus, OH (gaining) was not listed at all.	DFAS Columbus, OH is now correctly listed as a gaining installation (green triangle).
South Central United States (pg T-5)	NAS Corpus Christi, TX was incorrectly listed as a closure (red circle).	NAS Corpus Christi, TX is now correctly listed as a realignment (blue diamond).

These changes correct what are mostly editing errors. They do not alter the substance of the report and they accurately reflect the Commission's intent. As with previous changes, the electronic version of the Report posted on the Commission website will be corrected to reflect these changes.

Respectfully yours,

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

Enclosure
(1) New version of Appendix O

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

September 13, 2005

George W. Bush
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

The need for an additional change to the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Report has been brought to my attention. A motion to amend a recommendation of the Secretary of Defense was voted down but is reflected in the Report as having passed. As a result of the motion failing and in the absence of the Commission determining that the Secretary deviated substantially from the force-structure plan and final selection criteria as required by Section 2903(d)(2)(B) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990, as amended, the Secretary's recommendation is approved.

Three changes in the Report, described below, are required to correct this error.

- Page 170. Delete "Commission Recommendations" and the text that follows.
- Page Q-58, Appendix Q. Replace subparagraph a. with the Secretary's recommendation: "Realign Fairchild Air Force Base, WA. The 141st Air Refueling Wing (ANG) will associate with the 92nd Air Refueling Wing at Fairchild Air Force Base, and the 141st Air Refueling Wing's eight KC-135R aircraft are distributed to the 185th Air Refueling Wing (ANG), Sioux Gateway Airport Air Guard Station, IA. The 256th Combat Communications Squadron and 242nd Combat Communications Squadron, which are ANG geographically separated units at Four Lakes and Spokane, are relocated into available facilities at Fairchild Air Force Base."
- Pages Q-58 and 59, Appendix Q. Delete footnote 160.

The effect of these changes is limited with results that conform to and reflect the Commission's overall purpose and plan. The Secretary's recommendation largely provides for the distribution of aircraft as the Commission envisioned. I am confident that the realignment of Fairchild Air Force Base directed by the Secretary will be accomplished consistent with the overall KC-135 aircraft laydown plan developed by the Commission.

Respectfully yours,

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, the Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret), the Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), the Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

September 12, 2005

George W. Bush
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Further review of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report transmitted to you on September 8, 2005 has revealed several corrections needed for clarity and accuracy. The changes, which are to be incorporated into the Report, are administrative and conforming in nature and serve to ensure correct and complete understanding of the Commission's reasoning and intent.

In addition to the corrections contained in the enclosed errata provided earlier, the following changes have also been made to the Report:

- Page 127, 8th paragraph. Delete "(ANG)" after "57th Fighter Wing".
- Page 253, line 7. Change PAYBACK PERIOD from "4 YEARS" to "8 YEARS".
- Page O-7, Appendix O, 2nd entry: "Denver-Aurora, CO Metropolitan Statistical Area". Change "Air Reserve Personnel Center" to "Air Reserve Personnel Center and Defense Finance and Accounting Service (Buckley Annex)".
- Page O-21, Appendix O, 8th entry. "Fayetteville, NC Metropolitan Area". Replace "Pope Air Force Base/Net Changes for This Economic Area" figures with:

-5,806	-382	-132	-6,320	-4,234	-10,554	-3.8%
-1,728	-135	-132	-1,995	-1,321	-3,316	-1.6%

- Page O-22, Appendix O, 1st entry: "New Bern, NC Metropolitan Statistical Area". Replace "Total for North Carolina" figures with:

-1,310	-721	-161	-2,192	-1,424	-3,620	-1.7%

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, the Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret), the Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), the Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

The electronic version of the Report posted on the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission website will be corrected to reflect these changes.

Mr. President, I once again note, on behalf of the Commissioners and staff, that it has been an honor and privilege to serve on the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

Respectfully yours,

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

Enclosure
(1) Changes to BRAC Commission Report dtd September 8, 2005
(2) Changes to BRAC Commission Report dtd September 9, 2005

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

September 12, 2005

George W. Bush
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Further review of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report transmitted to you on September 8, 2005 has revealed several corrections needed for clarity and accuracy. The changes, which are to be incorporated into the Report, are administrative and conforming in nature and serve to ensure correct and complete understanding of the Commission's reasoning and intent.

In addition to the corrections contained in the enclosed errata provided earlier, the following changes have also been made to the Report:

- Page 127, 8th paragraph. Delete "(ANG)" after "57th Fighter Wing".
- Page 253, line 7. Change PAYBACK PERIOD from "4 YEARS" to "8 YEARS".
- Page O-7, Appendix O, 2nd entry: "Denver-Aurora, CO Metropolitan Statistical Area". Change "Air Reserve Personnel Center" to "Air Reserve Personnel Center and Defense Finance and Accounting Service (Buckley Annex)".
- Page O-21, Appendix O, 8th entry. "Fayetteville, NC Metropolitan Area". Replace "Pope Air Force Base/Net Changes for This Economic Area" figures with:

-5,806	-382	-132	-6,320	-4,234	-10,554	-3.8%
-1,728	-135	-132	-1,995	-1,321	-3,316	-1.6%

- Page O-22, Appendix O, 1st entry: "New Bern, NC Metropolitan Statistical Area". Replace "Total for North Carolina" figures with:

-1,310	-721	-161	-2,192	-1,424	-3,620	-1.7%

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, the Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret), the Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), the Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

September 8, 2005

The following administrative changes were made to the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Report following the printing of the hard bound and CD-ROM versions of the report. The electronic versions of the report on the www.brac.gov web site and three ring binder versions of the Report reflect the changes detailed below.

Page 335, chart, 2nd row, 2nd column. Changed from "Army, 12 major closures, $170,180,00;" to, "Army, 12 major closures, $170,180,000;"

Page Q-92, line 32. Added the motion number "186." to precede the wording, "CREATE AN INTEGRATED WEAPONS & ARMAMENTS SPECIALTY SITE FOR GUNS AND AMMUNITION (TECH 19)"

Page R-13, paragraph (3). Changed from, "After June 30, 2011, the Commission shall promptly provide, upon request, to any Member of Congress information used by the Commission in making its recommendations." to "After June 30, 2015, the Commission shall promptly provide, upon request, to any Member of Congress information used by the Commission in making its recommendations."

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, The Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret),The Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

September 9, 2005

The following are corrections to the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Report. The electronic versions of the report posted here at www.brac.gov will be corrected to reflect these changes.

Page 12, line 15, replace "substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1, 2 and 5" with "substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 7"

Page 129, line 24; page Q-38, Recommendation 90, paragraph a, and; page Q-39, footnote 113, replace "Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 183rd Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN" with "Establish 18 PAA F-16 aircraft at the 122nd Fighter Wing, Fort Wayne International Airport Air Guard Station, IN."

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, The Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret),The Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

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

Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC

From: Cowhig, Dan, CIV, WSO-BRAC
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2005 5:58 PM
To: 'Neil.Gorsuch@usdoj.gov'
Cc: 'brett_c._gerry@who.eop.gov'; Hague, David, CIV, WSO-BRAC; 'USADC.CC.VIOLATION.REP@usdoj.gov'; 'Peter.D.Keisler@usdoj.gov'
Subject: Re: Errata

Neil -

Got it. I'm on the road. I've passed your concerns on to General Hague. We expect that there will be more errors discovered as more folks get further into the report. For a project of this magnitude, done under the time constraints that were imposed on the Commission, there're are bound to be a fair number.

Thanks for the heroic efforts over the past week.

V/R

Dan

-----Original Message-----
From: Neil.Gorsuch@usdoj.gov <Neil.Gorsuch@usdoj.gov>
To: brett_c._gerry@who.eop.gov <brett_c._gerry@who.eop.gov>; Dan.Cowhig@wso.whs.mil <Dan.Cowhig@wso.whs.mil>
CC: David.Hague@wso.whs.mil <David.Hague@wso.whs.mil>; Christine.Hill@wso.whs.mil <Christine.Hill@wso.whs.mil>; USADC.CC.VIOLATION.REP@usdoj.gov <USADC.CC.VIOLATION.REP@usdoj.gov>; Peter.D.Keisler@usdoj.gov <Peter.D.Keisler@usdoj.gov>
Sent: Fri Sep 09 17:35:57 2005
Subject: RE: Errata

Dan, as I indicated over the phone, I think that any indication you can offer that these errata are authorized by the commission -- whether by vote, or at least by a letter from the Chairman so stating -- would help strengthen our hand in future litigation. I am adding Peter Keisler so he can add any views he may have. - NMG

-----Original Message-----
From: Dan.Cowhig@wso.whs.mil [mailto:Dan.Cowhig@wso.whs.mil]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2005 4:55 PM
To: Gorsuch, Neil M; brett_c._gerry@who.eop.gov
Cc: David.Hague@wso.whs.mil; Christine.Hill@wso.whs.mil
Subject: Errata

Brett, Neil -

Per conversation, here is today's errata sheet:

<<Changes2.pdf>>
Also on the Commission website at
http://www.brac.gov/docs/final/Changes2.pdf
<http://www.brac.gov/docs/final/Changes2.pdf> .

Here is yesterday's errata sheet:

<<Changes.pdf>>
Also on the web at http://www.brac.gov/docs/final/Changes.pdf
<http://www.brac.gov/docs/final/Changes.pdf> .

I've cc'd Christine Hill.

V/R

- In footnote 133, page Q-47, Appendix Q, delete the language "the Commission strike the text of the entire recommendation and inserted in its place".
- In footnote 153, page Q-56, Appendix Q, replace the word "altitute" with the word "altitude".
- On page Q-58, Appendix Q, delete footnote 159 (footnote 160 was deleted earlier). Renumber footnotes 161 through 268 as footnotes 159 through 266.
- In Recommendation 132, paragraph l, page Q-65, Appendix Q, replace the words "Amy Review Boards" with the words "Army Review Boards Agency".
- On page Q-67, Appendix Q, correct the formatting of the heading for Recommendation 135 by deleting the figure "2.".
- In footnote 187, page Q-68, Appendix Q, replace the abbreviation "UT" with the abbreviation "OK".
- On page Q-73, Appendix Q, correct the formatting of the heading for Recommendation 147 by replacing the figure "3." with the figures "147".
- On page Q-85, Appendix Q, insert the number for Recommendation 176.

These changes correct what are mostly editing errors. They do not alter the substance of the report and they accurately reflect the Commission's intent. As with previous changes, the electronic version of the Report posted on the Commission website will be corrected to reflect these changes.

Respectfully yours,

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

Enclosure
(1) New version of Appendix O

The corrections reflected below are required in Appendix T: Maps and Charts, ~~requiring~~

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AN
2521 South Cl
Arlingt
Telephor

Sep

George W. Bush
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Further examination of the 2005 I
report transmitted to you on September 8
tions. The changes are necessary for acc

A new version of Appendix O, I
attached at enclosure (1). Some sectior
and therefore misleading, economic data
reflect realignment and closure actions taken by the Commission
received from the Department of Defense is reflected in the new version in instances
Commission made no change to the Department of Defense recommendation. Where the Commission made a change to a Department of Defense recommendation that altered its economic impact, the Commission has recalculated the impact based on current economic data.

The corrections below are required in Appendix Q.

- In Recommendation 21, page Q-9, Appendix Q, change the subparagraphs to remove the repeated "a" designation.
- In footnote 102, page Q-33, Appendix Q, delete the word "Airlift" in the fifth bullet where it is repeated.
- Beginning in the fourth line of footnote 104, page Q-35, Appendix Q, delete the language "'The A-10s assigned to the 103d Fighter Wing will be distributed to the 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA (nine aircraft) and retirement (six aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission.' and insert in its place".
- In footnote 133, page Q-47, Appendix Q, delete the language "the Commission strike the text of the entire recommendation and inserted in its place".

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, The Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret),The Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

- In footnote 153, page Q-56, Appendix Q, replace the word "altitute" with the word "altitude".

- On page Q-58, Appendix Q, delete footnote 159 (footnote 160 was deleted earlier). Renumber footnotes 161 through 268 as footnotes 159 through 266.

- In Recommendation 132, paragraph l, page Q-64, Appendix Q, replace the words "Amy Review Boards" with the words "Army Review Boards Agency".

- On page Q-67, Appendix Q, correct the formatting of the heading for Recommendation 135 by deleting the figures "2.".

- In footnote 187, page Q-68, Appendix Q, replace the abbreviation "UT" with the abbreviation "OK".

- On page Q-73, Appendix Q, correct the formatting of the heading for Recommendation 147 by replacing the figure "3." with the figures "147".

- On page Q-85, Appendix Q, insert the number for Recommendation 176.

These changes correct what are mostly editing errors. They do not alter the substance of the report and they accurately reflect the Commission's intent. As with previous changes, the electronic version of the Report posted on the Commission website will be corrected to reflect these changes.

Respectfully yours,

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

Enclosure
(1) New version of Appendix O

DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202
Telephone: 703-699-2950

Katie – Patent memo

September 22, 2005

George W. Bush
President of the United States
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20500

Dear Mr. President:

Further examination of the 2005 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission report transmitted to you on September 8, 2005, has revealed the need for additional modifications. The changes are necessary for accuracy and clarity.

A new version of Appendix O, Economic Impact of Commission Final Deliberations, is attached at enclosure (1). Some sections of the original version of the appendix contain mixed, and therefore misleading, economic data from 2003 and 2005. Other sections do not accurately reflect realignment and closure actions taken by the Commission. The original economic data received from the Department of Defense is reflected in the new version in instances where the Commission made no change to the Department of Defense recommendation. Where the Commission made a change to a Department of Defense recommendation that altered its economic impact, the Commission has recalculated the impact based on current economic data.

The corrections below are required in Appendix Q.

- In Recommendation 21, page Q-9, Appendix Q, change the subparagraphs to remove the repeated "a" designation.

- In footnote 102, page Q-33, Appendix Q, delete the word "Airlift" in the fifth bullet where it is repeated.

- Beginning in the fourth line of footnote 104, page Q-35, Appendix Q, delete the language "'The A-10s assigned to the 103d Fighter Wing will be distributed to the 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Municipal Airport Air Guard Station, MA (nine aircraft) and retirement (six aircraft). The wing's expeditionary combat support (ECS) elements will remain in place at Bradley and Bradley will retain capability to support a Homeland Defense mission.' and insert in its place".

- In footnote 133, page Q-47, Appendix Q, delete the language "the Commission strike the text of the entire recommendation and inserted in its place".

Chairman: Anthony J. Principi
Commissioners: The Honorable James H. Bilbray, The Honorable Philip E. Coyle III, Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr., USN (Ret),The Honorable Jim Hansen, General James T. Hill, USA (Ret), General Lloyd Newton, USAF (Ret), The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner, Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)
Executive Director: Charles Battaglia

- In footnote 153, page Q-56, Appendix Q, replace the word "altitute" with the word "altitude".

- On page Q-58, Appendix Q, delete footnote 159 (footnote 160 was deleted earlier). Renumber footnotes 161 through 268 as footnotes 159 through 266.

- In Recommendation 132, paragraph l, page Q-64, Appendix Q, replace the words "Amy Review Boards" with the words "Army Review Boards Agency".

- On page Q-67, Appendix Q, correct the formatting of the heading for Recommendation 135 by deleting the figures "2.".

- In footnote 187, page Q-68, Appendix Q, replace the abbreviation "UT" with the abbreviation "OK".

- On page Q-73, Appendix Q, correct the formatting of the heading for Recommendation 147 by replacing the figure "3." with the figures "147".

- On page Q-85, Appendix Q, insert the number for Recommendation 176.

These changes correct what are mostly editing errors. They do not alter the substance of the report and they accurately reflect the Commission's intent. As with previous changes, the electronic version of the Report posted on the Commission website will be corrected to reflect these changes.

Respectfully yours,

Anthony J. Principi
Chairman

Enclosure
(1) New version of Appendix O