



DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION DCN: 12270  
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Telephone: 703-699-2950

## MEMORANDUM

**Date:** July 22, 2005  
**To:** Anthony Principi, Chairman, Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission  
**From:** James Schaefer, Director of Communications *JS*  
**Re:** Interview with the Washington Journal (C-SPAN) on Sunday, July 24, 2005

---

The following memorandum addresses the details associated with your interview with C-SPAN's Washington Journal on Sunday, July 24:

**WHAT:** Interview with the C-SPAN's Washington Journal regarding the current BRAC process. The interview will be conducted by Peter Slen, a producer for the program. Mr. Slen will begin the interview with 10-15 minutes of questions and will then allow public phone calls. The interview will focus on three primary topics: 1) the general BRAC process; 2) the proposed elimination of many of New England's military installations; and 3) the purpose/conclusions of the ADDS Hearing on July 19th.

**WHEN:** Interview is scheduled for the morning of Sunday, July 24, 2005. The current allotted interview time is 7:45-8:30. C-SPAN has requested that interviewee arrives 15 minutes prior to the interview.

**WHERE:** The interview will be conducted at the C-SPAN studios located at 400 N. Capitol Street in the Hall of States building (6<sup>th</sup> Floor).

In order to help you prepare for the interview, please find attached documents: Talking Points, Anticipated Question & Answers, and BRAC data points.

**Attachments:**

- A) Talking Points extrapolated from recent media clippings.
- B) Anticipated Questions and Answers
- C) BRAC Process Data Points

**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

**2005 Base Realignment and Closure Commission**  
**Suggested Talking Points for Washington Journal Interview**  
**July 24, 2005**

1. ***The Congress established the 2005 BRAC Commission to ensure the integrity of the base closure and realignment process. As directed by law, the Commission will provide an independent assessment of the list of suggestions created by DoD.***
  - The BRAC Commission is autonomous from DoD and all other entities.
  - The actions of the Commission are controlled by statute, and the recommendations of the Commission are submitted to the President for approval.
  - The BRAC Commission is non-partisan and is made up of both highly-qualified Democrats and Republicans. The Commission will seek a consensus while drawing on each Commissioner's individual views, background, and experience.
  - The BRAC Commission will conduct an objective, non-partisan, and quantitative analysis.
  - The purpose of the BRAC Commission is to ensure that DoD does not deviate from requirements prescribed by law.
  - *"This Commission knows what it is talking about and is not a rubber stamp. We are an independent check on the power of the secretary to close and realign military bases."*
  
2. ***The recommendations provided by the Department of Defense are extremely complex and interrelated, requiring the utmost attention to detail and in-depth analysis.***
  - For the first time, the Secretary of Defense has submitted recommendations from a joint cross-service-oriented, rather than a specific-service-oriented, perspective.
  - Many recommendations, received from the Secretary of Defense, contain multiple actions, impacting different services and installations.
  - The Commission must analyze individually each of the numerous integrated impacts on both the military value and the community.
  - The recent addition of bases affords the Commission the opportunity to conduct public hearings, visit those sites and collect data, and, in some situations, make direct comparisons with bases that perform similar missions and are slated for closure.

- 3. *The BRAC Commission will follow a fair and equitable process, to assess the military value of a base and the potential economic impact that the closure of that base may have on the surrounding community.***
- The Commissioners will place military value and our national security as priorities while still taking into account the potential economic effects if base closures.
  - The Commission is mindful of the potential human impact that the closure of a base may have on the surrounding community.
  - The Commissioners will have the responsibility to ensure that all interests have been fairly considered.
  - *“I think it’s important for our nation that our military and our society are close together. I think that’s important for democracy. That’s important for recruiting. That’s important for retention. It’s important for building support for our engagements overseas.”*
- 4. *The BRAC Commission’s process is transparent by nature and the Commission seeks public input into the decision-making process.***
- The BRAC Commission wants to ensure that those who will be impacted by the decisions are a part of the process.
  - The Commission has held approximately numerous hearings in various parts of the country in order to encourage public involvement and input into the Commission’s decision-making process.
  - The Commission’s decision will be driven by an objective analysis of facts.
  - All materials received and created by the BRAC Commission, with the exception of those sensitive to national security, will be publicly available on the Commission’s website: [www.brac.gov](http://www.brac.gov).
  - A library containing all documents which have been either created by or submitted to the BRAC Commission, with the exception of documents sensitive to national security, will be open to the public.

**INTERVIEW WITH THE WASHINGTON JOURNAL**  
**ANTICIPATED QS & AS REGARDING NATIONAL CORE ISSUES IN THE CURRENT**  
**BRAC PROCESS.**

*JULY 24, 2005*

*General BRAC Process*

**Q1. How does this BRAC round differ from the previous four in 1988, 1991, 1993, and 1995?**

**A1.** When the Secretary of Defense implemented the procedure which led to the authorization of the current BRAC round, he emphasized that “new force structures must be accompanied by a new base structure.” He furthered, “BRAC 2005 should be the means by which we reconfigure our current infrastructure into one in which operational capacity maximizes both war fighting capability and efficiency.” In total, the number of military installations affected in the current BRAC round is greater than the sum of those affected in the previous four rounds.

*July 19<sup>th</sup> ADDS Hearing*

**Q2. What was the underlying impetus behind holding the Addis Hearing on July 19<sup>th</sup>? Is the Commission satisfied with the results of the Hearing? What will the Hearing accomplish for the BRAC process as a whole?**

**A2.** The addition of bases to the Pentagon's proposed list of closures and realignment will allow the Commission to conduct public hearings, visit those sites and collect data, in some situations to make direct comparisons with bases that perform similar missions and are slated for closure.

**Q3. What is the procedure now that an installation has been added to the list? Will Commissioners visit all installations even if they have been previously visited?**

**A3.** In the event that an installation is added to the list by the Commission, that base will be visited by a minimum of two Commissioners. If the installation was previously visited by the Commission and the recommendations regarding that installation are changed, the base will be visited again by a minimum of two Commissioners. This is a standard that has been set by the Commission itself, not prescribed through statute.

*New England*

**Q4. The current BRAC round has received a lot of criticism for its apparent focus on military installations located in New England. Is the Commission equally concerned with this issue? What reasons do you believe led to the large amount of closures and realignment in this region of the country?**

**A4.** The Commission is aware of the impact of the BRAC recommendations on New England. As Chairman, I have expressed concern over the recommendations with regard to New England. I believe that the military should maintain a presence in every part of the country.

**INTERVIEW WITH THE WASHINGTON JOURNAL**  
**ANTICIPATED QS & AS REGARDING NATIONAL CORE ISSUES IN THE CURRENT**  
**BRAC PROCESS.**

*JULY 24, 2005*

*National Guard-Legal Issues*

**Q5. The United States Constitution recognizes that the National Guard is a partnership between the federal and state governments. As such, Congress has mandated that command, control, and oversight of the Guard involve a process of collaboration, coordination, and mutual consent. The current lawsuits allege that this collaboration was lacking in the DoD BRAC recommendations. How will the Commission address this lack of communication regarding National Guard assets in its final recommendation to the President?**

**A5.** The Commission is aware of the legal allegations central to these lawsuits. Be assured that these issues will be fully deliberated within the Commission prior to delivery of the final recommendations to the President on Sept. 8<sup>th</sup>.

*Homeland Security/Homeland Defense*

**Q6. Many of the DoD BRAC recommendations have serious Homeland Defense/Homeland Security implications. Will the Commission evaluate the HLD/HLS implications of these recommendations?**

**A6.** The Commission will review the HLD/HLS concerns expressed regarding these recommendations. Central to the evaluation process is the concept of military value. One of the primary criteria determining an installations military value is an analysis of its role in the changing global threat paradigm. As such, the HLS/HLD implications of the BRAC recommendations are of paramount importance in the Commission's evaluation of DoD's proposals

*Jointness*

**Q7. The concept of jointness is a central element within the "military value" equation. However, this concept has come under scrutiny with regard to certain BRAC recommendations. How does the Commission define the concept of "jointness?"**

**A7.** The concept of jointness is not contingent upon co-location of Services at one installation. Rather, jointness is a synergy of operations that occurs at the command level. If the Commission were to vote against any DoD recommendations regarding the co-location of services, that vote should NOT be viewed as a vote against the DoD concept of jointness.

*Medical Consolidation*

**Q8. The current BRAC recommendations consider the creation of a joint medical command headquarters by merging operations at four facilities. These recommendations will have a strong impact on the medical care provided and**

**INTERVIEW WITH THE WASHINGTON JOURNAL**  
**ANTICIPATED QS & AS REGARDING NATIONAL CORE ISSUES IN THE CURRENT**  
**BRAC PROCESS.**

*JULY 24, 2005*

**available to our military members, dependents, and retirees. Will the Chairman please comment on the overall impact of the BRAC recommendations regarding medical care on the military?**

**A8.** The Commission takes all pertinent factors into account, as prescribed by statute, as it performs an evaluation of the suggestions made by the Department of Defense (DoD) and formulates its own suggestions. The Commission is keenly aware of the human impact had by the closure or realignment of a medical center, and although current military value is the most important consideration, the Commission will also consider the effects that the removal of a medical capability would have on the surrounding community. The health and medical care provided to members of the nation's military family is a very important consideration. The Commission will ensure that its final recommendation will promote the greatest care available to the military and dependents.

***Issues of Recusal***

**Q9. Will the Chairman please comment on the issues of recusal currently facing the Commission? Will these issues of recusal negatively impact the Commission's vote on certain installations?**

**A9.** The actions of Commissioners Bilbray, Coyle, Gehman, and Hansen in limiting their participation in certain Commission actions reflect the importance they place on their personal integrity and the public trust. Their actions can only serve to enhance the reality and perception of the Commission as independent, open, and honest. As for a negative impact, the ADDS Hearing held on July 19<sup>th</sup> is evident to the fact that these recusals have not affected the voting process or outcome.

**INTERVIEW WITH THE WASHINGTON JOURNAL**  
**BRAC PROCESS DATA POINTS**

*JULY 24, 2005*

**MAJOR INSTALLATION CLOSURES:** 33 total installations with base replacement value exceeding \$100 million.

- Army: 14 Installations
- Navy: 9 Installations
- Air Force: 10 Installations

**\*\*Results in a rough estimated loss of 53,752 jobs.**

**MAJOR INSTALLATION REALIGNMENTS:** 29 installations losing 400+ net total military and civilian personnel.

- Army: 5 Installations
- Navy: 11 Installations
- Air Force: 10 Installations
- Defense Agencies/Multiple Services: 3 Installations

**\*\*Results in a rough estimated loss of 73,016 jobs.**

**MAJOR INSTALLATION GAINS:** 49 installations gaining 400+ total military and civilian personnel.

- Army: 18 Installations
- Navy: 14 Installations
- Air Force: 14 Installations
- Defense Agencies/Multiple Services: 3 Installations

**\*\*Results in a rough estimated gain of 123,895 jobs.**