



8 June 2005

06292005



BRAC Commission  
ATTENTION: Chairman Anthony J. Principi  
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600  
Arlington, VA 22202

Chairman Principi:

Thank you so much for adjusting your schedule in Omaha on 19 May 2005 to meet with the Adjutants General. We very much appreciated your intention to listen. Since the session included Title 10 National Guard officials certain issues were not discussed as completely and openly as we would have liked. One purpose of this letter is to summarize some key issues concerning the BRAC report. The other purpose is to ask for additional sessions for discussions between commission members, commission staff members, and the Adjutants General. We can provide constructive input to achieving DOD BRAC goals.

The Adjutants General support the BRAC process as legislated by Congress. We promote modernizing the armed forces and understand that infrastructure adjustments will be necessary to meet future mission needs. Our expectation was to be included in a process that would give the infrastructure and forces under our responsibility fair and accurate consideration. With regard to the section of the BRAC report dealing with Army operations this was done, and we support the process used by the Army to develop its recommendations. The same cannot be said for the Air Force.

Recent testimony by senior Department of Defense (DOD) officials implying that we were involved and concurred with the recently released BRAC recommendations is incorrect. Until very recently the Adjutants General were excluded from the deliberations to develop the Air Force Future Total Force (FTF) plan, the overarching guide used to develop the Air Force BRAC plan. Reviewing the still incomplete information set released by the Department of Defense has revealed that Air National Guard capabilities and operational efficiencies were not properly assessed resulting in flawed recommendations.

Two particular features of the Air Force BRAC recommendation list deserve special scrutiny. The first is a number of recommendations that simply shift aircraft from one location to another to increase squadron size. The reported reason is to improve operational effectiveness and reduce costs. No apparent assessment was made of the impact these moves will have on retention of experienced ANG operational and maintenance personnel. The Air Force will lose a significant percentage of its most experienced aircrews and maintenance personnel during the time when reserve forces are called to support operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Some states will lose all Air National Guard flying missions in order for the Air Force to increase the size of

some flying operations with no assurances that upsized units will be able to recruit the numbers needed to meet their added mission requirements.

The second, and related, feature is the "enclave" concept which leaves ANG bases that are losing flying operations open with a skeleton force reportedly to support homeland security needs and serve as placeholders for new but unidentified Air Force missions to be assigned at some unknown date later. This ill-defined concept may likely be only a precursor to actual base closure in many cases. Twenty eight Air National Guard facilities are recommended to have flying operations removed with only a skeleton force left behind.

As a body the Adjutants General Association of the United States (AGAUS) desires a BRAC outcome intended by Congress. We are developing helpful alternatives that will meet BRAC objectives without taking the nation down risky paths that open vulnerabilities in our capabilities to defend the homeland and inhibit our ability to support the fight against terrorism overseas. In this light I request the BRAC Commission provide the AGAUS an opportunity to present to you ideas for enhancing our defense posture through real savings. You have been so gracious to meet with us already. I hope you will grant us additional opportunities to meet directly with key commission members and staff.

As President of the AGAUS, I will serve as point of contact for arranging opportunities for the body to present its views and recommendations to the commission. Working together we believe your commission can produce a revised list that will better meet legislated objectives, achieve a stronger national defense posture, and meet with the approval of the American people.

Sincerely,



ROGER P. LEMPKE  
Major General  
President, AGAUS