

In response to the BRAC Commission's questions for the record following the 17 May hearing with General Jumper and Mr. Dominquez (question 4.c.), the Air Force stated that:

"The Air Force took into account the effect of proposed recommendations on other federal agencies, e.g. FAA, US Coast Guard. Since the BRAC law and DoD policy do not require these costs to be included in the costs of the recommendations, potential costs (or savings) to other federal agencies were not included in the Air Force recommendations."

However, the BRAC law (Sec 2913, paragraph e.) states that "the selection criteria relating to cost savings or return on investment from the proposed closure or realignment of military installations shall take into account the effect of the proposed closure or realignment on the costs of any other activity of the Department of Defense or any other Federal Agency that may be required to assume responsibility for activities at the military installations."

Questions:

1. How did the Air Force take into account the "effect" of its recommendations on other federal agencies? What effects were considered? How did these effects factor into the Air Force's recommendations? Please cite some examples.
2. Our read of the law, leads us to believe that additional costs to the federal government should be included in the savings and ROI of each recommendation. Please provide the rationale for Air Force's legal opinion on the requirements of the aforementioned section of the BRAC law and why the Air Force considered only "effects" and not costs to other federal government agencies.

30 Jun 2005

## Inquiry Response

**Re:** BI0080, 0360 Effects on Non-DoD Tenants (Otis)

**Requester:** BRAC Commission

**Question:** 1. How did the Air Force take into account the "effect" of its recommendations on other federal agencies? What effects were considered? How did these effects factor into the Air Forces recommendations? Please cite some examples.

**Answer:** The Air Force identified its non-DoD Federal tenants in Data Call 2, Question 20.1217. The Air Force coordinated with the headquarters of tenants that might be required to assume responsibility for activities at installations recommended for closure. The Air Force followed OSD Policy Memorandum Three, 7 Dec 2004, assuming the recommendation would increase the tenant's costs. In the case of Otis ANGB, the Air Force contacted the Coast Guard headquarters and notified them of the proposed closure. Although there was actual notice to the agency affected, the Air Force inadvertently omitted the standardized language to be added to the candidate recommendation identifying the non-DoD Federal agency.

**Question:** 2. Our read of the law, leads us to believe that additional costs to the federal government should be included in the savings and ROI of each recommendation. Please provide the rationale for Air Force's legal opinion on the requirements of the aforementioned section of the BRAC law and why the Air Force considered only "effects" and not costs to other federal government agencies.

**Answer:** The Air Force followed the direction in OSD Policy Memorandum Three, Dec 7, 2004. This policy memorandum can be found on the DoD BRAC web page under the 2005 Reports, Reports and Processes, Part 1, Appendix E.

Approved

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'DAVID L. JOHANSEN', is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and somewhat cursive.

DAVID L. JOHANSEN, Lt Col, USAF  
Chief, Base Realignment and Closure Division