

June 1, 2005

James D. Floyd
1701 Arbor Drive
Clovis, NM 88101-2305

06022005

505-762-5141
floydj@yucca.net

The Honorable James H. Bilbray
BRAC Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Sir;

I am writing this letter in support of retaining Cannon Air Force Base.

Cannon has attributes that cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Cannon has a bombing range within minutes of the air base. Cannon also have significant airspace and an electronic warfare range. Supersonic airspace allowances for Cannon Air Force Base's 27th Fighter Wing, the New Mexico Air National Guard and others, are pending. The base can, and has, supported several squadrons of aircraft and equipment. More significantly, Cannon does not have encroachment issues, or noise limitations, that limit or prevent operations that so limit operations elsewhere. Cannon has a safe environment for operational issues. Cannon has nearly limitless flying opportunities.

From what I have read pertaining to BRAC, the criteria established would have demonstrated Cannon's value, and therefore have precluded it being placed on a closure list. Closure of facilities that are inefficient, encroached upon, have noise (operational) limitations, present major issues in the event of mishaps, and/or have issues with the local populace/governments should have been the focus. The fact that a desirable facility possesses an older fielded fleet is a circumstance that has been faced repeatedly in the past. If we had closed every facility that incurred an equipment/fleet conversion, we would have closed nearly every facility the military ever possessed. This is one of those situations. It appears that the Department of Defense (DoD) selected Cannon based on the equipment/fleet, rather than the facility value. We will continue to park fleets, but we must retain the prime facilities that our future fleets will require. Cannon is one of the future facilities.

There are also three other issues relative to this BRAC that concern me. First, is the inclusion of forecasted overseas unit reassignments to the United States. These overseas unit returns are not a done deal and are not necessarily part of what you are to examine, or what our Congress will be asked to vote on. Our Department of State, our mutual defense treaties, and the world's political situation, will affect negotiations relative to these units return. To place them in the BRAC is akin to throwing some states a bone,

albeit with a rope attached. This BRAC could be approved, and subsequently the forecasted units not return. Our citizens will believe that they have been deceived and our politicians that have participated in the BRAC process will have good reason not to believe our DoD leaders in the future. The second issue has to do with the term "military value." We should have learned from previous experiences that placing all of our assets near coastal cities is shortsighted. Having the ability to respond quickly is an asset. However, exposing the same assets to hurricanes and seaborne threats is not necessary. One may recall that during the tragic 911 disaster that our President was not transported to our coastal cities, but rather to a much safer location centrally located away from Washington and coasts. The third issue that causes me some concern was the briefing given by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to you and your BRAC committee counterparts. The press used the word "warning" in reference to his comments and the BRAC committee's ability to examine and understand his proposal. Perhaps I shouldn't be concerned, but it bothers me that he felt that he needed to infer that his plan was too complicated for the commission to fully understand, and therefore the committee should accept his proposal as-is. Perhaps cavalier would describe his attitude.

The local community supports Cannon fully. I spent many years in the military and can speak with experience that the local community is military-friendly.

The official BRAC Internet site presents success stories for post-BRAC facilities. Unfortunately, there are very few success stories. Naturally, the site doesn't not show the disasters left in post-BRAC's wake. Eastern New Mexico would be one of those disasters. The DoD's released data seriously underestimates the impact to this already economically disadvantaged state. The implications would be far-reaching. Comments stating that Cannon could be converted in a major business function are not based on logic, but rather on wishful thinking, or excuses. One need only to examine the history of the business arena of eastern New Mexico to understand that conversion is not an opportunity, but rather an economic liability in the making.

Clovis has experienced a BRAC before. The repercussions lasted for several years. There is no way to minimize the impact that the closure of Cannon would have on the local community. It would destroy the economy in this area. One has only to look at Walker Air Force Base, which closed in 1967, and Roswell to verify that closure is not a temporary economic issue. Roswell had the fortune of being in the oil boom to survive. Clovis has supported Cannon and the US Air Force for more than 50 years. The people of eastern New Mexico and west Texas continue to support Cannon and Cannon's military families.

We need your help in removing Cannon from the proposed closure list. Cannon Air Force Base is essential to ensuring the future capabilities of the US Air Force and our military. Thanks for your time and attention.

James D. Floyd

James D. Floyd

June 1, 2005

James D. Floyd
1701 Arbor Drive
Clovis, NM 88101-2305

505-762-5141
floydj@yucca.net

06022005

General Lloyd W. Newton
BRAC Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

General;

I am writing this letter in support of retaining Cannon Air Force Base.

Cannon has attributes that cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Cannon has a bombing range within minutes of the air base. Cannon also have significant airspace and an electronic warfare range. Supersonic airspace allowances for Cannon Air Force Base's 27th Fighter Wing, the New Mexico Air National Guard and others, are pending. The base can, and has, supported several squadrons of aircraft and equipment. More significantly, Cannon does not have encroachment issues, or noise limitations, that limit or prevent operations that so limit operations elsewhere. Cannon has a safe environment for operational issues. Cannon has nearly limitless flying opportunities.

From what I have read pertaining to BRAC, the criteria established would have demonstrated Cannon's value, and therefore have precluded it being placed on a closure list. Closure of facilities that are inefficient, encroached upon, have noise (operational) limitations, present major issues in the event of mishaps, and/or have issues with the local populace/governments should have been the focus. The fact that a desirable facility possesses an older fielded fleet is a circumstance that has been faced repeatedly in the past. If we had closed every facility that incurred an equipment/fleet conversion, we would have closed nearly every facility the military ever possessed. This is one of those situations. It appears that the Department of Defense (DoD) selected Cannon based on the equipment/fleet, rather than the facility value. We will continue to park fleets, but we must retain the prime facilities that our future fleets will require. Cannon is one of the future facilities.

There are also three other issues relative to this BRAC that concern me. First, is the inclusion of forecasted overseas unit reassignments to the United States. These overseas unit returns are not a done deal and are not necessarily part of what you are to examine, or what our Congress will be asked to vote on. Our Department of State, our mutual defense treaties, and the world's political situation, will affect negotiations relative to these units return. To place them in the BRAC is akin to throwing some states a bone,

albeit with a rope attached. This BRAC could be approved, and subsequently the forecasted units not return. Our citizens will believe that they have been deceived and our politicians that have participated in the BRAC process will have good reason not to believe our DoD leaders in the future. The second issue has to do with the term "military value." We should have learned from previous experiences that placing all of our assets near coastal cities is shortsighted. Having the ability to respond quickly is an asset. However, exposing the same assets to hurricanes and seaborne threats is not necessary. One may recall that during the tragic 9/11 disaster that our President was not transported to our coastal cities, but rather to a much safer location centrally located away from Washington and coasts. The third issue that causes me some concern was the briefing given by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to you and your BRAC committee counterparts. The press used the word "warning" in reference to his comments and the BRAC committee's ability to examine and understand his proposal. Perhaps I shouldn't be concerned, but it bothers me that he felt that he needed to infer that his plan was too complicated for the commission to fully understand, and therefore the committee should accept his proposal as-is. Perhaps cavalier would describe his attitude.

The local community supports Cannon fully. I spent many years in the military and can speak with experience that the local community is military-friendly.

The official BRAC Internet site presents success stories for post-BRAC facilities. Unfortunately, there are very few success stories. Naturally, the site doesn't show the disasters left in post-BRAC's wake. Eastern New Mexico would be one of those disasters. The DoD's released data seriously underestimates the impact to this already economically disadvantaged state. The implications would be far-reaching. Comments stating that Cannon could be converted in a major business function are not based on logic, but rather on wishful thinking, or excuses. One need only to examine the history of the business arena of eastern New Mexico to understand that conversion is not an opportunity, but rather an economic liability in the making.

Clovis has experienced a BRAC before. The repercussions lasted for several years. There is no way to minimize the impact that the closure of Cannon would have on the local community. It would destroy the economy in this area. One has only to look at Walker Air Force Base, which closed in 1967, and Roswell to verify that closure is not a temporary economic issue. Roswell had the fortune of being in the oil boom to survive. Clovis has supported Cannon and the US Air Force for more than 50 years. The people of eastern New Mexico and west Texas continue to support Cannon and Cannon's military families.

We need your help in removing Cannon from the proposed closure list. Cannon Air Force Base is essential to ensuring the future capabilities of the US Air Force and our military. Thanks for your time and attention.

James D. Floyd

James D. Floyd

June 1, 2005

James D. Floyd
1701 Arbor Drive
Clovis, NM 88101-2305

505-762-5141
floydj@yucca.net

DISSENT
06022005

The Honorable James V. Hansen
BRAC Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Sir;

I am writing this letter in support of retaining Cannon Air Force Base.

Cannon has attributes that cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Cannon has a bombing range within minutes of the air base. Cannon also have significant airspace and an electronic warfare range. Supersonic airspace allowances for Cannon Air Force Base's 27th Fighter Wing, the New Mexico Air National Guard and others, are pending. The base can, and has, supported several squadrons of aircraft and equipment. More significantly, Cannon does not have encroachment issues, or noise limitations, that limit or prevent operations that so limit operations elsewhere. Cannon has a safe environment for operational issues. Cannon has nearly limitless flying opportunities.

From what I have read pertaining to BRAC, the criteria established would have demonstrated Cannon's value, and therefore have precluded it being placed on a closure list. Closure of facilities that are inefficient, encroached upon, have noise (operational) limitations, present major issues in the event of mishaps, and/or have issues with the local populace/governments should have been the focus. The fact that a desirable facility possesses an older fielded fleet is a circumstance that has been faced repeatedly in the past. If we had closed every facility that incurred an equipment/fleet conversion, we would have closed nearly every facility the military ever possessed. This is one of those situations. It appears that the Department of Defense (DoD) selected Cannon based on the equipment/fleet, rather than the facility value. We will continue to park fleets, but we must retain the prime facilities that our future fleets will require. Cannon is one of the future facilities.

There are also three other issues relative to this BRAC that concern me. First, is the inclusion of forecasted overseas unit reassignments to the United States. These overseas unit returns are not a done deal and are not necessarily part of what you are to examine, or what our Congress will be asked to vote on. Our Department of State, our mutual defense treaties, and the world's political situation, will affect negotiations relative to these units return. To place them in the BRAC is akin to throwing some states a bone,

albeit with a rope attached. This BRAC could be approved, and subsequently the forecasted units not return. Our citizens will believe that they have been deceived and our politicians that have participated in the BRAC process will have good reason not to believe our DoD leaders in the future. The second issue has to do with the term "military value." We should have learned from previous experiences that placing all of our assets near coastal cities is shortsighted. Having the ability to respond quickly is an asset. However, exposing the same assets to hurricanes and seaborne threats is not necessary. One may recall that during the tragic 911 disaster that our President was not transported to our coastal cities, but rather to a much safer location centrally located away from Washington and coasts. The third issue that causes me some concern was the briefing given by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to you and your BRAC committee counterparts. The press used the word "warning" in reference to his comments and the BRAC committee's ability to examine and understand his proposal. Perhaps I shouldn't be concerned, but it bothers me that he felt that he needed to infer that his plan was too complicated for the commission to fully understand, and therefore the committee should accept his proposal as-is. Perhaps cavalier would describe his attitude.

The local community supports Cannon fully. I spent many years in the military and can speak with experience that the local community is military-friendly.

The official BRAC Internet site presents success stories for post-BRAC facilities. Unfortunately, there are very few success stories. Naturally, the site doesn't not show the disasters left in post-BRAC's wake. Eastern New Mexico would be one of those disasters. The DoD's released data seriously underestimates the impact to this already economically disadvantaged state. The implications would be far-reaching. Comments stating that Cannon could be converted in a major business function are not based on logic, but rather on wishful thinking, or excuses. One need only to examine the history of the business arena of eastern New Mexico to understand that conversion is not an opportunity, but rather an economic liability in the making.

Clovis has experienced a BRAC before. The repercussions lasted for several years. There is no way to minimize the impact that the closure of Cannon would have on the local community. It would destroy the economy in this area. One has only to look at Walker Air Force Base, which closed in 1967, and Roswell to verify that closure is not a temporary economic issue. Roswell had the fortune of being in the oil boom to survive. Clovis has supported Cannon and the US Air Force for more than 50 years. The people of eastern New Mexico and west Texas continue to support Cannon and Cannon's military families.

We need your help in removing Cannon from the proposed closure list. Cannon Air Force Base is essential to ensuring the future capabilities of the US Air Force and our military. Thanks for your time and attention.

James D. Floyd

James D. Floyd

June 1, 2005

James D. Floyd
1701 Arbor Drive
Clovis, NM 88101-2305

505-762-5141
floydj@yucca.net

The Honorable Philip Coyle
BRAC Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

06022005

Sir;

I am writing this letter in support of retaining Cannon Air Force Base.

Cannon has attributes that cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Cannon has a bombing range within minutes of the air base. Cannon also have significant airspace and an electronic warfare range. Supersonic airspace allowances for Cannon Air Force Base's 27th Fighter Wing, the New Mexico Air National Guard and others, are pending. The base can, and has, supported several squadrons of aircraft and equipment. More significantly, Cannon does not have encroachment issues, or noise limitations, that limit or prevent operations that so limit operations elsewhere. Cannon has a safe environment for operational issues. Cannon has nearly limitless flying opportunities.

From what I have read pertaining to BRAC, the criteria established would have demonstrated Cannon's value, and therefore have precluded it being placed on a closure list. Closure of facilities that are inefficient, encroached upon, have noise (operational) limitations, present major issues in the event of mishaps, and/or have issues with the local populace/governments should have been the focus. The fact that a desirable facility possesses an older fielded fleet is a circumstance that has been faced repeatedly in the past. If we had closed every facility that incurred an equipment/fleet conversion, we would have closed nearly every facility the military ever possessed. This is one of those situations. It appears that the Department of Defense (DoD) selected Cannon based on the equipment/fleet, rather than the facility value. We will continue to park fleets, but we must retain the prime facilities that our future fleets will require. Cannon is one of the future facilities.

There are also three other issues relative to this BRAC that concern me. First, is the inclusion of forecasted overseas unit reassignments to the United States. These overseas unit returns are not a done deal and are not necessarily part of what you are to examine, or what our Congress will be asked to vote on. Our Department of State, our mutual defense treaties, and the world's political situation, will affect negotiations relative to these units return. To place them in the BRAC is akin to throwing some states a bone,

albeit with a rope attached. This BRAC could be approved, and subsequently the forecasted units not return. Our citizens will believe that they have been deceived and our politicians that have participated in the BRAC process will have good reason not to believe our DoD leaders in the future. The second issue has to do with the term "military value." We should have learned from previous experiences that placing all of our assets near coastal cities is shortsighted. Having the ability to respond quickly is an asset. However, exposing the same assets to hurricanes and seaborne threats is not necessary. One may recall that during the tragic 911 disaster that our President was not transported to our coastal cities, but rather to a much safer location centrally located away from Washington and coasts. The third issue that causes me some concern was the briefing given by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to you and your BRAC committee counterparts. The press used the word "warning" in reference to his comments and the BRAC committee's ability to examine and understand his proposal. Perhaps I shouldn't be concerned, but it bothers me that he felt that he needed to infer that his plan was too complicated for the commission to fully understand, and therefore the committee should accept his proposal as-is. Perhaps cavalier would describe his attitude.

The local community supports Cannon fully. I spent many years in the military and can speak with experience that the local community is military-friendly.

The official BRAC Internet site presents success stories for post-BRAC facilities. Unfortunately, there are very few success stories. Naturally, the site doesn't not show the disasters left in post-BRAC's wake. Eastern New Mexico would be one of those disasters. The DoD's released data seriously underestimates the impact to this already economically disadvantaged state. The implications would be far-reaching. Comments stating that Cannon could be converted in a major business function are not based on logic, but rather on wishful thinking, or excuses. One need only to examine the history of the business arena of eastern New Mexico to understand that conversion is not an opportunity, but rather an economic liability in the making.

Clovis has experienced a BRAC before. The repercussions lasted for several years. There is no way to minimize the impact that the closure of Cannon would have on the local community. It would destroy the economy in this area. One has only to look at Walker Air Force Base, which closed in 1967, and Roswell to verify that closure is not a temporary economic issue. Roswell had the fortune of being in the oil boom to survive. Clovis has supported Cannon and the US Air Force for more than 50 years. The people of eastern New Mexico and west Texas continue to support Cannon and Cannon's military families.

We need your help in removing Cannon from the proposed closure list. Cannon Air Force Base is essential to ensuring the future capabilities of the US Air Force and our military. Thanks for your time and attention.

James D. Floyd

James D. Floyd

June 1, 2005

James D. Floyd
1701 Arbor Drive
Clovis, NM 88101-2305

06022005

505-762-5141
floydj@yucca.net

General James T. Hill
BRAC Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

General;

I am writing this letter in support of retaining Cannon Air Force Base.

Cannon has attributes that cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Cannon has a bombing range within minutes of the air base. Cannon also have significant airspace and an electronic warfare range. Supersonic airspace allowances for Cannon Air Force Base's 27th Fighter Wing, the New Mexico Air National Guard and others, are pending. The base can, and has, supported several squadrons of aircraft and equipment. More significantly, Cannon does not have encroachment issues, or noise limitations, that limit or prevent operations that so limit operations elsewhere. Cannon has a safe environment for operational issues. Cannon has nearly limitless flying opportunities.

From what I have read pertaining to BRAC, the criteria established would have demonstrated Cannon's value, and therefore have precluded it being placed on a closure list. Closure of facilities that are inefficient, encroached upon, have noise (operational) limitations, present major issues in the event of mishaps, and/or have issues with the local populace/governments should have been the focus. The fact that a desirable facility possesses an older fielded fleet is a circumstance that has been faced repeatedly in the past. If we had closed every facility that incurred an equipment/fleet conversion, we would have closed nearly every facility the military ever possessed. This is one of those situations. It appears that the Department of Defense (DoD) selected Cannon based on the equipment/fleet, rather than the facility value. We will continue to park fleets, but we must retain the prime facilities that our future fleets will require. Cannon is one of the future facilities.

There are also three other issues relative to this BRAC that concern me. First, is the inclusion of forecasted overseas unit reassignments to the United States. These overseas unit returns are not a done deal and are not necessarily part of what you are to examine, or what our Congress will be asked to vote on. Our Department of State, our mutual defense treaties, and the world's political situation, will affect negotiations relative to these units return. To place them in the BRAC is akin to throwing some states a bone,

albeit with a rope attached. This BRAC could be approved, and subsequently the forecasted units not return. Our citizens will believe that they have been deceived and our politicians that have participated in the BRAC process will have good reason not to believe our DoD leaders in the future. The second issue has to do with the term "military value." We should have learned from previous experiences that placing all of our assets near coastal cities is shortsighted. Having the ability to respond quickly is an asset. However, exposing the same assets to hurricanes and seaborne threats is not necessary. One may recall that during the tragic 9/11 disaster that our President was not transported to our coastal cities, but rather to a much safer location centrally located away from Washington and coasts. The third issue that causes me some concern was the briefing given by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to you and your BRAC committee counterparts. The press used the word "warning" in reference to his comments and the BRAC committee's ability to examine and understand his proposal. Perhaps I shouldn't be concerned, but it bothers me that he felt that he needed to infer that his plan was too complicated for the commission to fully understand, and therefore the committee should accept his proposal as-is. Perhaps cavalier would describe his attitude.

The local community supports Cannon fully. I spent many years in the military and can speak with experience that the local community is military-friendly.

The official BRAC Internet site presents success stories for post-BRAC facilities. Unfortunately, there are very few success stories. Naturally, the site doesn't show the disasters left in post-BRAC's wake. Eastern New Mexico would be one of those disasters. The DoD's released data seriously underestimates the impact to this already economically disadvantaged state. The implications would be far-reaching. Comments stating that Cannon could be converted in a major business function are not based on logic, but rather on wishful thinking, or excuses. One need only to examine the history of the business arena of eastern New Mexico to understand that conversion is not an opportunity, but rather an economic liability in the making.

Clovis has experienced a BRAC before. The repercussions lasted for several years. There is no way to minimize the impact that the closure of Cannon would have on the local community. It would destroy the economy in this area. One has only to look at Walker Air Force Base, which closed in 1967, and Roswell to verify that closure is not a temporary economic issue. Roswell had the fortune of being in the oil boom to survive. Clovis has supported Cannon and the US Air Force for more than 50 years. The people of eastern New Mexico and west Texas continue to support Cannon and Cannon's military families.

We need your help in removing Cannon from the proposed closure list. Cannon Air Force Base is essential to ensuring the future capabilities of the US Air Force and our military. Thanks for your time and attention.

James D. Floyd

James D. Floyd

June 1, 2005

James D. Floyd
1701 Arbor Drive
Clovis, NM 88101-2305

06022005

505-762-5141
floydj@yucca.net

Brigadier General Sue E. Turner
BRAC Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

General;

I am writing this letter in support of retaining Cannon Air Force Base.

Cannon has attributes that cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Cannon has a bombing range within minutes of the air base. Cannon also have significant airspace and an electronic warfare range. Supersonic airspace allowances for Cannon Air Force Base's 27th Fighter Wing, the New Mexico Air National Guard and others, are pending. The base can, and has, supported several squadrons of aircraft and equipment. More significantly, Cannon does not have encroachment issues, or noise limitations, that limit or prevent operations that so limit operations elsewhere. Cannon has a safe environment for operational issues. Cannon has nearly limitless flying opportunities.

From what I have read pertaining to BRAC, the criteria established would have demonstrated Cannon's value, and therefore have precluded it being placed on a closure list. Closure of facilities that are inefficient, encroached upon, have noise (operational) limitations, present major issues in the event of mishaps, and/or have issues with the local populace/governments should have been the focus. The fact that a desirable facility possesses an older fielded fleet is a circumstance that has been faced repeatedly in the past. If we had closed every facility that incurred an equipment/fleet conversion, we would have closed nearly every facility the military ever possessed. This is one of those situations. It appears that the Department of Defense (DoD) selected Cannon based on the equipment/fleet, rather than the facility value. We will continue to park fleets, but we must retain the prime facilities that our future fleets will require. Cannon is one of the future facilities.

There are also three other issues relative to this BRAC that concern me. First, is the inclusion of forecasted overseas unit reassignments to the United States. These overseas unit returns are not a done deal and are not necessarily part of what you are to examine, or what our Congress will be asked to vote on. Our Department of State, our mutual defense treaties, and the world's political situation, will affect negotiations relative to these units return. To place them in the BRAC is akin to throwing some states a bone,

albeit with a rope attached. This BRAC could be approved, and subsequently the forecasted units not return. Our citizens will believe that they have been deceived and our politicians that have participated in the BRAC process will have good reason not to believe our DoD leaders in the future. The second issue has to do with the term "military value." We should have learned from previous experiences that placing all of our assets near coastal cities is shortsighted. Having the ability to respond quickly is an asset. However, exposing the same assets to hurricanes and seaborne threats is not necessary. One may recall that during the tragic 911 disaster that our President was not transported to our coastal cities, but rather to a much safer location centrally located away from Washington and coasts. The third issue that causes me some concern was the briefing given by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to you and your BRAC committee counterparts. The press used the word "warning" in reference to his comments and the BRAC committee's ability to examine and understand his proposal. Perhaps I shouldn't be concerned, but it bothers me that he felt that he needed to infer that his plan was too complicated for the commission to fully understand, and therefore the committee should accept his proposal as-is. Perhaps cavalier would describe his attitude.

The local community supports Cannon fully. I spent many years in the military and can speak with experience that the local community is military-friendly.

The official BRAC Internet site presents success stories for post-BRAC facilities. Unfortunately, there are very few success stories. Naturally, the site doesn't not show the disasters left in post-BRAC's wake. Eastern New Mexico would be one of those disasters. The DoD's released data seriously underestimates the impact to this already economically disadvantaged state. The implications would be far-reaching. Comments stating that Cannon could be converted in a major business function are not based on logic, but rather on wishful thinking, or excuses. One need only to examine the history of the business arena of eastern New Mexico to understand that conversion is not an opportunity, but rather an economic liability in the making.

Clovis has experienced a BRAC before. The repercussions lasted for several years. There is no way to minimize the impact that the closure of Cannon would have on the local community. It would destroy the economy in this area. One has only to look at Walker Air Force Base, which closed in 1967, and Roswell to verify that closure is not a temporary economic issue. Roswell had the fortune of being in the oil boom to survive. Clovis has supported Cannon and the US Air Force for more than 50 years. The people of eastern New Mexico and west Texas continue to support Cannon and Cannon's military families.

We need your help in removing Cannon from the proposed closure list. Cannon Air Force Base is essential to ensuring the future capabilities of the US Air Force and our military. Thanks for your time and attention.

James D. Floyd

James D. Floyd

June 1, 2005

James D. Floyd
1701 Arbor Drive
Clovis, NM 88101-2305

06022005

505-762-5141
floydj@yucca.net

The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner
BRAC Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Sir;

I am writing this letter in support of retaining Cannon Air Force Base.

Cannon has attributes that cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Cannon has a bombing range within minutes of the air base. Cannon also have significant airspace and an electronic warfare range. Supersonic airspace allowances for Cannon Air Force Base's 27th Fighter Wing, the New Mexico Air National Guard and others, are pending. The base can, and has, supported several squadrons of aircraft and equipment. More significantly, Cannon does not have encroachment issues, or noise limitations, that limit or prevent operations that so limit operations elsewhere. Cannon has a safe environment for operational issues. Cannon has nearly limitless flying opportunities.

From what I have read pertaining to BRAC, the criteria established would have demonstrated Cannon's value, and therefore have precluded it being placed on a closure list. Closure of facilities that are inefficient, encroached upon, have noise (operational) limitations, present major issues in the event of mishaps, and/or have issues with the local populace/governments should have been the focus. The fact that a desirable facility possesses an older fielded fleet is a circumstance that has been faced repeatedly in the past. If we had closed every facility that incurred an equipment/fleet conversion, we would have closed nearly every facility the military ever possessed. This is one of those situations. It appears that the Department of Defense (DoD) selected Cannon based on the equipment/fleet, rather than the facility value. We will continue to park fleets, but we must retain the prime facilities that our future fleets will require. Cannon is one of the future facilities.

There are also three other issues relative to this BRAC that concern me. First, is the inclusion of forecasted overseas unit reassignments to the United States. These overseas unit returns are not a done deal and are not necessarily part of what you are to examine, or what our Congress will be asked to vote on. Our Department of State, our mutual defense treaties, and the world's political situation, will affect negotiations relative to these units return. To place them in the BRAC is akin to throwing some states a bone,

albeit with a rope attached. This BRAC could be approved, and subsequently the forecasted units not return. Our citizens will believe that they have been deceived and our politicians that have participated in the BRAC process will have good reason not to believe our DoD leaders in the future. The second issue has to do with the term "military value." We should have learned from previous experiences that placing all of our assets near coastal cities is shortsighted. Having the ability to respond quickly is an asset. However, exposing the same assets to hurricanes and seaborne threats is not necessary. One may recall that during the tragic 911 disaster that our President was not transported to our coastal cities, but rather to a much safer location centrally located away from Washington and coasts. The third issue that causes me some concern was the briefing given by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to you and your BRAC committee counterparts. The press used the word "warning" in reference to his comments and the BRAC committee's ability to examine and understand his proposal. Perhaps I shouldn't be concerned, but it bothers me that he felt that he needed to infer that his plan was too complicated for the commission to fully understand, and therefore the committee should accept his proposal as-is. Perhaps cavalier would describe his attitude.

The local community supports Cannon fully. I spent many years in the military and can speak with experience that the local community is military-friendly.

The official BRAC Internet site presents success stories for post-BRAC facilities. Unfortunately, there are very few success stories. Naturally, the site doesn't not show the disasters left in post-BRAC's wake. Eastern New Mexico would be one of those disasters. The DoD's released data seriously underestimates the impact to this already economically disadvantaged state. The implications would be far-reaching. Comments stating that Cannon could be converted in a major business function are not based on logic, but rather on wishful thinking, or excuses. One need only to examine the history of the business arena of eastern New Mexico to understand that conversion is not an opportunity, but rather an economic liability in the making.

Clovis has experienced a BRAC before. The repercussions lasted for several years. There is no way to minimize the impact that the closure of Cannon would have on the local community. It would destroy the economy in this area. One has only to look at Walker Air Force Base, which closed in 1967, and Roswell to verify that closure is not a temporary economic issue. Roswell had the fortune of being in the oil boom to survive. Clovis has supported Cannon and the US Air Force for more than 50 years. The people of eastern New Mexico and west Texas continue to support Cannon and Cannon's military families.

We need your help in removing Cannon from the proposed closure list. Cannon Air Force Base is essential to ensuring the future capabilities of the US Air Force and our military. Thanks for your time and attention.

James D. Floyd

James D. Floyd

June 1, 2005

James D. Floyd
1701 Arbor Drive
Clovis, NM 88101-2305

06022005

505-762-5141
floydj@yucca.net

The Honorable Anthony J. Principi
BRAC Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Sir;

I am writing this letter in support of retaining Cannon Air Force Base.

Cannon has attributes that cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Cannon has a bombing range within minutes of the air base. Cannon also have significant airspace and an electronic warfare range. Supersonic airspace allowances for Cannon Air Force Base's 27th Fighter Wing, the New Mexico Air National Guard and others, are pending. The base can, and has, supported several squadrons of aircraft and equipment. More significantly, Cannon does not have encroachment issues, or noise limitations, that limit or prevent operations that so limit operations elsewhere. Cannon has a safe environment for operational issues. Cannon has nearly limitless flying opportunities.

From what I have read pertaining to BRAC, the criteria established would have demonstrated Cannon's value, and therefore have precluded it being placed on a closure list. Closure of facilities that are inefficient, encroached upon, have noise (operational) limitations, present major issues in the event of mishaps, and/or have issues with the local populace/governments should have been the focus. The fact that a desirable facility possesses an older fielded fleet is a circumstance that has been faced repeatedly in the past. If we had closed every facility that incurred an equipment/fleet conversion, we would have closed nearly every facility the military ever possessed. This is one of those situations. It appears that the Department of Defense (DoD) selected Cannon based on the equipment/fleet, rather than the facility value. We will continue to park fleets, but we must retain the prime facilities that our future fleets will require. Cannon is one of the future facilities.

There are also three other issues relative to this BRAC that concern me. First, is the inclusion of forecasted overseas unit reassignments to the United States. These overseas unit returns are not a done deal and are not necessarily part of what you are to examine, or what our Congress will be asked to vote on. Our Department of State, our mutual defense treaties, and the world's political situation, will affect negotiations relative to these units return. To place them in the BRAC is akin to throwing some states a bone,

albeit with a rope attached. This BRAC could be approved, and subsequently the forecasted units not return. Our citizens will believe that they have been deceived and our politicians that have participated in the BRAC process will have good reason not to believe our DoD leaders in the future. The second issue has to do with the term "military value." We should have learned from previous experiences that placing all of our assets near coastal cities is shortsighted. Having the ability to respond quickly is an asset. However, exposing the same assets to hurricanes and seaborne threats is not necessary. One may recall that during the tragic 911 disaster that our President was not transported to our coastal cities, but rather to a much safer location centrally located away from Washington and coasts. The third issue that causes me some concern was the briefing given by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to you and your BRAC committee counterparts. The press used the word "warning" in reference to his comments and the BRAC committee's ability to examine and understand his proposal. Perhaps I shouldn't be concerned, but it bothers me that he felt that he needed to infer that his plan was too complicated for the commission to fully understand, and therefore the committee should accept his proposal as-is. Perhaps cavalier would describe his attitude.

The local community supports Cannon fully. I spent many years in the military and can speak with experience that the local community is military-friendly.

The official BRAC Internet site presents success stories for post-BRAC facilities. Unfortunately, there are very few success stories. Naturally, the site doesn't not show the disasters left in post-BRAC's wake. Eastern New Mexico would be one of those disasters. The DoD's released data seriously underestimates the impact to this already economically disadvantaged state. The implications would be far-reaching. Comments stating that Cannon could be converted in a major business function are not based on logic, but rather on wishful thinking, or excuses. One need only to examine the history of the business arena of eastern New Mexico to understand that conversion is not an opportunity, but rather an economic liability in the making.

Clovis has experienced a BRAC before. The repercussions lasted for several years. There is no way to minimize the impact that the closure of Cannon would have on the local community. It would destroy the economy in this area. One has only to look at Walker Air Force Base, which closed in 1967, and Roswell to verify that closure is not a temporary economic issue. Roswell had the fortune of being in the oil boom to survive. Clovis has supported Cannon and the US Air Force for more than 50 years. The people of eastern New Mexico and west Texas continue to support Cannon and Cannon's military families.

We need your help in removing Cannon from the proposed closure list. Cannon Air Force Base is essential to ensuring the future capabilities of the US Air Force and our military. Thanks for your time and attention.

James D. Floyd

James D. Floyd

June 1, 2005

James D. Floyd
1701 Arbor Drive
Clovis, NM 88101-2305

06072005

505-762-5141
floydj@yucca.net

Admiral Harold W. Gehman Jr.
BRAC Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Admiral;

I am writing this letter in support of retaining Cannon Air Force Base.

Cannon has attributes that cannot be duplicated elsewhere. Cannon has a bombing range within minutes of the air base. Cannon also have significant airspace and an electronic warfare range. Supersonic airspace allowances for Cannon Air Force Base's 27th Fighter Wing, the New Mexico Air National Guard and others, are pending. The base can, and has, supported several squadrons of aircraft and equipment. More significantly, Cannon does not have encroachment issues, or noise limitations, that limit or prevent operations that so limit operations elsewhere. Cannon has a safe environment for operational issues. Cannon has nearly limitless flying opportunities.

From what I have read pertaining to BRAC, the criteria established would have demonstrated Cannon's value, and therefore have precluded it being placed on a closure list. Closure of facilities that are inefficient, encroached upon, have noise (operational) limitations, present major issues in the event of mishaps, and/or have issues with the local populace/governments should have been the focus. The fact that a desirable facility possesses an older fielded fleet is a circumstance that has been faced repeatedly in the past. If we had closed every facility that incurred an equipment/fleet conversion, we would have closed nearly every facility the military ever possessed. This is one of those situations. It appears that the Department of Defense (DoD) selected Cannon based on the equipment/fleet, rather than the facility value. We will continue to park fleets, but we must retain the prime facilities that our future fleets will require. Cannon is one of the future facilities.

There are also three other issues relative to this BRAC that concern me. First, is the inclusion of forecasted overseas unit reassignments to the United States. These overseas unit returns are not a done deal and are not necessarily part of what you are to examine, or what our Congress will be asked to vote on. Our Department of State, our mutual defense treaties, and the world's political situation, will affect negotiations relative to these units return. To place them in the BRAC is akin to throwing some states a bone,

albeit with a rope attached. This BRAC could be approved, and subsequently the forecasted units not return. Our citizens will believe that they have been deceived and our politicians that have participated in the BRAC process will have good reason not to believe our DoD leaders in the future. The second issue has to do with the term "military value." We should have learned from previous experiences that placing all of our assets near coastal cities is shortsighted. Having the ability to respond quickly is an asset. However, exposing the same assets to hurricanes and seaborne threats is not necessary. One may recall that during the tragic 911 disaster that our President was not transported to our coastal cities, but rather to a much safer location centrally located away from Washington and coasts. The third issue that causes me some concern was the briefing given by Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld to you and your BRAC committee counterparts. The press used the word "warning" in reference to his comments and the BRAC committee's ability to examine and understand his proposal. Perhaps I shouldn't be concerned, but it bothers me that he felt that he needed to infer that his plan was too complicated for the commission to fully understand, and therefore the committee should accept his proposal as-is. Perhaps cavalier would describe his attitude.

The local community supports Cannon fully. I spent many years in the military and can speak with experience that the local community is military-friendly.

The official BRAC Internet site presents success stories for post-BRAC facilities. Unfortunately, there are very few success stories. Naturally, the site doesn't not show the disasters left in post-BRAC's wake. Eastern New Mexico would be one of those disasters. The DoD's released data seriously underestimates the impact to this already economically disadvantaged state. The implications would be far-reaching. Comments stating that Cannon could be converted in a major business function are not based on logic, but rather on wishful thinking, or excuses. One need only to examine the history of the business arena of eastern New Mexico to understand that conversion is not an opportunity, but rather an economic liability in the making.

Clovis has experienced a BRAC before. The repercussions lasted for several years. There is no way to minimize the impact that the closure of Cannon would have on the local community. It would destroy the economy in this area. One has only to look at Walker Air Force Base, which closed in 1967, and Roswell to verify that closure is not a temporary economic issue. Roswell had the fortune of being in the oil boom to survive. Clovis has supported Cannon and the US Air Force for more than 50 years. The people of eastern New Mexico and west Texas continue to support Cannon and Cannon's military families.

We need your help in removing Cannon from the proposed closure list. Cannon Air Force Base is essential to ensuring the future capabilities of the US Air Force and our military. Thanks for your time and attention.

James D. Floyd

James D. Floyd