

**DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY**

WASHINGTON DC 20310-0200

NOV 10 2003

MEMORANDUM FOR CHAIRMAN, INFRASTRUCTURE STEERING GROUP**SUBJECT: Draft Selection Criteria for BRAC 2005**

The Army has reviewed and concurs with the Draft Selection Criteria proposed to the Infrastructure Steering Group (ISG) with the following comment. We request that the ISG discuss the comments provided in the attachments by the Technical Joint Cross Service Group and the Army representative to the Education and Training Joint Cross Service Group.

Handwritten signature of Mario P. Fiori in black ink.

Mario P. Fiori
Assistant Secretary of the Army
(Installations & Environment)

Handwritten signature of George W. Casey, Jr. in black ink.

George W. Casey, Jr.
General, United States Army
Vice Chief of Staff

Encls

1. Technical JCSG
2. Education & Training JCSG

Technical JCSG Proposed Draft Selection Criteria

Military Value

1. The current and future mission requirements and the impact on operational readiness of the Department of Defense's total force, including impacts on joint warfighting, technical capabilities, training, and readiness.
2. The availability and condition of land, facilities and associated airspace, including science and technology (S&T)/acquisition/test and evaluation (T&E) infrastructure and training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions in support of the national military strategy, at both existing and potential receiving locations.
3. The ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization, and future total force requirements at both existing and potential receiving locations to support operations, training, and science and technology (S&T)/acquisition/test and evaluation (T&E) missions.
4. The cost and manpower implications, including the impact on intellectual capital.

Return on Investment

5. The extent and timing of potential costs and savings, including the number of years, beginning with the date of completion of the closure or realignment, for the savings to exceed the costs.

Impacts

6. The economic impact on existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.
7. The ability of both the existing and potential receiving communities' infrastructure to support forces, missions, and personnel.
8. The environmental impact, including the impact of costs related to potential environmental restoration, waste management, and environmental compliance activities, as well as existing licenses and permits.

Comment from LTG Lovelace, Army Representative to E&T JCSG:

1. Agree that the primary consideration for making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations should be the Military Value. I recommend a change to Military Value #2. As written, it is not clear that the issue of encroachment is of vital concern and it implies that the paragraph only applies to Homeland Defense. As written, #2 states:

The availability and condition of land, facilities and associated airspace, including training areas suitable for maneuver by ground, naval, or air forces throughout a diversity of climate and terrain areas and staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions, at both existing and potential receiving locations.

2. Our proposed rewording is as follows:

The availability and condition of sustainable un-encroached land, sea and airspace and associated facilities throughout a diversity of climate, terrain and staging areas for use by the Armed Forces at both existing and potential receiving locations. This includes considerations for homeland defense missions.