

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Armstrong, Charlie (Legis Counsel) [Charlie_Armstrong@slc.senate.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2005 1:44 PM
To: Davis, Kevin (Legis Counsel)
Cc: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: FW: Thune BRAC Related Bills

Kevin:

These are the bills I mentioned to you earlier.

Charlie

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Friday, May 13, 2005 1:41 PM
To: Armstrong, Charlie (Legis Counsel)
Subject: Thune BRAC Related Bills

Charlie, per our phone conversation, the Senator would like three separate bills drafted.

First Bill - an elimination/termination of BRAC 2005 process.

Second Bill - Postponement of 2005 BRAC process until

- a) complete analysis and implementation of recommendations of Commission on Overseas Military facility Structure;
- b) Withdrawal and return to permanent garrison of all major combat units/assets on operational deployment to Iraq theater of operations;
- c) Receipt of the QDR (due in Feb 2006);
- d) Completion of a study by DoD - within one year after the DoD meeting of the last condition above - of an assessment of the impact and changes in basing requirements as a result of these factors.

Third Bill - mandate that the Secretary of Defense shall allow any active member of the armed services to testify before the BRAC commission as to the military value of a installation without fear of recrimination or retaliation by commanders, their service component of the Department of Defense, in any way. (Something similar to whistle blower protections/ Intelligence officer access to members of Congress).

I assume the first one has been used before. Please call if you have questions. Thanks

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Ashworth, Sid (Appropriations) [Sid_Ashworth@appro.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2005 7:26 PM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: RE: BRAC Bill

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

My view is if you get a lot of consponsors early..you will deflate the Administration's effort.

I will give you some feedback as soon as I talk to him.

Thanks.

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2005 7:25 PM
To: Ashworth, Sid (Appropriations)
Subject: RE: BRAC Bill

Oops. Here it is. All those state delegations will be prime targets for cosponsors. Pressures in our state, and some others, are pushing us to drop it with a few lead sponsors and then recruit others as we go.

-----Original Message-----

From: Ashworth, Sid (Appropriations) [mailto:Sid_Ashworth@appro.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2005 7:21 PM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: RE: BRAC Bill

Bob:
Do you have the bill available? If so, I will need to show him tomorrow and get his feedback in the morning.

Have you considered all of the states that lost Air Guard F-16 squadrons (12 units) and F-15 squadrons (3 units), as far as getting them on board? Or states that lost a lot of Guard/Reserve units?

Thanks.

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2005 7:17 PM
To: Ashworth, Sid (Appropriations)
Subject: BRAC Bill

Sid, I talked to you Friday about possible legislative actions our Senators could take on BRAC, albeit unlikely to pass. We will probably drop a bill tomorrow with Johnson, and likely Lieberman, Snowe and others, attached. Forgive the short notice, but we would love to have Senator Stevens as well. We are looking at the postponement approach, until certain events/conditions occur. Please take a look and talk to you boss if interested. Thanks.

Bob Taylor

8-5385

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Bennett, Jody (Johnson) [Jody_Bennett@johnson.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2005 5:36 PM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: BRAC Bills

Bob,

I'm Senator Johnson's MLA and I finally had a chance to speak to him about this. Tim will cosponsor either bill, but like Senator Thune, he feels the postponement legislation is more defensible.

Do you mind sharing with me your time table on dropping this bill? Let me know what else you need from me.

Jody

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2005 3:57 PM
To: Stubbendieck, Todd (Johnson)
Subject: RE: BRAC Bills

We are leaning strongly to the postponement. It has a reasonable argument for delay and is consistent with what both of our Senators have been saying since Friday.

From: Stubbendieck, Todd (Johnson) [mailto:Todd_Stubbendieck@johnson.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2005 3:55 PM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: RE: BRAC Bills

I'm sure we will, let me share with my defense person. As far as which bill, are you all leaning one way or the other at this point?

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2005 3:52 PM
To: Stubbendieck, Todd (Johnson)
Subject: BRAC Bills

Todd, we are going to introduce one of these two options. One terminates BRAC 2005. The other would postpone until certain events/conditions occur. Would like to join us?

Bob
8-5385

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Davis, Kevin (Legis Counsel) [Kevin_Davis@slc.senate.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2005 10:53 AM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: RE: Revised BRAC bill

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Attachments: DAV05483_xml.pdf



DAV05483_xml.pdf
(32 KB)

Bob,

I've attached a revised version (DAV05483.xml). Let me know if you have any questions or need anything further.

Thanks,
Kevin (4-6461)

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2005 10:26 AM
To: Armstrong, Charlie (Legis Counsel)
Cc: Davis, Kevin (Legis Counsel)
Subject: RE: Revised BRAC bill

Charlie, how fast can you add the following condition and turn this around? Let me know if its not doable before noon. Thanks

The DoD/DHS National Maritime Security Strategy and DoD's Homeland Defense and Civil Support directive must be must be fully developed and implemented.

(The latter is now in draft form at DoD)

From: Armstrong, Charlie (Legis Counsel) [mailto:Charlie_Armstrong@slc.senate.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2005 9:21 AM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Cc: Davis, Kevin (Legis Counsel)
Subject: Revised BRAC bill

Here it is (dav05481.xml).

Good luck with it.

Charlie
<< File: DAV05481_xml.pdf >>

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Bennett, Jody (Johnson) [Jody_Bennett@johnson.senate.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2005 11:55 AM

To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)

Subject: RE: BRAC bill

We've got no problem with the provisions and will cosponsor a bill that contains them.

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)

Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2005 11:25 AM

To: Bennett, Jody (Johnson)

Subject: RE: BRAC bill

The conditions, particularly the return of troops, would delay this conceivably for a number of years. With the passage of time and new factors they almost have to start from scratch. In the meantime, we work to put other missions into Ellsworth. We have also added two Homeland Security conditions into the bill that Snowe recommended. Take a look to see if you approve of these additions. Snowe will go with either version, but I think these help.

From: Bennett, Jody (Johnson) [mailto:Jody_Bennett@johnson.senate.gov]

Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2005 11:20 AM

To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)

Subject: BRAC bill

Importance: High

Bob,

Quick question on the BRAC legislation. I understand that this bill postpones the BRAC round, but (hypothetically) if DOD completes all actions required and we proceed with the round of base closures, does DOD draw up a new list of recommendations for which installations should be closed? Or do they start with the list they currently proposed (which includes EAFB).

Thanks,
Jody

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Vincent, Trudy (Bingaman)
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2005 3:57 PM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: RE: Thune BRAC Bill

Hey, Bob. Please put us on the bill. Sorry, thought someone got back to you already. You're definitely dropping today?

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Wednesday, May 18, 2005 11:55 AM
To: Vincent, Trudy (Bingaman)
Subject: Thune BRAC Bill

We are dropping this bill today. We have been talking to Domenici who will probably also join us.

Bob Taylor
8-5385

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Maher, Shawn (Dodd)
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2005 1:23 PM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: RE: BRAC Bill S 1075

Thanks, Bob. Sen. Dodd will be joining, as well.

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2005 11:36 AM
To: Maher, Shawn (Dodd)
Subject: BRAC Bill S 1075

Shawn, just wanted to let you know that Senator Lieberman has signed on the bill.

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Pierce, Erin (Burns) [Erin_Pierce@burns.senate.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 23, 2005 5:20 PM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: FW: Thune BRAC bill
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red
Attachments: BRACDAV05483_xml.pdf; BRACSTMT.pdf

Bob:
Please add Burns as a cosponsor tomorrow. Thanks.

From: Molen, Ric (Burns)
Sent: Friday, May 20, 2005 10:31 AM
To: Pierce, Erin (Burns)
Subject: FW: Thune BRAC bill

Thoughts?

-----Original Message-----

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Thursday, May 19, 2005 6:44 PM
To: Molen, Ric (Burns)
Subject: Thune BRAC bill

Ric, we introduced a bill late yesterday to delay BRAC 2005, until a number of events/conditions have occurred. I don't know how your state fared in DoD's recommendations but you may be interested in taking a look at this bill. Sponsors include Thune, Stevens, Gregg, Lott, Domenici, Bingamen, Snowe, Collins, Johnson and Murkowski. We will probably have Lieberman, Dodd, Lautenberg and Corzine by Friday. If you have any questions please call.

Bob Taylor
Legislative Director
Senator John Thune
8-5385

STATEMENT BY
SENATOR JOHN THUNE

Mr. President, I rise today to offer an amendment to S. 1042 that would delay implementation of the 2005 round of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment. This amendment does not seek to nullify the Department of Defense recommendations, nor does it seek to halt the work of the BRAC Commission now well underway. Nor do I seek to block the presentation of the BRAC Commission's final recommendations to the President. To the contrary, I believe the BRAC commission to be an integral and indispensable check on this process and I

value their analysis and demonstrated independence.

The amendment would essentially extend the Congressional review period for any final recommendations approved by the President until certain conditions are first met.

This proposed suspension of the "45 day" review period would thus delay "implementation" by the Department of Defense until one year following the last condition is met. These conditions center on certain events that are anticipated to occur and which have potentially large or unforeseen implications for our military force structure. Therefore, implementation of any final BRAC recommendations should not

occur until both the DoD and Congress have had a chance to fully study the effects such events will have on our basing requirements. I'll say more about those conditions in a moment.

But first, I want to make my position perfectly clear. I do not oppose the BRAC process. The underlying purpose of BRAC, as written by this body, is not only good for our armed forces, it is good for the American taxpayer. We all want to eliminate waste and reduce redundancy in the government. But when Congress modified the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) law in December 2001, to make way for the 2005 round of base closings, it failed to

envison this country involved in a protracted war involving stretched manpower resources, ever-evolving threats and the burden of large overseas rotational deployments of both troops and equipment. I do, therefore, question the timing of this round of BRAC.

The amendment identifies several principal actions that must occur before final implementation of the 2005 BRAC recommendations. First there must be a complete analysis and consideration of the recommendations of the Commission on Review of Overseas Military Structures. The overseas base commission has itself called upon the Department of Defense to "slow down

and take a breath." It cautions that we should not move forward on basing decisions without knowing exactly where units will be returned, and if those installations are prepared or equipped to support units returning from garrisons in Europe, consisting of approximately 70,000 personnel.

Second, BRAC should not occur while this country is engaged in a major war and rotational deployments are still ongoing. We have seen enough disruption of both military and civilian institutions due to the logistical strain brought about by these constant rotations of units and personnel to Iraq and Afghanistan without, at the same

time, initiating numerous base closures and the multiple transfer of units and missions from base to base. This is simply too much to ask of our military, our communities and the families of our servicemen and women, who are already stretched and over-taxed. And frankly, our efforts right now must be devoted to winning the global war on terrorism, not packing-up and moving units around the country.

Our amendment would delay implementation of BRAC until the Secretary of Defense determines that substantially all major combat units and assets have been returned from deployment in the Iraq theater of operations, whenever that might occur.

Third, it seems counter-intuitive and completely out of logical sequence to attempt to review or implement the BRAC recommendations without having the benefit of studying the Quadrennial Defense Review, due in 2006, and its long-term planning recommendations. Therefore, the bill requires that Congress receive the QDR and have an opportunity to study its planning recommendations as one of the conditions before implementing BRAC 2005.

Fourth and Fifth: BRAC should not go forward until the implementation and development by the Secretaries of Defense and Homeland Security of the National Maritime Security

Strategy; and the completion and implementation of the Secretary of Defense's Homeland Defense and Civil Support Directive -- only now being drafted. These two planning strategies should be key considerations before beginning any BRAC process.

Finally, once all these conditions have been met, the Secretary of Defense must submit to Congress, not later than one year after the occurrence of the last of these conditions, a report that assesses the relevant factors and recommendations identified by the Commission on Review of Overseas Base Structure; the return of our thousands of troops deployed in overseas garrisons that

will return to domestic bases because of either overseas base reduction or the end of our deployments in the war; and, any relevant factors identified by the QDR that would impact, modify, negate or open to reconsideration any of the recommendations submitted by the Secretary of Defense for BRAC 2005.

This proposed delay only seems logical and fair. There is no need to rush into decisions, that in a few years from now, could turn out to be colossal mistakes. We can't afford to go back and rebuild installations or relocate high-cost support infrastructure at various points in this country once those installations have been

closed or stripped of their valuable capacity to support critical missions.

Frankly, some of the recommendations made by the Department of Defense seem more driven by internal zeal to cut costs, than by sound military judgment. Several recommendations involving the consolidation of high value military air and naval assets at single locations seem to violate one of the most basic tenets of national security - ensuring strategic redundancy. Yes, the cold war may no longer be a factor in military basing requirements, but after 9/11 is there any question in anybody's mind whether the threat to our country or our military installations has diminished - particularly

as rogue countries and terrorist groups continue their quest for weapons of mass destruction?

The GAO, in its report of July 1, 2005, has even questioned whether this BRAC will achieve the savings that DoD contends it can achieve. GAO calculates the up-front investment costs of implementing this BRAC to be \$24 billion and reveals that DoD's estimated savings of \$50 billion NPV over 20 years is largely illusory - incorrectly claiming 47 % of the savings from military personnel that are not eliminated at all from the services, but only transferred to different installations.

There are many questions I and many of my colleagues have about the wisdom of the timing of this BRAC round and the prudence of some of its recommendations and I will return to the floor to speak to many of these as this amendment is considered. Again, I am not opposed to the BRAC process. But I do question whether this is the right time to begin a new round of domestic base closures and massive relocations of manpower and equipment.

I, therefore, offer this amendment today and call upon my colleagues to join us in this debate and support its passage.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2005 7:24 PM
To: Downey, Fred (Lieberman)
Subject: RE: Defense Bill - BRAC Amendments

Great. Let us know. We may not be ready to engage Warner in full debate as early as tomorrow, though we could drop it. We would like to coordinate floor statements with you Collins and others.

From: Downey, Fred (Lieberman)
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2005 5:28 PM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: RE: Defense Bill - BRAC Amendments

I imagine he will.

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2005 5:23 PM
To: Downey, Fred (Lieberman)
Subject: Defense Bill - BRAC Amendments

Fred, do you think your boss is up for a few BRAC amendments if the Defense bill comes up this week – maybe beginning tomorrow?

Bob
85385

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Wednesday, July 20, 2005 2:17 PM
To: Ashworth, Sid (Appropriations); Maher, Shawn (Dodd); Hild, Edward (Domenici); Bennett, Jody (Johnson); Vincent, Trudy (Bingaman); Cuzzi, David (Sununu); Bonvillian, Bill (Lieberman); Brinkerhoff, Liz (Corzine); Eaglen, Mackenzie (Collins); Daffron, Tom (Murkowski); Krncevic, Ray (Snowe); Waldman, Mitch (Lott); Barca, Frank (Gregg); Pierce, Erin (Burns); Anderson, Wendy (Lautenberg); Downey, Fred (Lieberman)
Subject: BRAC Amendments to Defense Bill
Attachments: DAV05501_xml.pdf; DAV05876_xml.pdf

As the Defense Authorization bill may come to the floor as early as this evening, Senator Thune would like to get an idea of who would be interested in cosponsoring BRAC related amendments or speaking in support – essentially the same language in the bills your boss already cosponsored, S 1075 & S 1136. I've attached the two most likely amendments to be offered. Senator Warner would like to lead off with BRAC – though we have not committed to do that. Please let me know you boss' thoughts. Thanks.

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Thursday, July 21, 2005 6:07 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Thune BRAC Statement
Attachments: BRACSTATEMENT BY.doc

Points : The effect is that there is no effect on the ongoing BRAC process until the point where the President's approval of the Commission's list is forwarded to the Congress and the 45 day period would begin to run. At that point, if the conditions outlined in the bill have not been met, the Congressional review period would be extended until all the conditions in the bill have been met, then the process would resume. Upon review of the additional info/analysis from DoD required in the amend, Congress could then decide to approve or not approve, just as they can now. But they would have the benefit of the QDR, the other reports, assessment of overseas base closure, redeployment of troops home...etc, before making that decision. In these times, that seems only prudent to us.

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Zabel, Matt (Thune)
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2005 9:25 AM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Red

Bob: Hope you had a good weekend. JRT just called and mentioned that he would like a chart that compares the DOD's proposed/claimed savings from BRAC with the GAO's estimates re: cost savings.

He also mentioned another chart that would show DOD's baseline spending over the relevant time period (I think 20 years) to compare it to the claimed savings of BRAC, to show that we would not really be saving all that much through BRAC, considering the dislocation, etc. I mentioned that we might need to be careful that we not minimize the amount of savings, because our opponents will then say that these saved dollars will go to buy armored humvees, bullet-proof vests, etc. for our soldiers. He agreed, but said he would at least like to have these numbers available for the debate. Thoughts?

Thanks. Matt

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2005 5:01 PM
To: Ashworth, Sid (Appropriations); Maher, Shawn (Dodd); Hild, Edward (Domenici); Bennett, Jody (Johnson); Vincent, Trudy (Bingaman); Cuzzi, David (Sununu); Bonvillian, Bill (Lieberman); Brinkerhoff, Liz (Corzine); Eaglen, Mackenzie (Collins); Daffron, Tom (Murkowski); Krncevic, Ray (Snowe); Waldman, Mitch (Lott); Barca, Frank (Gregg); Pierce, Erin (Burns); Anderson, Wendy (Lautenberg); Downey, Fred (Lieberman); Maurer, Dirk (HSGAC)
Attachments: DAV05935_xml.pdf

Senator Collins offered the BRAC-related service member protection amendment on behalf of Senator Thune and all its cosponsors this afternoon. In addition, another version of the postponement amendment was also offered. This one – like #1389 offered last week – would also suspend the 45 day Congressional review period pending the completion of all the conditions therein. (Under #1389, once the conditions were met and DoD reports to Congress all relevant factors impacting upon BRAC, the process would resume as presently written into law, i.e. Congress would approve or disapprove the list in its entirety.)

Unlike #1389, the modified amendment offered today is identical except that following the meeting of all the conditions it would allow Congress the flexibility (now being armed with more complete information and perhaps dramatically changed circumstances relating to the our basing needs) to remove individual bases from the closure list. This second version could possibly be brought up for a vote in place of, or in sequence with, the other amendment.

We hope your Senator can get down to the floor to speak in support of these amendments.

Thanks,

Bob
8-5385

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2005 8:17 PM
To: Maurer, Dirk (HSGAC)
Subject: RE:

Waldman told me he sent out a message to the cosponsors asking that whoever goes down to speak clarify the confusion sowed by Warner. We will but a number of us should after it got muddled.

Yeah. If Dodd is correct (and what he is saying we have been worrying about) that the BRAC amendments will fall off post cloture, we almost have to vote against cloture otherwise we do not get to debate or vote on BRAC. Also frankly, it may be best not to have this vote prior to the commission finishing their work.

-----Original Message-----

From: Maurer, Dirk (HSGAC)
Sent: Monday, July 25, 2005 8:11 PM
To: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Subject: Re:

Thanks Bob. Why are you voting vs cloture? Other than your amends of course.

I don't have an email fm Waldman. Whatcha mean?

Sent from my BlackBerry Wireless Handheld