

Taylor, Bob (Thune)

From: Taylor, Bob (Thune)
Sent: Friday, July 08, 2005 10:59 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: BRAC Point Paper

[REDACTED]

One thing we need to have ready is what we say to the expected counter-argument if BRAC staff again repeats the AF/DoD position to attack our "consolidation" argument.

We know the Beauchamp has already relied on the following two counter-arguments:

1. In 1995 BRAC the consolidation concern worked in Ellsworth's favor because of the SIOP mission. Since then, the B-1s have converted to a conventional mission. And the Nuclear threat has diminished from the days of the Cold War and therefore consolidation is no longer a concern.
2. Placing key weapons at one installation is not unusual for the AF. All B-2s are at Whiteman and all F-117s are at Holloman. Therefore, consolidation of the B-1s is nothing new.

We need to pick these apart. Of course, we should stress that regardless of whether a platform has a nuclear mission or not, they should not be consolidated in one spot. Even consolidating C-130s, for example, in a limited number of locations raises the risk to US security and the potential to disrupt support of US lift operations if large numbers are destroyed. As to examples like the B-2s and F-117s (this was actually cited to me as an example of existing consolidations by BRAC analyst Art Beauchamp) we need to find good arguments as to why these are exceptions to the rule....i.e the small numbers of this fleet and/or the unique technology and maintenance requirements involved make consolidation a necessity. Supporting documentation would be helpful, if we can find it.