



Association of Defense Communities  
Winter Conference  
San Antonio, Texas  
February 14, 2011

2011

**Local Sustainability Partnering Innovation Lab:  
Military-Community Partnering for  
Sustainability at the Local Level#**

## Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Introduction .....	3
Military and Community Presentations.....	6
Breakout Session Area Outcomes.....	10
Key Recommendations and Concepts from the Facilitated Discussions .....	11
Collaborative Possibilities .....	12
Communications: Listening is as Important as Speaking.....	12
Continuity.....	13
Legislative Authorities & Funding .....	13
Funding .....	14
Legislative Authorities.....	14
Mitigation Tools .....	15
Next Steps .....	16
Appendix A:.....	17
Camp Bullis Lab Concept of Operations.....	17
Appendix B:.....	19
Unedited Facilitator Notes.....	19
Mitigation Tools Notes.....	19
Collaborative Possibilities Notes.....	20
Legislative Authorities & Funding Notes.....	22
General Cross Discussion Group Notes.....	25

## Executive Summary

*Military-Community Partnering for Sustainability at the Local Level* was an “Innovation Laboratory” presented at the 2011 Association of Defense Communities (ADC) Winter Conference San Antonio, on Monday, February 14, 2011. ADC has been exploring the concept of “enduring installations” as a way to discuss a variety of mission readiness, sustainability, infrastructure, and compatible land use needs faced by military installations of all types across America. This three-hour innovation lab was designed as a follow-up to previous conference sessions presented at the ADC Winter Forum earlier in 2010 and the ADC 2009 Annual Conference.

Over forty people took part in the event, which was run as an interactive facilitated discussion exercise focusing on the case study of Camp Bullis, San Antonio, Texas. The session began with a panel of subject matter and policy experts presenting a case study of Camp Bullis and the collaborative community and military efforts to address local and regional sustainability. The panel familiarized the audience participants with the stakeholders, issues, processes, challenges, ways ahead and tools used to address the need for compatibility and sustainability. The panel included representatives from the United States Army, Department of Defense and other Federal agencies, Local governments, Community representatives and Non-Governmental Organizations that have been part of the process of achieving results at Camp Bullis. Following the presentations, audience participants divided into facilitated groups to discuss approaches, practices and tools that could be applied to achieve sustainable outcomes at installations with issues similar to Camp Bullis. Finally, the group as a whole then discussed the next steps to take with the recommendations gathered in the course of the lab.

The breakout session was conducted as a series of interactive facilitated discussions with installation, local and regional government representatives, and other stakeholders. It was designed to elicit recommendations for furthering collaborative approaches and the use of effective tools to achieve long-term sustainability, and intended to allow each participant the chance to input concerns and ideas in a selection of discussion areas at three different tables. After tasking of the group, each facilitator was given a topic of discussion based upon input from the innovation lab’s panelist. The facilitated discussions were designed to capture suggestions, challenges and recommendations from the Camp Bullis experience, to either enhance Camp Bullis’ future or that applied at other installations/ranges and communities.

Innovation lab participants proposed a variety of follow-up potentials for this after-action report and the information in the presentations. Workshop organizers captured and documented these ideas and will coordinate with stakeholders at Camp Bullis, the surrounding region and key military stakeholders concerning these and other recommendations. Copies of this report and accompanying documents have been made available to the Association of Defense Communities who in turn will make it available to all innovation lab participants upon request.

## Introduction

Utilizing the capabilities and capacities of all types of military installations to support mission readiness is a critical topic for the Department of Defense. Bases and ranges that are most critical to testing and evaluating new weapon systems and training the war fighter to meet the challenges of the modern battlefield must function at peak capacity and 100 percent efficiency to support our military around the globe. Yet this mission must be done in the context of an ever changing mix of factors, both inside and outside the fence line, that impact the ability of an installation/range to perform its mission.

Sustainability connects our activities today to those of tomorrow with sound business and environmental practices. If installations are to endure and become truly sustainable elements of local economies and regions, their missions must be protected via mutually beneficial partnerships with the communities, governments, and organizations that support them. Transportation, parks and open space, working lands, land development, emerging markets, air and water quality, and many other factors contribute to complex challenges for installations/ranges and local communities. It has become apparent at installations around the country that mere compliance with environmental regulations will not ensure that we will be able to sustain the mission of the United States military. This problem has been exacerbated as many installations have experienced significant growth and encroachment, community issues and economic concerns have multiplied.

For the installation of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, sustainability entails proactively planning for the long-term viability of the installation and the mission. This includes reducing fuel usage, increasing energy efficiency, reducing water consumption and planning growth in an environmentally manageable and logical fashion. Also, while continuing the mission and promoting the general welfare of the soldiers, the installation must effectively build relationships with the surrounding community to effectively manage encroachment issues, external environmental issues, the fluctuating costs of energy and the quality of life both internal and external to the fence line. Each installation must strive to implement the *triple bottom line* of sustainability: mission, environment, and community.

*Military-Community Partnering for Sustainability at the Local Level* was an “Innovation Laboratory” presented at the 2011 Association of Defense Communities (ADC) Winter Conference San Antonio, on Monday, February 14, 2011. ADC has been exploring the concept of “enduring installations” as a way to discuss a variety of mission readiness, sustainability, infrastructure, and compatible land use needs faced by military installations of all types across America. This three-hour innovation lab was designed as follow-on to previous conference sessions presented at the ADC Winter Forum earlier in 2010 and the ADC 2009 Annual Conference.

The lab was run as an interactive facilitated discussion exercise focusing on the case study of Camp Bullis. The session began with a panel of subject matter and policy experts presenting a case study of Camp Bullis and the collaborative community and military efforts to address local and regional sustainability. As with Eglin Air Force Base in Florida, and other installations across the country, significant residential growth around Camp Bullis has impacted the installation’s ability to fully conduct its mission. Camp Bullis was established in 1917 as a training site for soldiers stationed at Fort Sam Houston. Today, Camp Bullis is the Army’s premier training installation for combat medicine, as well as training grounds for the Air Force and Marines. Being in the heart of a highly urbanized location, Fort Sam Houston is severely limited in its ability to conduct on-site field training, especially during the night.

Encompassing approximately 28,000 acres, Camp Bullis provides nearly 22,000 acres of invaluable field training and maneuver areas for Fort Sam Houston and multi-service medical training. The types of training activities that are supported by Camp Bullis include small arms and large caliber firing ranges, ground and air operations night training (through the use of night vision equipment), air combat drop zones, and fixed-wing (airplane) and rotary-wing (helicopter) training. The significant growth around Camp Bullis has thus identified problems in accomplishing those missions while being located adjacent to a predominately urban community. Thus, as regions surrounding installations and ranges such as Camp Bullis continue experiencing economic and population growth in the future, a coordinated effort will be needed to ensure growth is managed in a manner that allows the installation to achieve its role in the nation's defense while remaining a vital member of the local community, a major contributor to its economy and acknowledging the rights of adjacent private property owners when evaluating mission expansion/contraction or new mission placement.

The panel familiarized the audience participants with the stakeholders, issues, processes, challenges, ways ahead and tools used to address the need for compatibility and sustainability. The panel included representatives from the United States Army and Department of Defense, specific civil Federal agencies and Local governments, Community representatives and Non-Governmental Organizations that have been part of the process of achieving results at Camp Bullis. Appendix A provides a Concept of Operations (CONOPS) document which was utilized by the innovation lab organizers. After the presentations were complete, audience participants divided into facilitated groups to discuss approaches, practices and tools that could be further applied to achieve sustainable outcomes at Camp Bullis and other locations with similar issues. The groups discussed:

- A) Available Legislative Authorities, such as Dark Sky Ordinance, Legislative priorities and Funding for Process and Plan implementation;**
  - How can current state governments play a more active role?
  - How can current local city and county government planning be leveraged with utility and transportation infrastructure planning?
- B) Collaborative Possibilities, such as Notification Process and comment periods for Fort Sam Houston on development activities; Community Engagement; Transportation and Traffic Planning measures; Enhanced coordination between Developers and United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Installation, Local Government and NGOs.**
  - How can NGOs and private land owners play a more active role?
  - How can the Installation play a more active long-term role?
- C) Mitigation Tools, such as Regional Habitat Conservation Plan (RHCP) that will set up mitigation method for non-federal parties to stop net loss; Sound attenuation standards around Camp Bullis; and Camp Bullis Mitigation Credits.**
  - How can the installation, the Local and State government, NGOs and the private sector manage habitat in the future to ensure that species encroachment issues do not return?
  - How can success achieved at Camp Bullis be capitalized upon for other sustainability programs at other installations and communities?

The facilitated discussion groups were designed to capture suggestions and recommendations for consideration that 1) could be applied to address known or emerging challenges at Camp Bullis and 2) could also be applied at other locations across the country. Representatives of each group briefed their set of suggestions and recommendations for addressing long-term needs in the spirit of enhancing the local partnership model. These were captured and are presented here in this formal after action report. **This after action report has been produced primarily for use by other installations/ranges and communities seeking to enhance the application of best practices and tools for sustainability at the local level.** Further, this report has been produced to provide insight into how the workshop was planned and executed, the ideas presented and the findings of the participants.

## Military and Community Presentations

The session began with a panel of subject matter and policy experts presenting a case study of Camp Bullis and the collaborative community and military efforts to address local and regional sustainability. The panel familiarized the audience participants with the stakeholders, issues, processes, challenges, ways ahead and tools used to address the need for compatibility and sustainability. The panel included representatives from the United States Army and Department of Defense, specific civil Federal agencies and Local governments, Community representatives and Non-Governmental Organizations that have been part of the process of achieving results at Camp Bullis. Appendix A provides a CONOPS document which was utilized by the innovation lab organizers.

The distinguished panel included:

- Mr. Jim Cannizzo, Environmental Attorney Advisor, Camp Stanley, and Retained Army Functions at Fort Sam Houston and Camp Bullis, San Antonio
- Mr. Bob Murdock, Director Office of Military Affairs, City of San Antonio
- Mr. Kevin Wolff, Bexar County Commissioner, San Antonio Texas
- Ms. Allison Arnold, Senior Fish and Wildlife Biologist Southern Edwards Plateau, San Antonio, Texas
- Ms. Nancy Natoli, Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative Coordinator, Office of Secretary of Defense
- Mr. Jeff Francell, The Nature Conservancy, San Antonio Chapter
- Mr. Gene Dawson, Jr., President, Pape-Dawson Engineering, Inc
- Mr. Lynn Boese, Office of Economic Adjustment

The following is a brief summary of each presentation. Copies of presentations are provided on the Association of Defense Communities website for the San Antonio Winter Forum and are available for all participants in the Winter Forum to download free of charge.

1. **“Camp Bullis Encroachment Issues,”** Mr. Jim Cannizzo, Environmental Attorney Advisor, Camp Stanley, and Retained Army Functions at Fort Sam Houston and Camp Bullis, San Antonio.

In his presentation, Mr. Cannizzo described the impacts to Camp Bullis by the explosive growth that San Antonio has experienced in the past decade. Mr. Cannizzo talked about the light and noise issues surrounding military operations at Camp Bullis, the tactical and strategic mission training taking

place and the impacts that the light pollution and other encroachment have on those missions. He described the Joint Land Use Study, Supplemental Environmental Impact Studies and the decision-making processes supported or undertaken by the Army over recent years in order to work with the surrounding communities to resolve the most pressing issues for both. He stressed that cooperating with neighbors is an absolute mission imperative and that the goal of the Army is to achieve long-term mission sustainability through partnership with the community, not in opposition. Mr. Cannizzo offered participants a perspective on how the Army achieved current successes and suggestions for ways ahead to continue down the path of long-term sustainability through defining what conditions are for all players involved, what factors are needed to support long-term sustainability of Army mission activities, what conditions and factors can impact long-term sustainability of Army mission activities and how the Army and surrounding community can develop criteria for compatibility for Camp Bullis and the community.

2. **“Camp Bullis Encroachment Issues and Lessons Learned,”** Mr. Robert Murdock, Brig Gen, USAF (Ret), Director, Office of Military Affairs, City of San Antonio, TX

In his presentation, Mr. Murdock described the actions taken by the City of San Antonio to assist in the tasks necessary to ensure long-term sustainability at Camp Bullis. As Director of Military Affairs for the city, Mr. Murdock detailed how his office was instrumental in forming the Military Transformation Task Force responsible for coordinating BRAC growth and encroachment issues. His office acted as the lead city agency responsible for the Camp Bullis Joint Land Use Study (JLUS), took on the role of lead in coordinating OEA Grants and Project Management support for the JLUS and assisted in coordinating meetings. Mr. Murdock described the city’s role in providing consultant aid in data collection and monitoring the implementation of JLUS recommendations and strategies. Mr. Murdock also presented challenges that became visible during the process, such as the need for adequate time to complete the tasks, initial lack of trust between developers, municipalities, military officials and property owners, the different priorities between involved parties such as zoning and regulation, property rights and the lack of authority in Zoning or Land Use Control in Extraterritorial Jurisdiction. As keys to success, Mr. Murdock stressed: public outreach and communication, legislative initiatives for state action, use of the oft-lengthy iterative process, keeping constituents, media and policy makers informed and keeping politics out of the project and process.

3. **“Camp Bullis Encroachment Issues and Lessons Learned,”** Mr. Kevin Wolff, County Commissioner Bexar County, Texas,

Mr. Wolff served as Co-Chairman for the JLUS Executive Committee, the JLUS “Implementation Committee” and as Co-Chairman for the Military Transformation Task Force (MTTF). He described the structure of the JLUS Executive Committee as the policymaking and decision making body in the JLUS process and the need to involve all stakeholders in the process, supported by technical advisors and consultants. Mr. Wolff stressed the need to keep the public informed and to keep all meetings open to the public, to involve all surrounding municipalities and governmental agencies and to bring non-governmental organizations into the process, in the quest to reach consensus and recommend courses of action. Mr. Wolff detailed how every player involved must monitor implementation efforts, channel information and keep the lines of communication open and in the end balance all

competing interests in the preservation of the Camp Bullis missions and the desires and needs of the community and environment.

4. **“Finding Solutions through Cooperation and Collaboration,”** Ms. Allison Arnold, Senior Fish and Wildlife Biologist Southern Edwards Plateau, San Antonio, Texas

Ms. Arnold began her presentation with a brief description of the Endangered Species Act and recovery efforts necessary to protect endangered and threatened species. Ms. Arnold spoke of the Fish and Wildlife Service’s role in Texas aimed at preservation and restoration of species throughout the Southern Edwards Plateau region and in and around Camp Bullis. She described the significant importance of areas such as Camp Bullis to species such as the Golden Cheeked Warbler, whose favorite nesting habitat of pine oak forest native to the area around San Antonio and Camp Bullis is often the sole remaining habitat and crucial to the survival of endangered species such as these. Ms. Arnold spoke of efforts and initiatives currently underway to protect this habitat in cooperation with surrounding communities, governments and the United States Army. Ms. Arnold stressed that communication and cooperation is in our mutual interests and went on to detail a variety of specific activities that would achieve both military sustainability and natural resource conservation goals.

5. **“Filling the Gap and Moving to the Next Level,”** Ms. Nancy Natoli, Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI) Coordinator, Office of the Secretary of Defense

Ms. Natoli provided what she called “the 100,000 foot perspective” as she described the efforts of the Department of Defense to protect military readiness through the REPI program. Since World War II, the United States has undergone expansive growth. This is evident in the way cities and communities have grown to abut and often surround military bases that were once far from population centers. She provided the following as examples of how development outside of installations creates encroachments on military missions, both inside and outside the fence: Camp Bullis, San Antonio, Texas; Camp Pendleton, California; Ft. Benning, Georgia. Her key introductory points were “war fighters must train as they fight because they will fight as they train” and “encroachment impacts constrain training and testing activities and ultimately inhibit military readiness.” REPI, she explained, is a cost effective tool to protect current and future combat capabilities. She provided examples of REPI being used with other tools, such as the 10 U.S.C. 2869 land exchange authority first used at NAS Fallon and then at MCAS Beaufort to add value to the REPI acquisitions and further protect the military mission and how REPI projects are enabling Camp Bullis to receive recovery credits and a number of other installations, from MCB Camp Lejeune to Cape Canaveral Air Force Station, are looking to apply lessons learned from this experience. Ms. Natoli explained how REPI lands also provide room for revenue generation, such as through the creation of hunting lands or by keeping working lands in agricultural production and gave examples such as at Fort Riley where renewable energy development is planned compatibly with the military mission by keeping a wind farm from being developed on land that would adversely impact digital surveillance radar. Lastly, she described how REPI projects can link together, creating ecosystem-wide corridors and linkages, such as in the longleaf pine range throughout the Southeast United States and how continued military access to the land, air, sea space, and frequency spectrum necessary for training war fighters and testing systems can function simultaneously while remaining excellent stewards of the environment and good neighbors in communities.

6. **“Maverick Ranch Conservation Easement Overview,”** Mr. Jeff Francell, The Nature Conservancy, San Antonio Division

Mr. Francell provided an overview of the efforts and successes in placing conservation easements on the Maverick Ranch in proximity to Camp Bullis and how cooperation is in our mutual interests. He detailed specific activities that were either currently underway or achieved which benefited the landowner and the environment as well as the endangered species. Mr. Francell described how similar land conservation efforts would achieve both military sustainability and natural resource conservation goals at installations around the country. Mr. Francell also described activities now taking place at the Maverick Ranch, which benefit endangered and threatened species and could not have taken place without the conservation agreements. These activities include Geographic Information System (GIS) mapping projects that allow planners and conservationists to target specific areas for conservation, to protect various agricultural lands and conservation projects that include planning for military readiness and natural resource conservation.

7. **“Joint Land Use Study, A Tool to Promote Compatible Use,”** Mr. Lynne Boese, DOD Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA), Compatible Use Program

Mr. Boese presented the OEA ability to influence and support the land use compatibility initiatives at installations around the country. Mr. Boese described how military installations and ranges play vital role in national defense in support of military testing, training and base support operations and serve as major economic engines accounting for thousands of jobs, billions in economic activity. However, encroachment pressures from incompatible civilian development create restrictions on use of installations, ranges and training corridors and threaten public safety exposing population to artillery fire, aircraft noise, dust, and even accidents. OEA is a DoD office that administers community adjustment assistance to state and local governments to undertake a Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) and implement the recommendations. Mr. Boese described how OEA supports cooperative planning efforts between Military Departments and jurisdictions surrounding installations, ranges and/or military training corridors and assists in the JLUS process, which serves as the comprehensive strategic action plan to assist state and local governments in addressing and preventing encroachment of civilian communities from impairing the operational utility of military missions. OEA assists in confirming the need for a JLUS, provides guidance to initiate, conduct and complete a community-driven JLUS, technical assistance to the local jurisdiction and installation and funding assistance to the local jurisdiction to prepare a JLUS and implement recommendations. Mr. Boese also described how OEA facilitates communications between the local jurisdiction and the installation.

8. **“Camp Bullis Encroachment Issues and Lessons Learned,”** Mr. Gene Dawson, PE, President, Pape-Dawson Engineering, Inc, San Antonio, Texas

Mr. Dawson participated as a member of the Camp Bullis Joint Land Use Study Implementation Team and provided the private sector point of view in his presentation. Mr. Dawson was very active in the Camp Bullis Joint Land Use Study and participated as a key stakeholder. He presented some key points that must be kept in the equation when dealing with encroachment. First and foremost, Mr. Dawson explained that it must be understood by all involved that cities are built and maintained by a host of agents: families, industrial firms, city bureaus, developers, investors, regulatory and subsidizing agencies, utility companies, and the like. Each has its own interests, and the process of

decision is fragmented, plural, and marked by bargaining. No single actor takes anything like a comprehensive view at first. First are the developers, sponsors, or owners--the proponents who initiate a project and have the most to gain from its implementation. These entrepreneurs do not appear automatically whenever there is unfulfilled demand for something. They have to believe that the risk of failure is minimal and the rewards that come with success are generous. However, most developers believe that planners do not trust developers' motives and are suspicious and cynical about their actions. Many developers feel that planners want to keep developers from receiving permissions that are theirs by right--such as the right to build according to zoning. That is where the role of a forum of key stakeholders comes into play, to include coordinating the plethora of participants, dealing with uncertainty, recognizing available opportunities that have not yet been exploited, and frequently accomplishing things in ways that have never been tried before. A developer can learn to work within almost any constraints, if they are known. However, what scares the developer and the financier is the unknown and the adversarial process. In the sustainability process, there must be five distinct classes of participants that must be considered in any development undertaking, which will assist in removing parts of that unknown: (1) entrepreneurs (e.g. developers, sponsors, and owners); (2) consultants (e.g. designers, financial and legal experts); (3) public officials (e.g. mayors, city council members, county commissioners); (4) military staff (e.g. installation planners, members of the public works and installation commanders and environmental departments); and (5) community members (e.g. as consumers, citizens, and political constituents). Trust must be built first and group planning and thought encouraged.

## Breakout Session Area Outcomes

As stated above, the breakout session was conducted as a series of interactive facilitated discussions with installation, local and regional government representatives, and other stakeholders. The breakout was designed to elicit recommendations for furthering collaborative approaches and the use of effective tools to achieve long-term sustainability and intended to allow each participant the chance to input concerns and ideas in a selection of discussion areas at three different tables. After the tasking of the group by moderator Fred Meurer, each facilitator was given a topic of discussion based upon input from the innovation lab's panelists. The facilitated discussions were designed to capture suggestions, challenges and recommendations from the Camp Bullis experience, which could be applied to enhance the Camp Bullis future or that could be applied to address known or emerging challenges at other installations and communities. Each topic area was provided 30 minutes of discussion, upon which time the facilitators moved to a new table. Thus each table was afforded the opportunity to discuss each topic. The Facilitators and facilitator assistants took notes and provided brief comments on the nature and content of discussions at their tables at the end of the innovation lab. See Appendix B for the verbal report notes.

1. Facilitators from Booz Allen Hamilton:
  - Available Legislative Authorities: Michael Mceachern
  - Collaborative Possibilities: Pat McCullough
  - Mitigation Tools: Don Gleason
2. Based upon panelist input, focus areas were:

- a. Available Legislative Authorities, such as Dark Sky Ordinance, Legislative priorities and Funding for Process and Plan implementation;
  - i. How can current state governments play a more active role?
  - ii. How can current local city and county government planning be leveraged with utility and transportation infrastructure planning?
- b. Collaborative Possibilities, such as Notification Process and comment periods for Fort Sam Houston on development activities; Community Engagement; Transportation and Traffic Planning measures; Enhanced coordination between Developers and United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Installation, Local Government and NGOs.
  - i. How can NGOs and private land owners play a more active role?
  - ii. How can the Installation play a more active long-term role?
- c. Mitigation Tools, such as Regional Habitat Conservation Plan (RHCP) that will set up mitigation method for non-federal parties to stop net loss; Sound attenuation standards around Camp Bullis; and Camp Bullis Mitigation Credits.
  - i. How can the installation, the Local and State government, NGOs and the private sector manage habitat in the future to ensure that species encroachment issues do not return?
  - ii. How can success achieved at Camp Bullis be capitalized upon for other sustainability programs at other installations and communities?

## Key Recommendations and Concepts from the Facilitated Discussions

Below are summaries of overall outcomes and recommendations from the facilitated discussion period.

The key recommendations presented by the groups were:

- **Effective communication is a key foundation to success in building good community-military relations;**
- **Effective communication is a two way street and the key for proper collaboration;**
- **Effective communication can only occur where each side understands the other's expectations and through awareness, education and training communicate that encroachment is a two way issue.**
- **Sustainability requires leadership. Continuity is a key to the success of this leadership in the form of a process and forum that can live on after the commander and politicians move on.**
- **Integrate responsibility and accountability across the board to meet objectives and targets.**
- **Most initiatives will require a cross-functional, cross-organizational structure, and cooperative action.**
- **Financial resources must be linked to strategic sustainability initiatives and projects or the plans will lack the means to be accomplished.**
- **Life-cycle costing and other sustainability considerations will somehow need to be factored into funding decisions.**
- **Proper legislative and financial aid tools and training to enable each directorate to contribute to the endeavor.**
- **States must be more proactive in outreach and external communications by educating the community on what the military installations mean to the people in a given area.**
- **One single regional partnership to ensure communications, collaboration and community involvement.**

Raw working notes from the facilitators are attached in Appendix C.

## Collaborative Possibilities

The purpose of this topic area was to discuss how to create long-term collaboration and partnering opportunities to achieve regional sustainability goals. The topic area produced a number of ideas and recommendations to improve communication and collaboration among regional stakeholders. These ideas include creating a common regional vision, developing a permanent sustainability partnership and developing a strategy to support collaboration efforts.

- Public meetings – both positive and negative
- Communication – not just speaking but listening
- Incorporate private sector
- Need for 3<sup>rd</sup> party facilitator
- Conservation forum
- Reach out to incoming commander prior to arrival
- TRUST, COMMUNICATION, & RELATIONSHIPS

## Communications: Listening is as Important as Speaking

Throughout the entirety of the innovation lab, communication was stressed as a key foundation to success. Many participants offered that effective communications and cooperation between local leaders and military base commanders are the keys to building good community-military relations.

Communication is a two way street and that the key is for military base leaders to work with mayors to establish good lines of communications, to collaborate on available resources to assist cities undergoing transition as a result of military actions and to build a relationship with the city, county and regional planners. In order for communication and relationship building to succeed, each side must understand the expectations and all stakeholders need to understand that encroachment is a two way issue and they must communicate that to their constituents. These relationships do not need to be immediately formalized, but can begin with informal meetings, such as monthly breakfasts and/or lunches, informing about the mission, concerns of the installation and upcoming actions. These relationships can also assist the military leaders to understand the local community issues, concerns and beliefs, such as “the military has already taken land from my family years ago through condemnation,” or the potential support for a sales tax increase or other incremental tax increase to support buffer zones and aquifer protections. The key is communication and these informal gatherings can be utilized to increase this communication to ensure that the opinions of both the military and the community are heard.

By understanding communities, leaders can be proactive, sending letters and information to the surrounding communities, involving the media through newspaper articles and disseminating correct information, preventing the spread of misinformation and creating a collaborative working environment. Both the installation and the surrounding local governments should encourage wide public participation at the public meetings. It was often stated that the community may not be willing or able to help solve all

issues at once. However, through the building of healthy partnering relationships both the installation and the community leaders can prioritize critical issues and look for meaningful/impactful projects that seek common ground. In addition, it was highly recommended that the community understand that these meetings will not be onetime events, but will be regular forums where all will sit as equals around a table, not just speaking but listening. If necessary, 3<sup>rd</sup> party facilitators, such as The Nature Conservancy, that stakeholders trust can be brought in to fully involve all stakeholders early in the process to lessen adversarial positions later on, to help communicate all positions, beliefs and also breakdown misconceptions on both sides. This 3<sup>rd</sup> party facilitator can also discuss with landowners the benefits of conservation easements, buffer zones, etc and ensure that recommendations are actually implemented.

## Continuity

Continuity was a key notion discussed and echoed by each group, in the form of a process and forum that can live on after the commander and politicians move on. Sustainability success will require leadership followed by action (e.g. planning, doing, checking, acting and then repeating this pattern). This particular initiative recognizes the need to integrate or establish responsibility and accountability across the board in order to meet objectives and targets. While some initiatives will be led and implemented by a single entity, most will require a cross-functional, cross-organizational structure, and cooperative action and oversight, to be achieved. Often successes are built upon personality; Commanders average two years and each new commander brings a different attitude, a different background, new concerns and even different values. This is mirrored on the local government side as well as the community. A forum is needed which can continue on after the military leader and the politicians are gone. One suggestion was to involve the Deputies in the forum. Deputy positions are typically occupied by individuals who have more longevity than their boss, such as Garrison Commanders, Mayor, City Council, etc. The physical installation and the public are the constant. The key is to provide a mechanism whereby long-term solutions can be developed regardless of constant changing of government and military leadership and continue communication with new incoming leadership.

It was also suggested that a forum cannot only go a long way in building trust, communication and furthering relationships that can help with encroachment, community partnerships and leveraging assets, but can go a long way towards growing the next workforce by including students and teachers in the process and workshops that arise and involve these younger members in community outreach. This outreach can act as a mechanism to foster communication and discussion with marginalized groups, before problems arise and can assist new stakeholders to quickly understand the situations and initiatives within an organization and community. They can also act as a physical location where involved community stakeholders can go to offer their recommendations and service. In many cases, community individuals are willing and glad to serve, but often require a place or entity to stimulate their interest. By integrating the installation, locality and community members into the actions and initiatives, the forum can develop a continuous improvement structure in a continual and ongoing process. The most important recommendation presented was “take baby steps building on common ground.”

## Legislative Authorities & Funding

The purpose of this topic area was to discuss what legislative authorities are needed and how to create long-term funding to “sustain” sustainability which often requires life-cycle costing, not often used by the Army.

- Build relationships at the staff working level as well as the senior leadership
- Develop interagency understandings/agreements
- Installations distributing information and reaching out (two way street)
- How to leverage contracted professional services across organizations at all levels?
- Recognize situation and understand the local environment
- Baby steps focusing on common ground
- Liaisons both within the military and local government organizations
- Master planning of installations include the communities
- Installation days (e.g., teachers, etc.)

## Funding

Participants discussed how everyone wants efficient and cost effective operations on military installations and want projects and activities that support sustainability concepts. But when presented with the costs of sustainability those legislative and taxpayer bodies consider the cost prohibitive because the financial benefits come over a long period of time or come in the form of cost avoidance. Recommendations suggested that investments in sustainability initiatives and life-cycle costing become standard practice in order to reach our installation’s sustainability goals and that management reviews take place more than once or twice per year.. Many participants feared that as installations compete for financial resources to conduct and support military training, operational costs may be subject to increased scrutiny without regard to sustainability. Participants recommended that financial resources will need to be linked to strategic sustainability initiatives and projects or the plans will lack the means to be accomplished. Life-cycle costing and other sustainability considerations will somehow need to be factored into funding decisions because sometimes to be sustainable costs more at the outset, but less in the long-term. Products, services and construction are provided by contract and it is imperative to begin to require that statements of work (SOW) and performance work statements (PWS) be in alignment with sustainability principles and to consider a potential provider with a systematic approach to sustainability as a key competitor in new offerings.

## Legislative Authorities

Many participants offered that meeting goals for sustainable activities needs to be the responsibility of the organizations with the authority and expertise to accomplish them. Often goals migrate to the environmental division. Yet, sustaining the installation’ mission into the future is the responsibility of every directorate, command, and activity on the installation. With proper legislative and financial aid tools, lessons learned, and lessons on how to navigate the bureaucracy, each directorate can contribute. Also, it was offered as an example how the State of Maryland took the initiative to show what the military installations mean to the people in a given area. Often, the State Representative stated, some residents don’t believe the base impacts them. Maryland sought to portray what the installation is doing, what business the installation supported and basically broke it down to how much one soldier adds to the local economy.

Finally, some participants offered the suggestions that local governing bodies and state legislatures need to proactively get involved in encroachment issues, precisely because of the economic justifications shown by the State of Maryland and others. One example was Southern Indiana where the Base Protection Act created a 3 mile perimeter around the base and all construction projects must be briefed with the local commander. However, it was also commented that without continued support by the local legislature and governing bodies these acts can merely be toothless tigers. A potential exists for conflicting priorities between regional and local installation sustainability goals. Without proper legislative buy in the ordinances are worthless. One suggestion was to bring all encroachment issues under a single regional partnership or forum, echoing the suggestions of improved communication, to include military training and mission readiness alignment with local community activities and needs. All Installation and local organizations should be working on the same page and creating goals that ensure the long-term viability of not just the installation but the community as a whole.

### Mitigation Tools

Participants in the mitigation tools discussions echoed the sentiment of the first discussion group on communications. Communication, they said, is essential to assist the local community understand why encroachment is an issue. Most local communities do not understand the mission at the installation and may even believe that the installation is not using the land if military personnel are not frequently seen.

- Communication
  - Keep structures in place
  - Don't stop when problem is solved
- Proactive
  - Today's problems started 10-15 yrs ago
  - Develop indicators / metrics to ID problems early
- Develop communication structures before problems arise
- Tool Box
  - Mechanisms Matrix – tools and circumstances

One suggestion discussed having installation leadership join community leaders in sessions “downtown” to communicate with the city council, mayor, state senators and other local government officials why the mission is important and what can be done to combat encroachment. This communication with the local government can create a forum whereby the importance of the mission and the presence of the military are communicated to others by local community leaders, not just the military. This can create further validity to the military statements.

The group participants agreed that the success at Camp Bullis shows us that we need to establish an “encroachment toolbox” to duplicate successes elsewhere. Legislation and Conservation easements that create buffer zones around installations are one example of tools that can be utilized. However, it was discussed that these tools must be used in conjunction with the communication forums. Buffers will differ based upon type of military branch, mission requirements, type of ranges, types of equipment used, etc. Establishing a matrix group that brings together all of the key stake holders in the community and installation can contribute to utilizing all of the possibly available encroachment tools. This forum can analyze all the encroachment prevention tools available locally and compare them to the scenario at

present, see what encroachment prevention tools were used elsewhere and what they can import or create locally.

Lastly, one participant, a planner with a county government, suggested that incentive zoning, also called density bonuses, is a regulatory approach that increases allowable density or floor area ratio in exchange for some desired land conservation by the developer elsewhere. For example, the City of Seattle allows development at densities beyond the conventional zoning for amenities such as a day care center, a shopping atrium, sidewalk widening, or urban plaza (reported in Garvin, 1996). Similar to transfer of development rights, incentive zoning is sometimes referred to as a technique for promoting dense development. But in the same fashion as transfers of development rights, incentive zoning is in fact a technique for billing developers for the right to develop more densely than zoning regulations permit in some areas, while protecting other areas. The reason why it works is that rights to develop densely are limited and hence valuable, thus the incentive zoning itself is additional evidence of the extent to which the private development market desires to develop more densely than conventional zoning allows.

## Next Steps

The final discussion of the laboratory was a brainstorming session for next steps, focusing on how this document could benefit Camp Bullis, Fort Sam Houston, other Army installations and communities surrounding those installations. A number of ideas were presented:

1. Asking the ADC Board of Directors to forward the document to the Army Secretariat;
2. Incorporate aspects of the document in the development of a regional Military Sustainability Partnership guidance;
3. Utilize the document to brief local community leaders in developing public-private partnerships;
4. Utilize the document to provide briefings to installation leaders on the complexities of dealing with encroachment issues;
5. Utilize this report as a template for an actual full-scale Tabletop Exercise on encroachment.

Innovation lab organizers and representatives of ADC will coordinate with representatives from Camp Bullis, local communities, stakeholder NGOs, and federal/state agencies to determine their wishes for implementing the ideas above or proposing other uses. Copies of this report will be available via free download from the ADC Winter Forum website or upon request from Booz Allen Hamilton. For electronic copy from Booz Allen Hamilton please contact John A. Crossen at [crossen\\_john@bah.com](mailto:crossen_john@bah.com)

## Appendix A:

### Camp Bullis Lab Concept of Operations

#### PART 1 CASE STUDY (65 minutes)

- A) Introduction to the Lab (5 Minutes):** Moderator, Fred Meurer, will introduce the lab session, explain the concept and the time structure and introduce each panelist.
- B) Panelist Case Study/Presentation Session (60 Minutes)**
- The focus of the panelist session is to introduce the subject matter and seed the discussion period to follow at the break out session to follow the presentations. Each Panelist will each have approximately 8 minutes to give a brief 5-8 slide presentation covering:
    - Their organization and its role in the process;
    - Challenges, issues, roadblocks, etc;
    - Accomplishments;
    - Success factors, lessons learned and effective tools for the partnership and process; and
    - Key recommendation for future success
  - Order of Presentation based upon input from and discussion with panelists:
    - Fort Sam Houston Installation Perspective: Jim Cannizzo
    - City of San Antonio Local City Perspective: Bob Murdock
    - Bexar County Larger Local Perspective; Kevin Wolff
    - US Fish and Wildlife Service Federal Sustainability Perspective: Alison Arnold
    - Office of Secretary of Defense Basing Office Perspective: Nancy Natoli
    - The Nature Conservancy NGO Sustainability Perspective: Jeff Francell
    - Local Real Estate Developer Perspective: Gene Dawson Jr.
    - Office of Economic Adjustment Perspective: Lynn Boese

#### BREAK (10 minutes)

#### PART 2 WORLD CAFÉ EXERCISE (95 minutes)

**Facilitators: Patrick McCullough, Michael Meachern, Donald Gleason**

Based upon discussion on Thursday 1/19/2011 conference call with panelists, there will be 3 tables based upon participation of 30 people @ 10 people per table. In the event the lab session is attended by additional people, the tables will be adjusted accordingly. At the 3 table configuration, we will have 30 minutes of discussion time per table/facilitator and THE END OF WHICH TIME EACH FACILITATOR WILL ROTATE AND PARTICIPANTS WILL STAY AT THEIR TABLE.)

- D) Tasking the Group: 5 minutes:** Moderator, Fred Meurer, will explain the concept of World Café Facilitated Break-Out Session and introduce the table facilitators. Each facilitator will have a focus area to begin the discussion. The facilitated discussions are designed to capture suggestions, challenges and recommendations from the Camp Bullis experience, which could be applied to enhance the Camp Bullis future or that could be applied to address known or emerging challenges at other installations and communities.

Based upon panelist input, focus areas can be:

- Available Legislative Authorities ( Ex. Dark Sky Ordinance), Legislative priorities and Funding for Process and Plan Implementation;
  - How can current state governments play a more active role?
  - How can current local city and county government planning be leveraged with utility and transportation infrastructure planning?
- Collaborative Possibilities, such as Notification Process and comment periods for Fort Sam Houston on development activities, Community Engagement, Transportation and Traffic Planning measures, Enhanced coordination between Developers and United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Installation, Local Government and NGOs.
  - How can NGOs and private land owners play a more active role?
  - How can the Installation play a more active long-term role?
- Mitigation Tools, such as Regional Habitat Conservation Plan (RHCP) that will set up mitigation method for non-federal parties to stop net loss; Sound attenuation standards around Camp Bullis; and Camp Bullis Mitigation Credits (assist in easement acquisitions for credits for Bullis).
  - How can the installation, the local and state government, NGOs and the private sector manage habitat in the future to ensure that species encroachment issues do not return?
  - How can success achieved at Camp Bullis be capitalized upon for other sustainability programs at other installations and communities?

**E) Discussion the Issues: 90 minutes**

Audience will self-select which table/focus areas they want to address first.

- Facilitators will lead discussions based on focus topics and will capture discussion, key points and recommendations or challenges.
- Discussion at each table will last 30 minutes.
- Facilitators will rotate to the next table at the end of the 30 minute session.

**F) Report Out/Follow On: 20 minutes**

- Facilitators will give bullet reports on discussions, recommendations and challenges arrived at during the facilitated discussion groups. Groups will see their comments projected upon the screen and will have opportunity to comment
- Moderator, Fred Meurer, will describe the after action report that will be submitted to all jurisdictions/stakeholders and the outline for this report.
- Panelists and audience participants will be given opportunity to discuss what appropriate follow on actions should be and their thoughts on the report out results.

## Appendix B:

### Unedited Facilitator Notes

#### Mitigation Tools Notes

Question 1: In order to ensure that encroachment issues do not happen at installations, installations need to communicate and be proactive

-**Communication** is essential because it helps the local community understand why encroachment is an issue

- Local communities may not understand the mission at the installation and may even believe that the installation is not using the land if military personnel are not frequently seen
- Send base leadership “downtown” to communicate with the city council, mayor, state senators, or other local government agents to discuss why the mission at the installation is important and what can be done to combat encroachment
  - This communication with the local government allows the importance of the mission and presence of the military to be communicated by people outside the military, which gives further validity to the message
  - A challenge that occurs with this communication with the local government is the constant rotation of base leadership (~18 months)
- Once an encroachment issue is resolved, that does not mean that encroachment at the installation is not longer a threat; communication channels must remain open between the installation and the local community

-Being **proactive** is important because today’s encroachment issues started 10-15 years ago

- Begin to identify where development and growth will be happening in 10 years from now and which installations are located in these areas
- Identify where mission changes will be happening, where BRAC movements will occur, what new flying missions and technologies will be coming to the military
- Start working with NGO’s, the local governments, local developers, and wildlife agencies to help establish that buffer around those installations that will be encroached by the surrounding community and where the installations will encroach on the surrounding communities (two way street)

Question 2: The success at Camp Bullis shows us that we need to establish an **“encroachment toolbox”**

- Establish necessary buffers for installations and apply them across the DoD
  - Buffers will differ based on type of military branch, flying mission vs. radar, type of firing ranges, number of flights per day, types of aircraft, etc.
- Establish a matrix that has all encroachment prevention tools listed on x-axis and the scenario where these tools worked or did not work, i.e. urban versus non-urban, (y-axis)
  - Record all encroachment prevention cases to develop trends of what tools work in what scenarios, allowing installations to identify what types of solutions will aid the encroachment problems
- Write up brief case studies of encroachment issues that exist and the remedies attempted to better document the issues and resolutions that are out there for installations

## Collaborative Possibilities Notes

How can NGOs and private land owners play a more active role?

How can the Installation play a more active long-term role?

### Summary

- Encourage greater participation at public meetings and seek common ground
- Hold regular forums where all sit as equals around a table
- Don't just speak, but also listen
- Have 3<sup>rd</sup> party facilitator that stakeholders trust
- Involve all stakeholders early in the process to lessen adversarial positions later on
- Communicate that encroachment is a two-way issue
- Make sure JLUS recommendations are actually implemented
- Ensure the military's opinion is heard even though there are no voting privileges
- Give military leadership greater sense of what is legal in regards to speaking in public forums
- Pay the landowners and understand that many have already seen the military take their family's land away once through condemnation/eminent domain
- Potentially raise money for land protection through small increase in local sales tax such as 1/8-of-a-cent increase to protect Edwards Aquifer through Proposition 1 and 3
- Communicate with incoming installation leadership before their arrival to ensure they are aware of the issues and the top priorities on base and in the community moving forward
- Look into longer terms of service for leadership such as the Marine Corps leadership serving 3 years rather than 2
- Ensure that there is an office that offers stability through all the turnover in leadership that can occur on military bases and in local communities
- Understand who holds the power within a community and realize that this power may come from someone without a leadership title attached to their name
- Get to know the landowners, their family situation, and their point-of-view
- Have 3<sup>rd</sup> party such as The Nature Conservancy discuss with landowners how they benefit
- Develop long-term solutions. Avoid the problems that build up over many years.
- TRUST, COMMUNICATION, AND RELATIONSHIPS

### Detailed Notes

- Table #1
  - Public meetings can be positive or negative
  - Transportation is a big issue in encroachment
  - Communication is key – not just speaking but listening
  - Need to prevent adversarial thoughts
    - Need to listen to those who can stop what you are trying to achieve and understand what their concerns are
  - Value is in opening lines of communication
  - There needs to be better communication between the community and DoD
  - The process is just as important as the results
  - Identify business opportunities with the private sector
  - Trust, communication, and relationships

- One person recommended having some sort of game like SimCity
  - Would allow all the different stakeholders to play the game separately and then come together and learn how everyone is viewing the process
  - It would hopefully result in everyone understanding that by not working together, everyone loses
  - He seemed to think they needed some sort of gimmick like a game
- Communications – there would be a bunch of advertising for meetings but no one would actually show up to the meetings – what else can they do to encourage involvement earlier on in the process?
- The perception is that encroachment is a one-way issue but it is actually both sides encroaching on each other
- It seems that everyone wants to be patriots, but the military has to be reasonable some times in what they are requesting
- Communication is key
- Consultant should be brought in as a 3<sup>rd</sup> party facilitator
- All the key players need to get in one room and find common ground
- Table #2
  - Start collaboration early in the process to lessen adversarial positions later on
  - The Air Force has been very guarded
  - Get increased visibility out to the community and get leadership behind you
  - Make sure the ideas of the JLUS are actually implemented
  - Coordinate with stakeholders and make sure everyone realizes that encroachment is a serious deal
  - The military has been pushing back more since 9/11
  - Keep your neighbors informed
  - The military has been too silent in terms of voicing their opinion
    - They can't vote but they are allowed to speak their mind in meetings
    - Military needs to work closely with local organizations
    - The military is not speaking up even though the city is looking for them to do so. It seems the city wants to hear the military's opinion and the city would be willing to go along with it, yet the military remains too silent.
    - The military is not allowed to lobby and thus there seems to be confusion over what they can and cannot say. There needs to be education of the JAG in terms of legal advice. Leadership seems afraid/unsure.
    - One person was apparently going to send something out discussing exactly what is allowed.
    - It seems that the military is allowed to testify before a local planning committee.
  - Defense Science Board – military should be part of NPO (not sure of the meaning of this)???
  - Pay the landowners
    - The land means a lot to these people and they should be justly compensated for it.
    - One person spoke how people saw how much money was brought in through Proposition 1 and 3 to protect the aquifers and are thus wondering why the same sort of approach can't be used to protect the military bases and compensate the effected landowners.
    - In some instances, the landowners are already upset with the military because they remember the days when the military took land away from their relatives through condemnation/ eminent domain. They are probably a little more hesitant to work with the military because of these bad memories.

- There is a need for conflict resolution individuals/facilitation companies that can develop trust among all the stakeholders and help resolve the tough issues that come up. It is kind of like having a therapist.
- Need to involve military in changes to city/county/etc. master plan.
- Communication
- Community partnership
- Start early to resolve tough issues
- Table #3
  - More collaboration is needed
  - Everyone needs to be going in the same direction
  - Marine Corps now has installation commanders serving 3 years rather than 2
    - This allows for more continuity
    - Changes in leadership a little too often makes things difficult
    - Civilians are taking on a greater role
    - Meet the installation commander prior to them coming to the base so that they are aware of the issues and what the top priorities are
  - There are things that seem to help the garrison commander's career but not necessarily the community.
  - All commanders want to leave their mark on the installation
  - Private landowners are going to be very suspicious of a JLUS. They are going to equate this to them most likely losing money. There needs to be a 3<sup>rd</sup> party brought in like The Nature Conservancy that helps prove the helpfulness of JLUS to private landowners.
  - Start early in building relationships
  - Need to understand where the issues stand on the installation commander's priority list.
  - Develop long-term solutions. Avoid the problems that build up over many years.
  - Turnover is an issue in many different realms of military, government, local organizations, etc. There needs to be an office where there is continuity so that they can help smooth the transitions of power elsewhere.
  - There needs to be an understanding of who holds the power in the community. A lot of times there is an informal structure within the community.
  - Get landowners involved through NGO
  - Get to know the landowners, their family situation, and their point of view.
  - Conservation Forum
    - Make it so everyone is equal around the table
    - Make it a regularly occurring meeting

## Legislative Authorities & Funding Notes

### Listening is as important as Speaking

- **Base Communications**
  - Establish Relationships
  - Partner with the local Base
    - Relationship with City, County, City Managers, Regional Officials
    - Include military installation planners with local community planners
      - Regional Water Districts and Local Utilities
      - Inform about mission concerns/upcoming actions

- Informal meetings can build relationships
  - Monthly breakfasts or lunches
  - Increase partnerships between city and installation leadership
- Understanding communities
  - Example: rural communities can be very different than urban
- Being proactive:
  - Send letters and information to the surrounding communities; newspaper articles
    - Method for disseminating correct information, prevents the spread of misinformation; creates collaborative working environments
  - Prioritize critical issues; a community may not be willing/able to help solve all issues at once
    - Look for meaningful/impactful projects
- Partnership example
  - Create Base buffer, while managing an installation's wastewater and cleaning Chesapeake Bay.
- Concern: Mission support/demand can affect Installation leadership
  - Commanders average 2 year terms
    - Each commander brings different attitude/culture/concerns/values
  - Suggestion: Contact Deputy Support and build lasting relationships
    - These positions are typically occupied with individuals who have more longevity than their boss; many (e.g., Commanding Generals, Garrison Commanders, Mayor, City Council, etc.)
  - Constant changing of government and Military leadership makes building and maintaining relationships difficult
- Grow Next Work Force
  - Include students and teachers in workshops that promote math, science, and engineering etc
- **Recognize Situation and Environment**
  - Communities (in many cases) are willing and glad to serve
    - Communities/People are typically willing to give rather than have something taken away
    - How much bleeding must cities/communities do to maintain bases?
      - Local Base/Mission protects the entire nation therefore the entire nation should help maintain the community.
      - Example: A community spends \$30M for a hospital/school then lose the tax base during the next BRAC
  - Military Liaisons in County Offices
    - Help solve issues
    - Old position of a Base Transition Coordinator
    - Honorary Commanders
      - Learn more about the mission
      - Community Outreach
      - Can enhance the mission value
- **Take baby steps building on common ground**
- **BRAC financial aid tools, lessons learned, and how to navigate the bureaucracy would be beneficial**

- How to better process/integrate BRAC gains/losses with the community? Toolkit for communities to leverage working with DoD and other stakeholders
- **Example: Ft. Sill; Altus, OK**
  - Know the issues
    - Working together; give and take benefits
  - Legislature
    - BRAC moves missions, but doesn't pay for the consequences
    - May be a BRAC "gainer" this time, but mission may be defunded next time
      - Communities could spend \$30M for a hospital/school then lose the tax base during the next BRAC
      - No national legislation to help mitigate difficulties after the fact
  - Ft. Sill has quarterly meetings
    - Hard to get everyone together consequently hard to get anything done
  - Some residents don't believe the base impacts them
- **Example: Oceana**
  - Portray what the installation is doing
  - Brought Businesses on base
    - Community day
      - How much taxes pay to local government
      - How much to schools, roads
- **Example: Economic Impact Study**
  - Took 18 months
  - Pre BRAC/Post BRAC analysis
    - \$36B to state economy in Maryland
    - Broke it down to how much one soldier adds to the local economy
- **Example: Southern Indiana**
  - Base Protection Act
    - 3 mile perimeter around the base
    - Must tell commander what all construction plans are
    - "toothless tiger"
- **Example: Public Works in California**
  - Multiple award schedules
  - Piggybacking
    - New legislation to allow
    - City gets benefit
    - Special ordinances
    - No local prohibition
- **Example: Kentucky \$251M investment in utility/infrastructure by the state**
  - # prioritized list for all communities
  - Communities consensus on list and order

## General Cross Discussion Group Notes

For sustainability to really get a public buy in, one of the key things I heard was there is a need to bring about more public forums, which can be used to identify both positive and negative aspects of what sustainability means to the community and not just to the installation. Communication is key and by this the audience meant not just talking at them, but with them to identify the problems, seek positive ways to change behavior and see if there is a win-win position.

Another thing that I heard was the need to really incorporate the private sector early in the process. Many people spoke about the fact that every time a situation arises the first meetings are adversarial, not cooperative. One woman said that she has done sustainability at three different locations and the cycle is always the same; adversaries, finger pointing, calming down, seeing that we have mutual interests and then collaboration. She stated that this is not a new game so why do we need to go through the wringer first and then collaborate. We can get a lot more done if we begin at collaboration and maybe that is where a 3<sup>rd</sup> party facilitator can help out. By showing both sides up front the mutually shared interests we can possibly avoid the awful initial battles.

A third idea that I heard was the notion of creating a process and forum that can live on after the commander and politicians move on. This was echoed by Colonel Chioke during the community partnerships session. He stated that Marine commanders are there on average 3 years. Often successes are built upon personality but if a forum with a process can be created then the forum will live on after he and the politicians are gone. The public is the constant but they are often the ones left out of the decisions. A forum can go a long way in building trust, communication and furthering relationships that can help with encroachment, community partnerships, leveraging assets back and forth across the installation boundary, etc. These forums can also act as mechanisms to create and continue communication before problems arise. Most importantly I heard that these forums should live on and not end when a problem is solved but be living breathing organisms that are the problem solvers.

During the Community Partnerships session I heard a lot of talk about effective communications and cooperation between the local leaders and the military installations. At lunch after everybody left I saw Joy Cooper who is the Hallandale Beach (FL) Mayor and she asked if we could talk over lunch. She pointed out some things that she did not get a chance to do in the session since we ran out of time. She said she agreed that effective communications and cooperation between local leaders and military base commanders are the keys to building good community-military relations and that she serves as Vice Chair of The U.S. Conference of Mayors Task Force on Community and Military Relations and has reached out to some of the mayors of cities where bases are located in Florida. In talking with them, she became convinced that the key is for military base leaders to work with mayors to establish good lines of communications, to collaborate on available resources to assist cities undergoing transition as a result of military actions, and to make sure each side knows what is expected of them. She also suggested that it is important that demographic information on military personnel moving into communities be shared with local leaders as soon as possible to allow as much time as possible for planning.

Another key point I heard towards building community partnerships was to go beyond the cities and towns. Yes the leaders of those communities must be tied in, but the military installation commander

needs to connect with local community organizations as well. The installation commander should reach out to local grassroots organizations that share your goals about the community and the installation, community-based assistance organizations, youth and family organizations, volunteer organizations, faith-based organizations, local schools, and universities. These can all endear the installation to the community and make everyone understand that the installation is not the 800 pound gorilla on the block, but a neighbor.

Finally, ongoing communication was stressed. The key to strong partnerships is to maintain an ongoing dialogue with community partners. Get to know local leaders and open the lines of communication. Then work together to understand important issues and seek to develop solutions from the ground up. Stay connected in town hall meetings and forums, have staff regularly spend time in the community, invite community members to share their knowledge with installation leaders and work with installation staff on issues involving outside the fence line.