



ADC BRAC Workshop:
Using Lessons Learned To Address
The Resource Challenges Of Today

After Action Report

August 07, 2012

Executive Summary

On August 7, 2012, the Association of Defense Communities (ADC) hosted a four-hour workshop entitled: *ADC BRAC Workshop: Using Lessons Learned To Address The Resource Challenges of Today*. This workshop was held as a part of the Association of Defense Communities (ADC) 2012 Annual Conference, “Navigating Change” in Monterey, California. This workshop was the first of two directly related events to be hosted by ADC in an effort to gather and share ideas about how state and local government, local communities, Department of Defense (DoD) installations, and industry can work better together to address the budgetary and resource challenges they face today. The second event will be a Forum on the results of the workshop, including this report, hosted by ADC in Washington, DC in late Fall, 2012.

Since 1988, the Military Services and communities across the nation have been learning important, and sometimes difficult, lessons from the process of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC). Each phase of a BRAC round brought its own unique challenges and opportunities, and taught the practitioners at the base, in the surrounding community, at DoD headquarters, in the state, and at federal levels the importance of cooperation, communication, and partnership. How can we use the Best Practices and Lessons Learned that emerged from these experiences to address the daunting challenges of contracting budgets, evolving missions and force structure, economic development, energy, encroachment, environmental responsibility and the changing community dynamics of today?

This four-hour workshop was a unique opportunity for ADC participants to focus in on the key takeaways from BRAC planning and implementation over the past 23 years, share in the evolution of the body of lessons learned knowledge, and brainstorm its application to challenges of today. Workshop participants heard from the leaders of past BRAC rounds, including Dr. Craig College of the



United States Army, Mr. Jim Holland of the United States Air Force, Mr. Jimmy Anderson of the United States Navy, Mr. John Armbrust of the State of Kansas, and Mr. Greg Taylor of the Fort Bragg Regional Alliance as they framed the issues and shared their experiences. Then, through five breakout sessions, participants discussed each phase of the BRAC process and shared their own experience to arrive at a common understanding of what worked, what we learned, and how it might be adapted to today’s problems.

The planning for this event began in May, 2012. The planning committee consisted of senior military leaders and their staffs, state and local government leaders, and representatives from

industry. The first step in the planning process was data gathering, in which more than 130 reports, papers, and other documents produced by government, academia, think tanks, and other experts were assembled to capture a baseline of lessons learned and best practices (see Appendix B). Using this data as a baseline, the planning committee developed the following five definitions for the various phases of the BRAC process:

Phase 1: Planning: Coordination between installations, communities, and states during the time prior to a formal BRAC announcement by DoD.

Phase 2: Deliberation: Data Collection, Analysis and Sharing among installations, communities, and states during the time frame between the announcement of a new BRAC round and impending creation of BRAC offices and data calls and delivery of the recommendations to the BRAC Commission.

Phase 3: Commission: Coordination among the Commission, communities and states that is heavily prescribed in public law and is intended to ensure transparency, objectivity and fairness into the BRAC process.

Phase 4: Implementation (A) Closure and Realignment – Coordination between installations, communities, and states includes all actions and activities that lead to the closing of installations, or the downsizing of installation missions through BRAC realignment.

Phase 5: Implementation (B) Growth – Coordination between installations, communities, and states that includes all actions and activities that lead to the successful realignment of new missions to installations, and the concurrent economic and social adjustments communities must undergo to accommodate rapid, and sometimes very large, increases in population.

These definitions became the framework for a Situation Manual that served as the key resource for all participants during the workshop. On the day of the workshop the five presenters noted above provided overviews of their experience with BRAC, and helped provide a common frame of reference for all participants. Their presentations are available on the ADC website. Breakout sessions were conducted based upon the five phases of the BRAC process. Following the breakouts, the participants reconvened in a closing plenary session, where they received briefings from the facilitators on key takeaways identified in each breakout.



Some of the key takeaways identified included:

Planning

- Create PROCESS, in addition to PERSONAL relationships – relationships between organizations, as well as to individuals.
- Establish regular and reliable communications and relationships between installation and community staff levels.
- Hold facilitated offsite meetings that allow military and civilian leaders to discuss challenges in a workgroup environment.
- Installations need to lay out a “portfolio” of their needs with communities and states.
- Master Planning is a critical tool for partnership.
- Create and take advantage of every opportunity for dialogue.



Deliberation

- Best Practice= Garrison Command training that Army held prior to release of BRAC list so Garrisons would know how to handle and what to say.
- DoD should not ask for everything they could use but only ask for what they will use.
- Design web tools that can be manipulated and updated constantly (not static).

Commission

- Many of the challenges during the Commission phase are caused by its compressed timeline as compared to the other phases of the BRAC process. Thus, successful strategies and specific approaches to influence Commission decision-making recognize this fact.
- Communities must use targeted, data-driven analyses that are focused on military value, and speak with “one voice” when communicating to the Commission.
- Analyses should reflect an understanding of the impacted installation’s mission and demonstrate synergies between an installation and the surrounding community and its infrastructure.
- Understanding of an installation’s mission starts well before the Commission phase and is based on routine interaction between the installation and the local community.
- Communities must understand and use *all* of the various means to provide input during the Commission phase – use and make the most of all opportunities to communicate.

Implementation – Closure

- The communities that took a more pragmatic, business oriented approach seemed to have an easier move into the redevelopment process.
- Sometimes there is a simple disconnect between the stakeholders involved in the cleanup and redevelopment.
- A lack of resources can affect a community as well as the Service

Implementation – Growth

- Military leadership should participate/become active member of the organizations established by the community to address issues related to installation growth.
- Joint land use planning involving both military and community organizations...ensures that proposed uses inside the fence do not conflict with proposed uses outside the fence.
- Input from the local jurisdiction should weigh more heavily in BRAC move decisions.

Following the event, a team of subject matter experts reviewed and analyzed the results from each breakout session to identify the key findings that emerged from having 98 very experienced and knowledgeable people discuss all aspects of BRAC. Those findings are documented in this report, which is being distributed to all workshop participants, and will be available on the ADC web site. The results contained in this document will be presented to senior DoD, state, and community leaders during a special ADC Forum scheduled in Washington, DC on October 30, 2012.



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	i
Table of Contents.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Planning	3
Deliberation	8
Commission	16
Implementation (A) – Closure & Realignment.....	22
Implementation (B) - Growth.....	24
Appendix A: List Of Best Practices and Lessons Learned Sources.....	29
Appendix B: Biographies	39
Appendix C: Survey Results.....	43

Introduction

This report is a detailed account of the *ADC BRAC Workshop: Using Lessons Learned To Address The Resource Challenges of Today*. While this workshop was only a four hour session during the weeklong conference, the findings outlined below are the results of a much larger effort. A planning committee composed of subject matter experts and thought leaders from the Military Services, state and local government, and industry collaborated on the design and development of this workshop over a three month period. Our research team conducted a review of the literature available on past BRAC actions and the personal experience of a number of key experts in BRAC. By reviewing over 130 reports and other source documents, as well as conducting an in-depth planning process with BRAC experts, we were able to gather Best Practices and Lessons Learned needed to provide the participants with a concise background to clearly frame each discussion.

During the workshop 98 conference attendees participated in the session. Building upon the vast wisdom and experience of previously identified Best Practices and Lessons Learned, the participants developed new insights and clarified past assumptions about how best to meet the challenges and opportunities that BRAC represents. But more importantly, the findings below illustrate how the services, state and local governments and industry can work more effectively together to overcome the current budgetary constraints they each face.



Breakout Group Key Findings Overview: Each breakout group had extensive discussions and as a result, produced a significant number of comments, insights and recommendations. A team of Subject Matter Experts has analyzed the results of each group and extracted the findings outlined below. In the following sections of this report, a more detailed explanation and recommendations can be found for each. The raw notes from each breakout group have been captured in a supplement to this document.

1. Planning: Pre-Announcement coordination between installations, communities, and states

- Communications and relationships are critical, and require investment of time and resources beyond what most communities/states and installations feel they can commit
- Sharing accurate data about capabilities and capacities both inside and outside the fence line can facilitate the creation of partnerships that address budgetary and resource needs today
- Master Planning is a highly efficient and effective tool that can capture data and information, facilitate communication and the building of organizational relationships, identify opportunities for partnerships and sharing of resources, and provide decision makers with fact-based analysis in resource-constrained environments

2. Deliberation: Data Collection, Analysis and Sharing among installations, communities, and states

- Effective deliberations rely heavily on effective planning, data management and training.
- The quality of recommendations needs to be improved.
- All aspects of data management could be improved.

3. Commission: Coordination among the Commission, Communities and States

- Understanding of an installation's mission starts well before the Commission phase and is based on routine interaction between the installation and the local community.
- Many of the challenges during the Commission phase are caused by its compressed timeline as compared to the other phases of the BRAC process.
- Communities must use targeted, data-driven analyses that are focused on military value, and speak with "one voice" when communicating to the Commission.
- Analyses should reflect an understanding of the impacted installation's mission and demonstrate synergies between an installation and the surrounding community and its infrastructure.
- Communities must understand and use *all* of the various means to provide input during the Commission phase – use and make the most of all opportunities to communicate.

4. Implementation (A): Coordination between services and communities facing a Realignment or Closure

- Importance of open and constant communication.

5. Implementation (B): Coordination between services and communities experiencing Growth

- Importance of establishing communications and building strong relationships.
- Take a Regional Approach to address growth
- Joint Land Use Planning

Planning

Pre-BRAC Announcement Communication, Coordination, and Partnership between Services and Communities

The Planning phase of BRAC for this breakout includes all of the time prior to a formal BRAC announcement by DoD, including the day-to-day communications and cooperation that occur as a matter of course, such as:

- Interlocal public safety cooperation,
- Master planning, both on the installation and in the community,
- Coordinating Infrastructure construction and maintenance, including transportation, energy, water and waste water, and telecommunications,
- The state role in addressing infrastructure requirements as well as possible state legislation required,
- Installation mission execution, and the impacts of decisions made “outside the fence” on the capacity and capability to test, train, or operate,
- Provision of municipal, health, education, and family services both on and off the installation.

Breakout Group Goal:

- Identify effective ways to increase Communications, Information Sharing, and Partnership

- ***Background and Current Situation:*** Experience and research has shown that waiting to communicate and cooperate after a BRAC was announced was too late. In the current environment of fiscal constraints (both in DoD and in local and state government), mission encroachment due to urban sprawl, species issues, the new boom in renewable energy, and rapidly evolving national security threats, installations and their host communities can no longer afford NOT to communicate. There are many success stories for cooperation and collaboration between installations, communities, and states, and in every case good communication was the key to that success.
- ***Preferred Future State:*** Robust sharing of information, active cooperation in master planning activities inside and outside fence lines, and partnership to deliver facilities and services are the new imperatives of military/community interaction.

Key Finding: Importance of Establishing Communications and Building Strong Relationships

Why is this important?

- Communications and relationships are critical, and require investment of time and resources beyond what most communities/states and installations feel they can commit.
- The concept of clear, reliable communications between installations, states, and local governments was the single most identified need identified in this workshop for EVERY phase of BRAC.
- Close behind and directly related was the concept of relationships based upon organizations and processes that can weather the coming and going of individuals to produce enduring partnerships.
- Communities, states, and installations cannot cooperate to address resource constraints if they don't understand each other's' needs and motivations.
- *Missions and military technologies are evolving rapidly, creating change that is difficult to adjust to quickly*

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- *PROCESS and ORGANIZATION, rather than PERSONAL relationships*
 - o *Establish regular and reliable communications and relationships at the staff level as well (e.g. Base Planning office with community Planning Department)*
 - o *Installations should actively engage and attend local planning, zoning, and other community meetings, even in an ex officio role only – remain informed and engaged*
 - o *Community planners should be invited to participate in installation master planning processes*
- *State Commanders Councils – emerging venues to support communication (e.g. the Arizona Commanders Summit, chartered in 2008)*
 - *DoD fostering the creation of Commanders Councils in states across the nation*
 - *Serve as effective ways to facilitate communications between senior DoD leaders and state elected officials/agency heads*
 - *Charters provide “top cover” for staff-level interaction and cooperation*
 - *Create venues to convene and facilitate both official and unofficial staff-level engagements*
 - *Installations should be cognizant of and engage in state and regional planning efforts*
 - *Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) conducting transportation planning*
 - *State level natural resource and infrastructure plans*
- *“Retreat” to communicate*
 - o *Hold facilitated offsite meetings that allow military and civilian leaders to discuss challenges in a workgroup environment*
 - o *Use this time to build relationships and collaborations*
- *Installations need to lay out a “portfolio” of their needs with communities and states*
 - o *Provides a starting point for discussions of shared services and other partnership*
 - o *Helps communities and states better understand BRAC vulnerabilities*
- *Communities need to make the effort to understand the workforce on installations*

- *Attract new industry to absorb jobs lost in budget cuts*
 - *Identify opportunities to share skills and knowledge*
- *Communities need to understand missions in depth, not just at the “flag and apple pie” level*
 - *Understand how to create synergies to missions outside the fence*
 - *Tech parks and incubators to commercialize technologies*
 - *Reduce travel and other direct costs that use up Federal budgets*
- *Community representatives discussed the importance of understanding the value that they bring to the installation and the value the installation brings to the community.*
 - *One community shared information about an exercise that was intended to make people in the community more aware/appreciative of their local military – the Credit Union placed colored stickers on some currency and gave these bills to military personnel. It was very eye opening to see how far and wide these marked bills showed up within the local businesses*

What are the challenges to success?

- *Even groups that have strong relationships need to keep working to improve.*
- *Base commanders change every two years and don't always get involved in community and state issues*
- *State and local elected officials and senior staff turnover often*
- *Bases are “locked up” as a result of force protection requirements*
- *Each service likes to stay within itself and keep to its culture*

How do we implement these ideas?

- *States and communities must invest in relationship building and strengthening communications with all levels of the military, from the installation to Washington*
- *Communities would also do well to prepare for technology-driven changes (e.g., remotely piloted vehicles) and different threat sources (e.g., cyber warfare) – establish themselves as a good place for DoD to do business*
- *Communities need to look beyond DoD and DHS to other missions of the Federal government*
- *States need to foster Commanders' Councils – don't wait for DoD to do it for you*
 - *Serve as effective ways to facilitate communications between senior DoD leaders and state elected officials/agency heads*
 - *Charters provide “top cover” for staff-level interaction and cooperation*
 - *Create venues to convene and facilitate both official and unofficial staff-level engagements*

Key Finding : Importance of Sharing Accurate Data

Why is this important?

- *Sharing accurate data about capabilities and capacities both inside and outside the fence line can facilitate the creation of partnerships that address budgetary and resource needs today.*

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- *Data and Information: Installations and communities need to better understand the value of their assets (e.g., land) and excess capabilities/capacity (e.g., water supply, sewage treatment)*
- *BRAC 05 database has capacity data as a starting point*
- *NEXTGEN IT provides a better tool for Air Force asset management (contact HQAF/A7C for information)*
- *The military's move towards an asset management approach to infrastructure and facilities can facilitate the move toward "shared services" or public-public partnerships.*
- *Data sharing can make it easier to use excess capacity for in-kind services for mission support, which gives more incentive to understand and track this information*
- *The group discussed the importance of updating data from BRAC 05 before another BRAC announcement, when communications with the Commission are closed*

What are the challenges to success?

- *Bureaucratic inertia and the fear of change stand as obstacles to actions.*
- *Data gathering and validation are time and resource intensive*

How do we implement these ideas?

- *Military services must make it easier for installations to share data and information about infrastructure and facilities while protecting national security*
- *Need to have reliable, comparable baseline data to start*
- *Need to ensure that elected officials and community leaders understand the impacts of potential changes economically, environmentally, and socially*
- *Installations and communities need to better understand the value of their assets (e.g., land) and excess capabilities/capacity (e.g., water supply, sewage treatment)*

Key Finding : The Value of Master Planning

Why is this important?

- *Master Planning is a highly efficient and effective tool that can capture data and information, facilitate communication and the building of organizational relationships, identify opportunities for partnerships and sharing of resources, and provide decision makers with fact-based analysis in resource-constrained environments*
- *Land uses outside of bases are evolving rapidly (e.g. the boom in renewable energy)*

infrastructure) creating new encroachments on missions that Federal policy and DoD programs need to adjust to.

- *Environmental issues continue to grow in importance, but are often poorly understood by installation and community leaders*
 - o *Understanding the true impacts of environmental considerations on missions*
 - o *Natural resources planning and mission sustainability*

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- *Master Planning -- a critical tool for partnership*
 - o *The group discussed the importance of having more collaboration on master planning, and that it would be helpful to consider the installation master plan as a component of the county or regional master plan*
 - o *Infrastructure planning can provide opportunities and incentive to partner*
 - *Joint uses*
 - *Enhanced use leasing and other asset sharing*
 - *Diversification of missions and land uses both on and off installations*
- *The trend outside the fence is toward multi-agency regional planning. Installations should become a part of this*

What are the challenges to success?

- *Bases are "locked up" as a result of force protection requirements*
- *Each service likes to stay within itself and keep to its culture*
- *Military policy and regulations do not require coordination of planning with outside jurisdictions*
- *Coordination of planning adds an extra level of complexity that further stretches limited resources*

How do we implement these ideas?

- *Communities and installations need to look deeper than BRAC, look at the next level of issues and take a regional approach to master planning*
- *Installations must engage local and regional planners in master planning efforts on base*
 - o *Create venues to convene and facilitate both official and unofficial staff-level engagements*
 - o *Installations should be cognizant of and engage in state and regional planning efforts*
 - *Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPO) conducting transportation planning*
 - *State level natural resource and infrastructure plans*
 - *Councils of Government*
 - *Installations should engage at the O-6 level*
 - *Understand the relationships to MPOs, local planning and zoning authorities, and social services*

Deliberation

Post-BRAC Announcement Data Collection, Analysis and Recommendation Development

The Deliberation phase of BRAC for this breakout includes the time frame between the announcement of a new BRAC round and impending creation of BRAC offices and data calls and delivery of the recommendations to the BRAC Commission. During this deliberation phase the services often sequester themselves behind closed doors. Data calls inundate the services and staff at Headquarters and Installations struggle to provide accurate data. In the meantime, communities and states are gearing up for BRAC Commission hearings, and desire both to have the best information and data possible about the missions and capabilities of the installation and provide accurate data concerning the community factors which go into the Services decision making processes.

Breakout Group Goals:

- Identify ways to improve the data accuracy and relevance and make the management process and tools more effective and efficient
- Identify ways to improve communications and quality of recommendations.

Background and Current Situation: Experience and research has shown that once the BRAC decision has been announced the services sequester themselves behind closed doors under a veil of secrecy. Data calls are received one after another, often asking for mountains of information that will never be used, but will ensure that those tasked with answering the data calls are left with not enough time to accurately provide the critical information. Data is often pulled from data bases that are out of date, measure only square footage or use algorithms that make no sense outside of that particular office. Community data is often gleaned from websites, rather than through cooperation with the communities and states to arrive at the accurate information. It was often reported that many of the services used assumptions that had undergone limited testing, and the full savings realization depends upon the transformation of the existing system to achieve organizational efficiencies. Moreover, realizing the full extent of the savings would depend on actual implementation of the recommended actions. Installations, communities, and states cannot answer questions and provide data in a bubble, and need to understand the both the information and sources of data that are used to make recommendations to better respond to needs for partnering. Issues from mission encroachment due to urban sprawl to renewable energy issues affect both sides of the fence line. Installations and their host communities can no longer afford NOT to communicate. .

Preferred Future State: Robust sharing of information, active cooperation in developing and delivering data packages about mission capability and capacity that make sense, accurately

Key Finding: Effective deliberations rely heavily on effective planning, data management and training.

Why is this important?

- Most of the deficiencies identified by participants involved inaccurate data that could have been addressed during the Planning Phase and corrected during the Deliberation Phase through effective communications with sources of the data.
- The deliberation organizations that invested in developing processes and training their employees on those processes were more effective than those that tried to move directly into data gathering and analysis.
- Errors or poor decisions made during the Deliberation Phase often produced negative impacts throughout the Commission and Implementation Phases.

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- Early communications created a better tone for getting the right information to analyze.
- Leadership involvement across DoD was critical to the success of BRAC 05. An effective "battle rhythm" was created and implemented to keep leadership engaged at both the DoD and HQ Army levels.
- The TABS Analytical Framework (TAF) was extremely useful for describing the Army deliberative process. It was used to structure valuable training both at the beginning and half way through the deliberation phase. This was the main reason why the Army exceeded its BRAC 05 goals and objectives.
- Be more open during the Deliberation Phase. Carefully define what pieces of information are truly "need to know."
- Explain politician role, do they influence development of recommendations?
- Include updated information from local communities & their stakeholders.
- How can social media be used to: 1) monitor chatter and customize communications to address rumors and misinformation and/or 2) mine for intelligence that could be useful data?
- Best Practices: Army training conducted during the Deliberation Phase and Garrison Command training held prior to release of BRAC list so Garrisons would know how to handle predictable reactions and establish credibility with installation and community populations.

What are the challenges to success?

- Allowing bureaucratic inertia and the fear of change stand as obstacles to actions.
- Reliance on out of date installation Real Property Master Plans and similar documents.
- Data calls not written to gather information for the specifically stated goals and desired outcomes of the BRAC round.
- Lack of full understanding by the installations about the communities that surround them and the needs of host communities.
- Decisions about reducing the supporting base structure lack a theoretical framework to guide the process. Each service must examine its own operational and contingency plans and requirements.

How do we implement these ideas?

- States and communities must invest in relationship building and strengthening communications with all levels of the military, from the installation to Washington.
- Best Practices: Army training conducted during the Deliberation Phase and Garrison Command training held prior to release of BRAC list so Garrisons would know how to handle predictable reactions and establish credibility with installation and community populations.
- From the outset, identify the focus of BRAC: close, save, re-align or transform?
- For those outside of DoD, watch your “lane” and help with the information flow but don’t try to get into the deliberations with DoD.
- For DoD, be mindful of community inputs; do not ignore their issues/concerns.
- Communicate future force structure inside and outside DoD early in the process.
- Communicate/disclose to investment market.
- Host community forums, town halls, web site, or hold training at ADC conferences.
- Consider group training for installations, e.g.: maybe regional or type/size of installation.
- Improve communication modalities: articles, publications, videos, training.
- Plan in advance for long-term activities for military families.

Key Finding: The quality of recommendations needs to be improved.

Why is this important?

- Poorly written recommendations caused negative impacts in the Commission and Implementation Phases.
- The recommendations approved by the Commission, President and Congress become BRAC law and therefore require legislative action, normally through a subsequent Commission to be modified.

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- In BRAC 2005 the Infrastructure Steering Group oversaw the vetting of both Service centric and Joint Cross-Service Group (JCSG) recommendations and made better-informed decisions than in the past.
- Poor communications and rigid adherence to past practices led directly to quality issues with several BRAC 05 recommendations. Many of the issues did not surface until the implementation phase.
- Different deliberation organizations took different approaches to creating recommendations. Some that did not work included trying to combine low payback actions with high payback actions, trying to combine too many actions, and not combining “domino” actions.
- Some recommendations relied on acquisition of property that turned out to be unfeasible.
- Some recommendations turned out to be somewhat ambiguous during the Implementation Phase

What are the challenges to success?

- Over-adherence to past practices.
- Reluctance to include the use of special BRAC tools (e.g. real property exchange and other MILCON alternatives) as part of individual recommendations
- Cultural desire to maximize property ownership within DoD – ownership often is confused with control and security

How do we implement these ideas?

- A special group should be established to review past performance and establish new guidance for writing recommendations.
- Organizations responsible for creating recommendations should be trained on how to write them.

Key Finding: All aspects of data management could be improved.

Why is this important?

- Individuals from virtually every organization inside and outside DoD voiced complaints about BRAC data accuracy, applicability, tools, storage and classification.
- Data issues caused a few poor decisions and subsequent negative impacts throughout the Commission and Implementation Phases.

What are the critical ideas that emerged? (Note: A good deal of this section is philosophy rather than a description of critical ideas that emerged)

- Data and Information: Installations and communities need to better understand the value of their assets (e.g., land) and excess capabilities/capacity (e.g., water supply, sewage treatment).
- The entire data management process could be improved significantly. The multiple processes and tools used for BRAC 05 caused considerable confusion and frustration, and produced data that was not as good as it could have been.
- A fundamental flaw with the process is that no one knows what it is that should be valued in order to properly measure an installation. A proper process that fully understands the desired end results should be developed. The development of the process should help to develop the questions which if done properly can help develop the answers.
- Allow time for collaboration with communities around the installation and time to train everyone on the process and objectives of the data call.
- Data Collection helps your team to assess the health of your process. To do so, you must identify the key quality characteristics you will measure, how you will measure them, and what you will do with the data you collect. When you are selecting processes to improve, you need to find out the processes, or process steps, that produce the characteristics your customers perceive as important.
- Data Collection is nothing more than planning for and obtaining useful information on key quality characteristics produced by your process. However, simply collecting data does not ensure that you will obtain relevant or specific enough data to tell you what is occurring in your process. The key issue is not: How do we collect data? Rather, it is: How do we obtain useful data?
- Data Collection enables a team to formulate and test working assumptions about a process and develop information that will lead to the improvement of the key quality characteristics of the product or service.
- Data Collection improves your decision-making by helping you focus on objective information about what is happening in the process, rather than subjective opinions. In other words, I think the problem is... becomes... The data indicate the problem is.... For your team to collect data uniformly, you will need to develop a Data Collection plan. The elements of the plan must be clearly and unambiguously defined—operationally defined.
- Data collectors should have a standard operating procedure to use during their Data Collection activities.
- DoD must decide on a purpose for collecting the data. In a Data Collection Plan DoD should develop a working hypothesis that will serve as a guide to future

investigation of the process. This hypothesis is an assumption based on already existing data and observations. You develop working assumptions and collect data to determine the process changes that will improve the key quality characteristics of your product or service. Your proposed change should be stated as an "If . . . then" statement.

- Remembering that data form the basis for the effective, unemotional communication without which no process improvement effort can succeed, you need to avoid two significant problems associated with Data Collection. Problem 1 - Failure to establish Operational Definitions and Problem 2 - Adding bias to the Data Collection process. You can never eliminate bias, but it is important to minimize it.
- Pilot your process. You want to make sure that you can really get the data you need. For example, if you want crime statistics from the police station for a particular neighborhood, check in to make sure that they will be available when you need them and will be available for the population you are serving.
- Collaboration in what "good data" would constitute from the installation and the community.
- Data sharing can make it easier to use excess capacity for in-kind services for mission support, which gives more incentive to understand and track this information.
- Communications were greatly constrained by the close-hold rules implemented during the deliberation phase. This contributed to data errors and not understanding the nature of excess capacity.
- Training for Army Trusted Agents in key organizations and all BRAC-eligible installations significantly enhanced the Army's data gathering process.
- Collaboration should not be a bad word. Communication with communities is the key to proper information.
- Installations and communities need to better understand the value of their assets (e.g., land) and excess capabilities/capacity (e.g., water supply, sewage treatment).
- Don't use old databases!!

What are the challenges to success?

- DoD should not ask for everything they could use but only ask for what they will use.
- Various data issues caused coordination challenges among different BRAC deliberation groups in three military departments and across seven Joint Cross Service Groups.
- Bureaucratic inertia and the fear of change stand as obstacles to actions.
- Data gathering and validation are time and resource intensive.

How do we implement these ideas?

- Develop the entire data management process and tools as a first priority -- definitely before developing data calls.
- Get early buy-in from stakeholders. Get buy-in from partner agencies (and other important stakeholder) during worksheet and performance measurement plan development. Check to ensure that what you want is something that they either

already collect or are willing to collect and share with your project.

- Develop a web-based tool that could be used to populate and update inputs. This data tool could be used to answer questions and validate the information.
- Start with success. Begin your data collection efforts with those sites that can and will provide you the data you need in a timely manner.
- Data Collection can involve a multitude of decisions by data collectors. When you prepare your Data Collection plan, you should try to eliminate as many subjective choices as possible by operationally defining the parameters needed to do the job correctly. It may be as simple as establishing separate criteria and a specific way to judge when a step begins and when it ends.
- Identify your helpers (data collectors). Consider using your members to help collect data for you. With a little training on how to use the instruments, members can often be a great source of information. They are there and see it all!
- Train your helpers (data collectors). This does not need to be complicated but should happen. Do data collectors know what to say? Where to turn in the information? How to respond to questions? How to protect confidentiality?
- Use low burden methods and processes. Integrate data collection with on-going processes. Do members develop goal-setting plans with teen mothers? Reviewing those plans at the end may provide data on the changes that teens were able to make with the help of the member. Do your schools already do an intake and exit form for tutored youth? Discussing the addition of a question or two may allow you to get some outcome data in a relatively easy way. Many agency partners already do intakes or exit forms. Build on those!
- Set a schedule Timing is a critical element of data collection. Be sensitive to the schedule of data collection at the sites. Coordinate your data collection efforts with the availability of the information you need. Trying to push people to give you data that is not ready/collected or no longer available only increases resistance.
- Eliminate assumptions unless validated and tested to enhance the quality of the data.
- Validation of the data by an independent third party would greatly enhance the decision making process.
- Figure out before you start what it is that you want to do with this data and make sure your focus is clear.
- Allow time for collaboration with communities around the installation and time to train everyone on the process and objectives of the data call.
- Start the data collection process before the Deliberation Phase begins and constantly validate data.
- Identify appropriate methods. Part of the problem with collecting data may be the method. Consider what method you are using to collect your data. Many sites and programs use surveys to collect data but this is not always the best way considering the populations your members serve. Maybe an observation, a focus group with cookies or lunch, or short in person interviews would be more effective.
- Identify appropriate data source. One challenge is getting the information from the person or organization (data source) identified in your worksheet or performance measurement plan. You may have an excellent survey for your clients but it is not feasible to get the survey to them, much less get it back. In some cases, it may be more appropriate to identify another data source for ease of collection (e.g. supervisors) or to increase the strength of Develop data quality objectives like we have to do in the environmental arena for CERCLA cleanups.

This way you understand what you intend to do and how you intend to do it.

- Provide confidentiality. Obtaining data from respondents can often be difficult if they are concerned that their information will be shared with others, or that they will be identified in the report. Always inform respondents of the confidentiality guidelines (e.g. the survey is not anonymous but will not be shared with others), and abide by those guidelines.
- Encourage respondents to give you the information you need. Keep instruments short, provide directions, inform folks about how you will use the information, offer incentives (food!), and use a captive audience. These are all ways to make sure respondents complete the instruments.
- Form relationships with the communities before a data call is declared. Continue to foster and update these relationships and the information that comes out of it.
- Make sure that the people answering the questions have expertise on the subject matter. The motivation was not there to ask the right questions.
- Military services must make it easier for installations to share data and information about infrastructure and facilities while protecting national security.
- Need to have reliable, comparable baseline data to start.
- Use Army Mapper to gather capacity & usability data—we didn't have the data in BRAC '05 because we didn't want to tip our hand by asking the questions. (Note: This is Army centric - what about the other Services?)
- Validate data from inside and outside the fence line with an independent third party –engage subject matter experts to review the data.

Commission

Coordination among the Commission, Communities and States

The Commission phase of BRAC is the heavily prescribed in public law and is intended to ensure transparency, objectivity and fairness into the process. While decisions made by the Commission are heavily based upon the certified data provided by DoD, opportunities do exist to fill gaps in information or to correct data or misperceptions that may impact decisions. These opportunities must be predicated on a thorough understanding of the data and criteria the Secretary of Defense uses to make recommendations to the Commission and on the specific activities during this phase where the Commission obtains more data. These opportunities are also based on a constructive and targeted approach that puts national security ahead of local economic interest

Breakout Group Goals:

- Identify ways to improve communications between Commission, Communities and States
- Identify proactive community preparations in advance of the Commission's recommendations
- Develop ways to identify and eliminate unintended consequences

***Background and Current Situation:** Experience and research have shown that significant amounts of money and political capital are expended upon attempts to influence BRAC Commission decisions. Unless those efforts provide genuinely new information or correct existing information used to make recommendations, those funds and efforts are often fruitless, thanks to the structure and tenets of the BRAC authorizing legislation. Opportunities to influence the Commission are complicated the compressed timeframe of this phase and the amount of data that must be absorbed by the Commission. Too often, all stakeholders in the outcomes of a BRAC Commission see the potential results as "win/lose" scenarios.*

***Preferred Future State:** Robust communications between the Commission, states and communities focused on providing the best outcomes for national defense priorities. Launching of planning efforts (concurrent with the Commission Phase) by communities and states to begin preparation for implementation of Commission findings.*

Key Finding: Understanding of an installation’s mission starts well before the Commission phase and is based on routine interaction between the installation and the local community.

Why is this important?

- Since the timeline of the Commission phase is compressed, it is difficult to simply react to DOD recommendations “on the fly”.
- Lack of planning will likely put communities at a disadvantage vis-à-vis other communities.
- Once a BRAC process officially begins it will become more difficult to get access to installation representatives.
- This routine interaction will yield communities insights into how the installation would respond to BRAC data calls.

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- Routine and frequent interaction among military stakeholders and local communities is critical. Building this understanding and relationship takes time.
- There is not sufficient time to build a complete understanding of an installation’s military value “from scratch” during the Commission phase.
- Local community’s access to installation commanders may be restricted during a BRAC process.

What are the challenges to success?

- Routine access and engagement between installation commander’s and local communities.
- Military commanders may not see incentive to engage and work routinely with local communities.
- It is sometimes difficult to raise local issue awareness and action at State level.

How do we implement these ideas?

- Standing committees between local communities and installation commander will increase nodes of communication and understanding.
- Installation commanders need to understand that they need to have a relationship with local communities to be successful.
- Communities need to identify multiple forums to create and sustain this interaction.

Key Finding: Many of the challenges during the Commission phase are caused by its compressed timeline as compared to the other phases of the BRAC process.

Why is this important?

- In prior BRAC rounds, the Commission phase has been the shortest in duration compared to the prior internal DOD deliberation phase and subsequent implementation phase.
- The Commission phase has averaged only about 4 months from the time DOD recommendations were submitted to the Commission to the time the Commission recommendations were submitted to the President. In contrast, other phases are measure in years.
- Successful strategies and specific approaches to communicate and influence Commission decision-making must recognize this dynamic.
- Some felt the timeframe is too compressed and recommendations are too complex to be sufficiently evaluated in this short period of time.

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- More time allocated to the Commission phase would allow for more thorough analyses by both the impacted communities and the Commission.
- More time would allow the Commission and the communities more time for review and the presentation of relevant data, i.e. for communities to offer their most germane arguments in the most appropriate way.
- More time and analyses could lead to better recommendations and fewer unforeseen or unintended consequences.
- Communities need to understand the lifecycle of the Commission from appointment of Commissioners to its final report to the President. (Note: Can this information be provided as an appendix?)
More time might also allow for interim hearings that would allow for a pulse-check to allow communities to see which direction the Commissioners were leaning.

What are the challenges to success?

- The BRAC process and its timelines are prescribed by law. An act of Congress would be required to amend this law.
- Not all stakeholders would agree that the Commission should be afforded more time.
- Additional time for the Commission phase would not guarantee better analyses or provide communities more opportunities to communicate.
- The Commission phase timeframe has been relatively constant through the previous four BRAC rounds (1991 through 2005).

How do we implement these ideas?

- DOD and/or communities would need to advocate to Congress to revise the BRAC law and prescribed timelines.
- Specifically, DOD would need to include this change to the process in its proposed legislation for the next round of BRAC.

Key Finding: Communities must use targeted, data-driven analyses that are focused on military value, and speak with “one voice” when communicating to the Commission.

Why is this important?

- Given compressed timeline of the Commission phase, analyses and communication must be targeted at specifically why the DOD recommendation and supporting analyses are flawed.
- Analyses must be focused on the four military value components of the BRAC selection criteria as they hold the most weight in both DOD and the Commission analyses. (Note: Can we somewhere in the document (e.g. an Appendix) provide the BRAC selection criteria, highlighting the four military value components?)
- Sometimes States or different parts of the local community may have different priorities or perspectives. These differing views may undermine one another. Communities need to decide how to react to the BRAC recommendation, whether the base or mission is critical to the local community or not; and determine how to defend it.
- Data analyses have on occasion been found to be incorrect, though simple human error. These types of mistakes can be identified by communities.

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- Use the most data-driven arguments possible in all presentations to the Commission.
- Communities need to avoid/minimize any arguments predicated on “brain-drain” as a vast number of programs and missions have been moved around the country without a mission failure.
- Both communities and the Commission can leverage information technology for purposes of data analysis and data submission.
- Communication should be clear and consistent at all levels (local, state, national representatives).

What are the challenges to success?

- A uniform template for data submission to the Commission that reflects the types and format of data deemed useful by the Commissioners for review does not exist.
- Understanding the DOD analysis including its detailed COBRA analysis.
- States and local communities can be unprepared for BRAC recommendations and without strategic direction as they may be focused on other (non BRAC) state or local issues. States may not always take a holistic view of military affairs.

How do we implement these ideas?

- States and local communities need to be continually talking about the roles military installations play in their communities.
- Local communities need to engage at the State-level to ensure those stakeholders are aware of the role installations play in communities.
- Developing a uniform template for data submission to the Commission would be useful.

Key Finding: Analyses should reflect an understanding of the impacted installation's mission and demonstrate synergies between an installation and the surrounding community and its infrastructure.

Why is this important?

- Military value is the most important component of the BRAC selection criteria.
- Local communities and infrastructure can often have an impact on the ability of an installation to perform its mission (its military value) or react to future changes to its mission.
- The impact of a local community on an installation may put it at a disadvantage compared to other communities. (I have no clue what this means – may need to clarify with an example)
- Local communities can influence how it supports an installation's mission or military value.

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- Local communities need to understand the missions local installation perform and how the local community and infrastructure can impact the installation's ability to perform that mission.
- Communities also need to understand any anticipated or planned changes to the installation's mission, e.g. national level trends in force structure that may lead to increases or decreases installation forces and personnel. A good source of this information is the ADC 360 daily newsletter.
- These trends may lead to additional demands on the local community.

What are the challenges to success?

- Local communities do not always have routine access to or interaction with military commanders on the local installation.
- It may be difficult to obtain national level or a headquarters perspective of possible changes to an installation's mission, forces, or personnel
- Planned or possible changes to an installation's mission may be classified and restricts access.

How do we implement these ideas?

- Standing committees and meetings between local communities and installation commanders will increase means of communication and mutual understanding.
- These relationships and means of communication need to occur at multiple levels – locally, regionally and State.
- Local communities need to engage and track issues at national level so they are aware of any potential changes to the installation's mission and personnel.

Key Finding: Communities must understand and use *all* of the various means to provide input during the Commission phase – use and make the most of all opportunities to communicate.

Why is this important?

- The Commission phase is designed to ensure “openness and fairness” to the BRAC process. Opportunities for communities to communicate are limited during the DOD internal deliberation phase.
- There were multiple means for communities to engage the Commission, from Commissioner and staff visits to local installations to Regional hearings.
- Since the Commission phase is compressed, communities should take advantage of every opportunity they can to communicate their message to the Commission.

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- Communities should focus on data-driven analyses and highlight any shortcomings in DOD data and analyses to both Commissioners and staff.
- Communities can get access to all documents provided to the Commission through its website, they should take advantage of this. This website is www.brac.gov.
- The Commission should exercise great care in ensuring that all substantive communications are made a matter of public record.
- Regional hearings were cited as the least helpful means of communication, as they address a wide range of installations and issues.
- It can be difficult to convey local installation issues during a regional hearing as many political leaders and installations are more likely to be involved.

What are the challenges to success?

- Getting sufficient time and access to Commissioners and staff when desired. The timeline of the Commission phase exacerbates this.
- Commissioners and staff may be overwhelmed with volume data and issues to process in a relatively short period of time.
- A State-wide issue might limit communication and visibility to a local installation issue because the State-wide issue is deemed more significant.

How do we implement these ideas?

- Communities should have a communication strategy and stay focused and on message. This strategy must leverage all opportunities to communicate.
- Local communities must communicate this strategy to State and National levels.
- Focus specifically on the DOD data and analyses and highlight any shortcomings or errors to both Commissioners and Commission staff.

Implementation (A) – Closure & Realignment

Coordination between installations, communities, and states facing a Realignment or Closure

The Closure & Realignment phase of BRAC for this breakout includes all actions and activities that lead to the closing of installations, or the downsizing of installation missions through BRAC realignment. Among others these actions include:

- Planning for the reuse of closing installations,
- Identifying opportunities to make productive use of excess capacities at installations that are downsizing,
- Addressing ongoing costs of infrastructure construction and maintenance, including transportation, energy, water and waste water, and telecommunications, at downsizing installations,
- Workforce re-training and reemployment challenges,
- Addressing environmental remediation and cleanup needs,
- Streamlining real estate transactions to speed the reuse of closed or under-utilized facilities.

Breakout Group Goals:

- Identify ways to improve communication and cooperation between all parties
- Identify ways to address common resource needs in the case of downsizing
- Identify ways to improve preparations for realignment and closure
- Identify ways to improve human capital management

Background and Current Situation: Experience and research has shown that the closure or significant downsizing of an installation need can actually be a very positive event for the economic health of communities. BRAC actions where multiple jurisdictions are unable to communicate and cooperate with each other, where communication with Service representatives from the installation level to Washington are based upon politics, not the sharing of accurate and useful information, and where issues of control prevent critical local, state, and Federal agency stakeholders from engaging in the planning process are examples of the opposite outcome.

Preferred Future State: Robust sharing of information aggressive and early engagement and creation of a strong, focused community voice, active cooperation in workforce development and retraining, and partnership to productively reuse closed and underutilized facilities.

Key Finding: Importance of Open and Constant Communication

Why is this important?

- *There are many complex issues to be addressed in a Closure situation, including economic development, societal justice, environmental cleanup, and matters of law. These issues fester without open and constant communication between stakeholders.*

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- Stakeholders must coordinate early in the process to develop strategic, flexible, reasonable and executable reuse plans. The reuse plan does not need to be the perfect plan but it must be grounded in logic and understanding of market forces, economic realities and LRA capabilities.
- Regulators must be brought into the process as fully integrated members of the redevelopment team to foster an ownership of the process and project, identify and solve issues early on and participate in the decision-making.
- Quarterly meetings to discuss findings, proposed actions and desired end results, along with open and consistent dialogue with the regulators must be scheduled and maintained.
- Full disclosure of the environmental condition of the property upfront helps the process run more smoothly and can help the redevelopment process identify any barriers upfront.
- The Services should provide the environmental data to the community as early as possible. The Army hired Staubach to do a report on each of the major installations, which included a highest and best use analysis.
-

What are the challenges to success?

- *People are intimidated by the concepts of environmental liability and the costs of environmental remediation.*
- *Balancing economic development needs with those of the larger community and the environment is a daunting task.*

How do we implement these ideas?

- *Efficient and successful execution of a base closure and transition to community reuse requires a fully engaged Local Redevelopment Authority that is integrated into every aspect of the planning and execution of the base closure and redevelopment process.*
- *Bringing in a contractor to educate a community on the cleanup process can help the community understand the situation and engage better in the process. (Note: cannot this be done by OEA in conjunction with ADC?)*
- *Jointly train the community and installation. Training should include redevelopment planning, the military disposal planning process, environmental impact process, ECP process, and transition of installation management. This training helps mobilize action and enhance communication.*

Implementation (B) - Growth

Coordination between services and communities experiencing Growth

The Growth phase of BRAC for this breakout includes all actions and activities that lead to the successful realignment of new missions to installations, and the concurrent economic and social adjustments communities must undergo to accommodate rapid, and sometimes very large, increases in population. Among others these actions include:

- Planning for rapid expansions of infrastructure construction and maintenance, including transportation, energy, water and waste water, and telecommunications,
- Planning for new demands for public education, recreation, social services, and health services driven by population growth,
- Workforce re-training and development to meet new demands,
- Identifying ways communities and installations can partner provide to jointly provide infrastructure and services.

Breakout Group Goals:

- Identify ways to improve communication and cooperation between all parties
- Identify ways to address common resource needs to meet new demands on public infrastructure and services
- Identify ways to improving preparations for growth realignment
- Identify ways to improve human capital management

***Background and Current Situation:** Experience and research has shown that the significant growth of an installation need can lead to unforeseen challenges for the economic and social health of communities. Rapid increases in demands on public infrastructure, schools, health care facilities, and other services are not paid for in advance through increases in the tax base, the growth of which lags behind mission growth. Local workforces may not have the necessary training and skills to immediately fill the new jobs that accompany military missions. However the long-term positive economic impacts of mission growth cannot be denied, and communities and states are learning hard lessons quickly in responding to the challenges.*

***Preferred Future State:** Robust sharing of information, aggressive planning for infrastructure, facility, and services growth accompanied by creative approaches to financing that growth, and active cooperation in workforce development and retraining.*

Key Finding: Importance of Establishing Communications and Building Strong Relationships

Why is this important?

- Communications and relationships are critical, and require investment of time and resources beyond what most communities/states and installations commit.
- The concept of clear, reliable communications between installations, states, and local governments was the single most identified need identified in this workshop for EVERY phase of BRAC.

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- *DoD fostering the creation of Commanders Councils in states across the nation (contact DASD/Readiness for information)*
 - o Serve as effective ways to facilitate communications between senior DoD leaders and state elected officials/agency heads
- *Create venues to convene and facilitate both official and unofficial staff-level engagements*
 - o Hold facilitated offsite meetings that allow military and civilian leaders to discuss challenges in a workgroup environment
 - o Use this time to build relationships and collaborations

What are the challenges to success?

- *Even groups that have strong relationships need to keep working to improve.*
- *Base commanders change every two years and don't always get involved in community and state issues*
- *State and local elected officials and senior staff turnover often as well*

How do we implement these ideas?

- *States and communities must invest in relationship building and strengthening communications with all levels of the military, from the installation to Washington*
- *Communities would also do well to prepare for technology-driven changes (e.g., remotely piloted vehicles) and different threat sources (e.g., cyber warfare) – establish themselves as a good place for DoD to do business*
- *Communities need to look beyond DoD and DHS to bring in other missions of the Federal government*
- *States need to foster Commanders' Councils – don't wait for DoD to do it for you*
 - o Serve as effective ways to facilitate communications between senior DoD leaders and state elected officials/agency heads
 - o Charters provide “top cover” for staff-level interaction and cooperation
 - o Create venues to convene and facilitate both official and unofficial staff-level engagements

Key Finding: Take a Regional Approach to address growth

Why is this important?

- Communities, states, and installations cannot cooperate to address resource constraints if they don't understand each other's' needs and motivations.
- Missions and military technologies are evolving rapidly, creating change that is difficult to adjust to quickly

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- *Engage DoD's Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA)*
 - o In addition to funding assistance communities traditionally look to OEA for, they can provide a wealth of contacts to assist with Regional planning efforts
- *The Association of Defense Communities is championing and leading efforts to assist communities with establishing and nurturing public-public and public private partnerships as a means to support community/base efforts*
- *Federal budgets are shrinking, installations need the communities assistance to insure base operations are conducted in the most cost effective manner possible*

What are the challenges to success?

- *Many old issues that a concerted Regional effort can help minimize*
 - o Bases are "locked up" as a result of force protection requirements
 - o Each service likes to stay within itself and keep to its culture
- *A focus strictly on the federal budget and MILCON by bases to provide the resources necessary to maintain and expand infrastructure and facilities,*
- *Allowing bureaucratic inertia and the fear of change stand as obstacles to actions.*

How do we implement these ideas?

- *States, communities, and installations must invest in relationship building*
- *Installations need to lay out a "portfolio" of their needs with communities and states*
 - o *Provides a starting point for discussions of shared services and other partnership*
- *Communities need to make the effort to understand the workforce on installations*
 - o *Attract new industry to absorb jobs lost in budget cuts*
 - o *Identify opportunities to share skills and knowledge*
- *Communities need to understand missions in depth*
 - o *Understand how to create synergies to missions outside the fence*
- *Community representatives discussed the importance of understanding the value that they bring to the installation and the value the installation brings to the community.*

Key Finding: Joint Land Use Planning

Why is this important?

- *Joint land use planning involving both military and community organizations (similar to regional planning) ensures that proposed uses inside the fence do not conflict with proposed uses outside the fence (and vice versa).*
 - o *Completing a joint land use study early in the process is looked upon favorably by the BRAC commission, and it demonstrates that the community is “military friendly.”*
 - o *Each party must understand the others’ planning processes, cycles for updating plans and their cycle of funding for planning.*
- *States and communities do not have (advance) funds allocated for BRAC, thus planning for growth does not commence until the announcements are made, at which point you’re already behind.*
 - o *Lifting restrictions on OEA money to fund planning activities in advance of an announcement could be advantageous. (Note: You might want to check with OEA since I believe such funding is available for a community to request)*
- *States have limited funding to build the infrastructure needed to accommodate BRAC-related growth. The military, as a fellow federal agency, should include the Department of Education, the Department of Transportation, and other agencies for the purpose of planning and funding the infrastructure requirements associated with a BRAC move. (Note: Should not the EAC be energized since it brings all the players to the table?)*

What are the critical ideas that emerged?

- *Create venues to convene and facilitate both official and unofficial staff-level engagements*
- *PROCESS and ORGANIZATION, rather than PERSONAL relationships*
 - o *Establish regular and reliable communications and relationships at the staff level as well (e.g. Base Planning office with community Planning Department)*
 - o *Installations should actively engage and attend local planning, zoning, and other community meetings, even in an ex officio role only – remain informed and engaged*
 - o *Community planners should be invited to participate in installation master planning processes*
- *“Retreat” to communicate*
 - o *Hold facilitated offsite meetings that allow military and civilian leaders to discuss challenges in a workgroup environment*
 - o *Use this time to build relationships and collaborations*
- *Community representatives discussed the importance of understanding the value that they bring to the installation and the value the installation brings to the community.*

What are the challenges to success?

- *Even groups that have strong relationships need to keep working to improve.*
- *Base commanders change every two years and don’t always get involved in community and state issues*
- *State and local elected officials and senior staff turnover often*
- *Bases are “locked up” as a result of force protection requirements*
- *Each service likes to stay within itself and keep to its culture*

How do we implement these ideas?

- *States and communities must invest in relationship building and strengthening communications with all levels of the military, from the installation to Washington*
- *Communities would also do well to prepare for technology-driven changes (e.g., remotely piloted vehicles) and different threat sources (e.g., cyber warfare) – establish themselves as a good place for DoD to do business*
- *Communities need to look beyond DoD and DHS to other missions of the Federal government*
- *States need to foster Commanders' Councils – don't wait for DoD to do it for you*
 - o *Serve as effective ways to facilitate communications between senior DoD leaders and state elected officials/agency heads*
 - o *Charters provide "top cover" for staff-level interaction and cooperation*
 - o *Create venues to convene and facilitate both official and unofficial staff-level engagements*

Appendix A: List Of Best Practices and Lessons Learned Sources

Document	Reference
Environmental Insurance: A Guide for BRAC Communities	http://www.defensecommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Infobrief_Environmental_Insurance.pdf
Understanding Key Issues in DOD's Base Redevelopment & Realignment Manual	http://www.defensecommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/infobrief_BRRM.pdf
Making it Happen: Implementing the Installation Reuse Plan	http://www.defensecommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Implementation-LRA-InfoBrief.pdf
Advancing Public-Private Partnerships in Defense Communities: An ADC Policy Paper	http://www.defensecommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Partnership-Policy-Paper-July-2007.pdf
Case Studies in Base Conversion	http://www.defensecommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/Case-Studies-in-Base-Conversion.pdf
Navigating Regional BRAC Traffic Jams Innovation Lab: Challenges and Best Practices	http://www.defensecommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/BRAC-Transportation-Innovation-Lab-After-Action-Report.pdf
Air Force Fact Sheet: Air Force BRAC Success Stories	http://www.safie.hq.af.mil/library/factsheets/factsheet_print.asp?fsID=8602&page=1
A Model for Successful Reutilization of a Military Installation: A Case Study of Gentile Air Force Station	http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA319908&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf
Privatization in Place and the Base Closure Community: Newark Air Force Base, Ohio	http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA319524&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf
BRAC Restoration Program, FY09 and Beyond	ftp://swrcb2a.waterboards.ca.gov/pub/swrcb/dwq/dodscp/2009%20Environmental%20Summit/Air%20Force%20Summit%202009/8_A_FRPABrief_WesternRestor_Revised_071409.pdf

Air Force Real Property Agency Center of Excellence, 2011 Strategic Plan	http://www.safie.hq.af.mil/shared/media/document/afd-110517-041.pdf
BRAC Environmental Assessment for Realignment of Nellis Air Force Base	http://www.nellis.af.mil/shared/media/document/AFD-070322-039.pdf
Determining the Military Value of Army Installations During Base Realignment and Closure	http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA312473
A Handbook for Growth Communities	http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/HandbookForGrowthCommunities3.18.pdf
Army BRAC Best Practices Fact Sheet	http://www.army.mil/standto/archive/2009/09/21/
BRAC Process Overview, Lesson Learned & Considerations for NASA	-
Joint Task Force National Capital Region Medical	http://www.boozallen.com/media/file/Joint_Task_Force_Case_Study.pdf
2005 BRAC Commission Report: Chapter 2, Appendix R	-
Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission	http://www.defense.gov/brac/docs/1993com2.pdf
Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission Report to the President	http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/000218.pdf
California Military Base Reuse	http://www.oea.gov/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=35&Itemid=33
Closing Military Bases: An Interim Assessment	http://cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/ftpdocs/46xx/doc4665/1996doc33.pdf
Working Group on Impacts of Privatization on the BRAC Public Participation Process:	http://www.cpeo.org/pubs/IDApaper.html
Economic Impact of Rural Military Base Realignment and Closure	http://www.utexas.edu/lbj/archive/pubs/pdf/brac_report.pdf
Military Base Closures Since 1998: Status and Employment Changes at the Community and State Level	http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA321657

Understanding BRAC 2005 & Military-Related Economic Development	http://www.slideserve.com/pallaton/understanding-brac-2005-military-related-economic-development
San Antonio BRAC 2005: Growth Management Plan	http://www.sanantonio.gov/oma/pdf/bracpdfs/Task%201--BRAC%20Economic%20Impacts.pdf
Base Redevelopment and Realignment Manual	http://www.defense.gov/brac/pdf/4165-66-M_BRRM.pdf
Charting the Course to Cleanup and Reuse	http://www.denix.osd.mil/brac/upload/bct-lra-factsheet.pdf
The Report of the Department of Defense on Base Realignment and Closure	http://www.defense.gov/pubs/brac040298.pdf
2012 Report to Congress on Sustainable Ranges	http://www.denix.osd.mil/sri/Policy/Reports.cfm
Training and Employment Guidance Letter No. 02-05: Workforce Investment System Support of Actions of the 2005 BRAC, Attachments A-J	http://wdr.doleta.gov/directives/attach/TEGL2-05_attach.pdf
Interim Guidance for EPA's Base Realignment and Closure Program	http://nepis.epa.gov/Exe/ZyNET.exe/900Z0H00.PDF?ZyActionP=PDF&Client=EPA&Index=2006%20Thru%202010&File=D%3A%5CZYFILES%5CINDEX%20DATA%5C06THRU10%5CTXT%5C00000001%5C900Z0H00.txt&Query=FNAME%3D900Z0H00.TXT%20or%20%28%20base%20or%20realignment%20or%20ideas%20or%20for%20or%20improvement%29&SearchMethod=1&FuzzyDegree=0&User=ANONYMOUS&Password=anonymous&QField=&UseQField=&IntQFieldOp=1&ExtQFieldOp=1&Docs
Improving the Base Realignment and Closure Process	http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA498583

BRAC Side Effect: Greener Buildings	http://www.federalnewsradio.com/?nid=475&sid=2381254
Military Base Realignment and Closures: Key Factors Contributing to BRAC 2005 Results	http://www.gao.gov/assets/590/589135.pdf
Military Bases: Lessons Learned from Prior Base Closure Rounds	http://www.gao.gov/archive/1997/ns97151.pdf
Defense Infrastructure: High-Level Leadership Needed to Help Communities Address Challenges Caused by DOD-Related Growth	http://www.oea.gov/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=56&Itemid=33
Defense Infrastructure	http://www.gao.gov/assets/230/223661.pdf
Defense Infrastructure: Opportunities Exist to Improve the Navy's Basing Decision Process and DOD Oversight	http://www.gao.gov/assets/310/304353.pdf
Environmental Contamination: Information on the Funding and Cleanup Status of Defense Sites	http://www.gao.gov/assets/130/124225.pdf
Defense Infrastructure: DOD Needs to Periodically Review Support Standards and Costs at Joint Bases and Better Inform Congress of Facility Sustainment Funding Uses	http://www.gao.gov/assets/290/288011.pdf
Military Base Realignment and Closures: Impact of Terminating, Relocating, or Outsourcing the Services of the Armed Forces Institute of Pathology	http://www.gao.gov/assets/270/269269.pdf
Military Base Closures: Projected Savings from Fleet Readiness Centers Likely Overstated and Actions Needed to Track Actual Savings and Overcome Certain Challenges	http://www.gao.gov/assets/270/263113.pdf

Defense Infrastructure: Challenges Increase Risks for Providing Timely Infrastructure Support for Army Installations Expecting Substantial Personnel Growth

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/270/266775.pdf>

Military Base Closures: Management Strategy Needed to Mitigate Challenges and Improve Communication to Help Ensure Timely Implementation of Air National Guard Recommendations

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/270/260790.pdf>

Military Base Closures: Observations on Prior and Current BRAC Rounds

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/120/111622.pdf>

Military Base Closures: Opportunities Exist to Improve Environmental Cleanup Cost Reporting and to Expedite Transfer of Unneeded Property

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/260/255919.pdf>

Military Base Closures: Progress in Completing Actions from Prior Realignments and Closures

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/240/234188.pdf>

Military Base Closures: Assessment of DOD's 2004 Report on the Need for a Base Realignment and Closure Round

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/250/242359.pdf>

Military Base Closures: Updated Status of Prior Base Realignments and Closures

<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05138.pdf>

Updated Status of Prior Base Realignments and Closures: Summary

-

Military Base Realignments and Closures: Higher Cost and Lower Savings Projected for Implementing Two Key Supply-Related BRAC Recommendations

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/280/273086.pdf>

Military Base Realignments and Closures: Estimated Costs Have Increased While Savings Have Decreased Since Fiscal Year 2009

<http://www.gao.gov/assets/100/96471.pdf>

Military Base Realignments and Closures: Opportunities Exist to Improve Environmental Cleanup Cost Reporting and to Expedite Transfer of Unneeded Property	http://www.gao.gov/assets/260/255919.pdf
Military Base Realignments and Closures: Transportation Impact of Personnel Increases Will Be Significant, but Long-Term Costs are Uncertain and Direct Federal Support is Limited	http://www.gao.gov/assets/300/295005.pdf
Military Base Closures: Analysis of DOD's Process and Recommendations for 1995	http://www.gao.gov/assets/110/105974.pdf
Military Bases: Status of Prior Base Realignment and Closure Rounds	http://www.gao.gov/assets/160/156428.pdf
Military Bases: Analysis of DOD's 1995 Process and Recommendations for Closure and Realignment	http://www.gao.gov/assets/160/154945.pdf
Running for Cover: The BRAC Commission as a Model for Federal Spending Reform	http://mercatus.org/sites/default/files/publication/WP1023_The%20BRAC%20Commission%20as%20a%20Model%20for%20Spending%20Reform%20(2).pdf
Closure of Military Installations - The Good, the Bad, the Better?	http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA370476&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf
ICMA Special Report: The Impact of Unique Contaminants on BRAC Redevelopment	http://icma.org/Documents/Document/Document/5969
Issues and Alternatives for Cleanup and Property Transfer of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Sites	http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA407642
Does Privatizing Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Cleanup Expedite Closure and Reduce Costs?	http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA425025
Property Revitalization--Lessons Learned from BRAC and Brownfields	http://www.itrcweb.org/Documents/Brnflid2web.pdf

Fort Knox Transformation: Infrastructure Improvements Update	http://www.oneknox.com/pdfs/Infrastructure.pdf
Base Reutilization Status: An Assessment	http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?AD=ADA377111&Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf
The Transformation of BRAC Sites into Successful and Sustainable Economic Redevelopments (presentation)	http://www.astswmo.org/Files/Meetings/2008/2008-FederalFacilitiesSymposium/JulieCarverASTSWABRACPresentationCarver030208.pdf
BRAC on Track: State of Maryland Base Realignment and Closure Program-Innovative and Best Practices	http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=brac%20best%20practices&source=web&cd=10&ved=OCFcQFjAJ&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.pmibaltimore.org%2Fpmi%2Fevents%2Fattachments%2F7180806.pptx&ei=WtbgT76TN8210QGpQfzGDg&usg=AFQjCNFzr0JxXFRC1qizXFvHmqilnnWIA
State of Maryland BRAC Action Plan: 2008 Progress Report	http://brac.maryland.gov/documents/2008bracReport.pdf
2011 State of Maryland Base Realignment and Closure Update for the Maryland Government Finance Officers Association	http://www.mdgfoa.org/publications/Alpha%20Presentations/MD%20BRAC%20Update.pdf
2011 Innovative Awards Application	http://ssl.csg.org/innovations/2011/east/2011EastapplicationsinPDF/11-E-01-MD%20baserealignmentclosureprocess2011.pdf
Depot Biz Park Changes Directions	http://www.memphisdailynews.com/news/2011/nov/28/depot-biz-park-changes-direction/
From Barracks to Business: The M.I.T Report on Base Redevelopment	http://www.oea.gov/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=142&Itemid=33
BRAC Success Stories: Fort Benjamin Harrison, Glenview Naval Air Station, Grissom Air Force Base	http://www.oea.gov/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&layout=blog&id=317&Itemid=50

Press release: Navy Dredging at Former NAS Alameda Seaplane Lagoon	http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/base_docs/nas_alameda/documents/press_releases/2012-02_SeaplaneLagoonPressRelease.pdf
Press release: Navy Transfers Nearly 1,000 Acres to Puerto Rico	http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/base_docs/rosevelt_roads/documents/press_releases/2012-01-26_EDC_PressRelease.pdf
Final EIS for the Disposal and Reuse of Hunters Point Shipyard, San Francisco, CA: Chapter 5	http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/base_docs/hps/documents/enviro_docs/10Chapter5.pdf
Enhancing States' Roles in the Early Transfer of Closed Military Bases	http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902EARLYTRANSFERMILITARY.PDF
State Education Activities to Support Mission Growth	http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0903MISSIONGROWTHEDUCATION.PDF
State Workforce Activities to Support Mission Growth	http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0902MISSIONGROWTH.PDF
Organizing State Efforts to Respond to Mission Growth	http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0811MISSIONGROWTH.PDF
National Governors Association Center for Best Practices Mission Growth Working Group Federal Recommendations	http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=36&ved=0CFQQFjAFOB4&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.oea.gov%2Findex.php%3Foption%3Dcom_docman%26task%3Ddoc_download%26gid%3D217%26Itemid%3D33&ei=IlXjT8KuLZC20QGezo3qAw&usq=AFQjCNHMuOLhphWxrl766_PFA5fVV5Tyig
State Financing Strategies to Address the Economic Impacts of Military Base Realignments and Closures	http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0607BRACFINANCESTRATEGIES.PDF
Reimbursement of State Oversight of the Cleanup of Former Military Bases	http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0809BASECLEANUPREIMBURSEMENT.PDF
Financing Tools to Address Growth Around Military Installations	http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0601FACTMILGROWTH.PDF
Fact Sheet: The 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Process	http://www.nga.org/files/live/sites/NGA/files/pdf/0104BRACFACTS.pdf

Officials Say JBLM at Forefront of Joint Basing Best Practices	http://www.northwestmilitary.com/news/focus/2011/08/Officials-say-JBLM-at-forefront-of-joint-basing-best-practices/
Renaissance: A New Life for Former Military Bases	http://www.oea.gov/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=79&Itemid=33
Responding to Change: Communities & BRAC	http://www.oea.gov/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=86&Itemid=33
Feedback from the Field: Community Experience with BRAC	http://www.oea.gov/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=53&Itemid=33
Base Reuse Success Stories	http://www.oea.gov/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=34&Itemid=33
Economic Transition of BRAC Sites	http://www.oea.gov/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=45&Itemid=33
Community Guide to Base Reuse	http://www.defense.gov/brac/docs/oeacomunityguide97.pdf
Base Development: Communities Respond	http://www.oea.gov/index.php?option=com_content&id=191&template=modal&Itemid=46
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and Organizational Restructuring in the DOD	http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND_MG153.pdf
Taking Stock of the Army's Base Realignment and Closure Selection Process	http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph_reports/2009/MR1337.pdf
Infrastructure Reform	http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/conf_proceedings/2008/CF133.pdf
California Base Closure: Lessons for DoD's Cleanup Program	http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/monograph_reports/2005/MR621.pdf

Transferring Army BRAC Lands Containing Unexploded Ordnance: Lessons Learned and Future Options http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2004/RAND_MG199.pdf

BRAC Regional Task Force Tabletop Exercise After Action Report <http://www.bractf.com/documents/BRACRTFTXAfterActionReportDraftFinal.pdf>

Utah Relieved Destruction of Chemical Weapons is Complete <http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/news/53347170-78/says-chemical-utah-weapons.html.csp>
http://www.lpesinc.com/Pubs/Lavallee_T%20-%20Bettaker%20M%20-%20BRAC%20NEPA%20Lesson%20Learned%20-%2016%20May%2007%20-%201300%20TL051107.pdf

BRAC EIS: Challenges and Lessons Learned from Ft. Belvoir, Ft. Lee, and Ft. A.P. Hill http://www.lpesinc.com/Pubs/Lavallee_T%20-%20Bettaker%20M%20-%20BRAC%20NEPA%20Lesson%20Learned%20-%2016%20May%2007%20-%201300%20TL051107.pdf

Federal Funding of Transportation Improvements in BRAC Cases <http://onlinepubs.trb.org/onlinepubs/sr/sr302.pdf>

Environmental Impact Statement for BRAC 2005 Disposal and Reuse of Fort Monroe, VA http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/eis_docs/FTMonroeFEIS.pdf

Final Environmental Impact Statement: Implementation of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Recommendations and Other Army Actions at Ft. Lee, VA and Ft. A.P. Hill, VA http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/eis_docs/Fort%20Lee%20Final%20EIS.pdf

Implementation of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Recommendations and Other Army Transformation Actions at Ft. Jackson, SC http://www.hqda.army.mil/ACSIM/brac/EA_DOCS/EA_final/FortJacksonSC%20EA.pdf

Swords into Plowshares: The Defense Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Process <http://www.dtic.mil/cgi-bin/GetTRDoc?Location=U2&doc=GetTRDoc.pdf&AD=ADA366754>

Appendix B: Biographies

Dr. Craig College, Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management, U.S. Army Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management (OACSIM), Washington DC

Dr. Craig E. College was selected for the Senior Executive Service in April 1991. Since May 2006, he is serving as the Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management. In this position, Dr. College is a Deputy Headquarters, Department of the Army Staff Principal of an organization that is the single resource provider for policies, programs, and budgets for installations worldwide to ensure facilities are available for the senior mission commanders and to enhance the readiness of Soldiers, Families, Civilians, and Units who live, work, and train on Army Installations.

Previous Senior Executive Service assignments have included Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army (Infrastructure Analysis) from February 2003 until May 2006; Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Programs (G-8) from January 2000 thru February 2003; Deputy Director, Program Analysis and Evaluation from April 1996 thru December 1999. Dr. College began his service as a Senior Executive in the Office of the Secretary of Defense where he served as Director, Economic Analysis and Resource Planning Division from April 1991 thru March 1995 and from March 1995 thru March 1996 as Director, Force and Infrastructure Cost Analysis Division.

John Armbrust, Executive Director, Kansas Governor's Military Council, Manhattan, KS

John was born and raised in Ellsworth, Kansas. After graduating from Ellsworth High School, he attended Kansas State University, where he graduated with honors in 1968 with a BS in Math and as a Distinguished Air Force ROTC Graduate. Mr. Armbrust's first assignment in the Air Force was to the Air Force Institute of Technology, where in 1970 he received his Master degree in Systems Analysis/Operations Research. While in the Air Force, he attended the Air Command and Staff College and Industrial College of the Armed Forces.

Mr. Armbrust retired from the Air Force as a Colonel in 1993. During his military career he served four years in the A-10 Close Support Aircraft System Program Office; three years as the F-16 fighter aircraft Country Manager for Norway (Office in Brussels Belgium); three years as Commander of an Air Force Plant Representative Office associated with the B-1 Bomber program; four years in J-8 on the Joint Staff, serving as the Executive Office to the Director of J-8 and as the Chief of the Program and Budget Analysis Division (PBAD). As Chief of PBAD, he worked on the "Base Force" analysis which served as the force structure

and basing basis for BRAC. John's final Air Force assignment was as the Controller of the newly formed Air Force consolidated Space Laboratory.

Upon his retirement, Mr. Armbrust returned to Manhattan, Kansas, serving as a Bank Officer for five years, and then four years as Vice President of the Manhattan Area Chamber of Commerce. In February 2004 he was selected to serve as the Executive Director of the Governor's Strategic Military Planning Commission, which worked BRAC issues for the State of Kansas. In February 2006 he began serving as the Executive Director of the Governor's Military Council. John has been married to his wife Karen for 44 years. They have two married sons and four grandchildren.

Jimmy Anderson, Director, Navy BRAC Program Management Office, Charleston, SC

Mr. Anderson is the Director of the Navy's BRAC Program Management Office, Southeast, located in Charleston, South Carolina. His office is responsible for all Navy BRAC actions in the southeastern United States, including Puerto Rico. He has over twenty years experience in BRAC, having been involved in well over fifty separate BRAC actions. Mr. Anderson's Navy career includes assignments in Public/Private Ventures, Real Estate, Master Planning and Facility Planning. He has Bachelor of Science degrees in Civil Engineering and in Recreation and Park Administration from Clemson University and is a registered professional planner.

Greg Taylor, Executive Director, Fort Bragg Regional Alliance, Dublin, NC

Greg Taylor was selected to become the Executive Director of the Fort Bragg Regional Alliance in June of 2010. He earned his MBA at the University of North Carolina at Pembroke and his Bachelor's Degree in Business Administration at Campbell University. Prior to this assignment, Mr. Taylor was an instructor in the Department of Management and served as Economic Development Director for Fayetteville State University.

He has extensive experience as an entrepreneur and small business owner. He was awarded the 2003 SBA Financial Services Advocate of the Year for NC and he is a recipient of the L.E. McLaughlin, Jr. Regional Leadership Award given by the Lumber River Council of Governments. Additionally, he has a broad background that includes: ten years with the NC Small Business and Technology Development Center as a Regional Center Director, twelve years as an elected county commissioner for Bladen County, North Carolina, and service in various capacities for several local and regional community organizations. Taylor also currently serves as Vice President of the Cape Fear River Assembly.

Greg and his wife Pam live near Dublin, NC. They have three sons, Justin, Derek, and Nicholas. Justin is a lawyer that lives in Wake Forest, NC with his wife, Sara Ann. Derek is a graduate of NC State University (NCSU) and works for the Chi Psi Fraternity Head Office out of Nashville, Tennessee and Nicholas is a junior at NCSU majoring in Finance.

**Jim Holland, Deputy for Installation Policy, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force
for Installation, Environment and Logistics, Washington, DC**

James P. Holland is the Deputy for Installation Policy, Office of The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, the Pentagon, Washington, DC. He is the principal staff advisor to the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Policy Formulation and Program Direction on Department of the Air Force installations, real estate, base closure and base disposal issues. He assumed his duties in May 2007 after a 27½ year career in the United States Air Force, retiring in the grade of colonel. His previous assignment was Director, Air Force Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Program Management Office, Office of The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Pentagon, Washington, DC.

Mr. Holland entered the Air Force in January 1980 as a second lieutenant upon graduation from the Reserve Officer Training Corps Program at Memphis State University with a Bachelor's Degree in Civil Engineering. He later received Masters Degrees in Engineering Management and Civil Engineering from the University of Missouri-Rolla.

Mr. Fred Meurer, City Manager, City of Monterey, Monterey, CA

Mr. Meurer graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point in 1966. He was commissioned as a Corps Engineer Officer. Mr. Meurer received graduate degrees from Stanford University in Water Resources Planning and Civil Engineering in 1971. He had overseas assignments in Germany, Viet Nam and Korea. He also served as the Test Director for the operational test of the Apache Helicopter and the Hellfire Missile Systems. His final tour of active duty was as Director of Public Works and Housing at Fort Ord. He retired from the Army as a Colonel in 1986.




Mr. Meurer was hired by the City of Monterey in 1986 where he served as Public Works Director for five years until his appointment to City Manager in July 1991. As City Manager, Mr. Meurer has been instrumental in developing working relationships between businesses and residential neighborhoods, as well as with City Hall. He has led the development of the

City's neighborhood improvement, neighborhood policing, waterfront acquisition and tourism development programs.





Mr. Meurer has also been the catalyst in developing cooperative relationships between the City and the Department of Defense (DoD) activities in Monterey in an effort to further increase DoD mission effectiveness while reducing operating costs. His goal is to provide the same high quality municipal service to DoD activities and personnel as the City provides its civilian neighborhoods. This concept has been embraced by the Secretary of Defense as a model for the Community-Installation Collaboration. He has been successful in obtaining language in several defense authorization bills to demonstrate the viability of Community-Installation partnerships.

Appendix C: Survey Results

1. The workshop was well structured and organized.

		Response Percent	Response Count
1 - Strongly Disagree		6.3%	1
2		0.0%	0
3		0.0%	0
4		60.0%	8
5 - Strongly Agree		43.8%	7
answered question			18
skipped question			0

2. The information provided by the speakers framed the issues well

		Response Percent	Response Count
1 - Strongly Disagree		0.0%	0
2		6.3%	1
3		12.5%	2
4		31.3%	5
5 - Strongly Agree		60.0%	8
answered question			18
skipped question			0