



City Manager's Office Trip Report

To: Mayor Kelly and Commissioners

Cc: Montana Defense Alliance Members
David Weissman – Montana Defense Alliance Chair
Cheryl Ulmer – Field Director, Senator Tester
Cari Kent – Field Director, Senator Daines Office
Christy Hagler – Field Director, Congressman Zinke
Major General Matthew T. Quinn – Adjutant General, Montana Army/Air National Guard

From: Gregory T. Doyon – City Manager

Re: Association of Defense Communities National Summit, Washington, D.C. (June 20-22, 2016)

Date: July 22, 2016

Monday June 20, 2016

State Advisors Council Meeting

CO-CHAIRS: David Weissman, Chairman, Montana Defense Alliance; Kristine Reeves, Executive Director, Washington Military Alliance

Discussion Highlights:

- Organized Capitol Hill visits
- Promoted release of State Support Survey (link: [ADC - State Support - 2016](#))
- House Armed Service Committee and Senate Armed Service Committee Member Updates
 - First ADC briefing
 - Update on NDAA
 - House passed version – Senate on break; in conference cooperation
 - \$18 billion difference (base requirements, overseas contingency, other “challenging issues”)
 - Acquisition reform
 - DoD purchasing has become longer and slower over time, highly bureaucratic
 - Needs systematic rewrite
 - OSD oversight, service day to day responsibilities to drive innovation (slipping relative to other countries, trumped if not disappeared, 180 acquisition provisions under review)
- State Advisor from Massachusetts asked about direct state/ local investments.
 - The basis for the question was whether direct gifting created additional tension between Congress, DoD, and installations

- Discussion about the different types of support included gifting for new construction or mission support functions – How appropriate/sustainable is this option?
- States are seeing a huge shift from *offsite improvement* to *onsite construction*.
 - How will this play out with BRAC?
- **SASC – “I wouldn’t put it on base; I’d place infrastructure in where it will count during a BRAC – far more important for local community. New construction was ignored in BRAC 2005; create a place where place where the military wants to go. Improve the community first...”**
- No Congressional funds appropriated to study/explore a BRAC
- Representative Smith (along with a few House members 5-6) will introduce a BRAC bill tomorrow.
 - They expect the bill is dead on arrival
 - However, idea is better received because of the process allowing communities to participate
 - Congress questions the capacity analysis completed by DoD
 - Sequestering is a “non-BRAC”- BRAC
 - 2005 flaws in BRAC administration created mistrust in Congress
 - Members are not going to vote to close a base – period
 - House has never supported a BRAC – always brought along kicking and screaming with Senate...no current support
- Congress may have a budget deal in the fall, too many things in its way (election, sequestration, etc.)
 - Army 20% excess infrastructure; Air Force excess as well
 - Calculation questions exist
 - Military branches are really talking about 2-3% excess, not the 20%. Message is not being heard on Hill. SASC members went on an installation to see the excess and saw an empty building; which the Guard wanted.
 - Congress wants to hold the line instead of growing now
 - Members concerned about surge capacity
- What about a limited BRAC?
 - No appetite
 - Excess reports need more vetting
 - **Rhetorical question from staffers: You’re going to go through all of this for 2%? The parametrics don’t work.**
- Office of the Secretary of Defense – Reorganization.
 - General officer downsizing = 25% reduction army (four star to four star)
 - DOD restructuring; appointment updates (requirements)
 - Civilian nominated by president; manage it rather than being managed by the bureaucracy
 - Article from Federal Manager ([FedMgr Article](#))

Welcome & Opening Keynote Address

Welcome: Mike Cooper, President, Association of Defense Communities; Chairman, Oklahoma Strategic Military Planning Commission; ***Keynote:*** Rep. Madeleine Bordallo, Ranking Member, House Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee

Key Points:

- NDAA – much more to talk about and work through
- Hope to find common ground and reasonable compromises
 - Issues from space launch to sage grouse
- OEA targeted for cuts – defeated efforts with ADC; attacks will continue
- Educate Congressional members on importance of programs that support not just the war fighter, but the communities
 - Guam – two active duty stations and guard, and other impacts
 - Asia/Pacific pivot – Marine realignment (Okinawa) large presence; military/ community symbiotic relationships; military building up infrastructure – outside community support
- Funding Challenges
 - Office of Economic Adjustments budget cuts
 - Sub Committee Readiness: family housing, defense industry adjustment sequestration
 - **Readiness at a critical stage – neglect; infrastructure, maintenance workers to crumbling infrastructure DOD accepting risk with lack of maintenance**
 - Facilities sustainment, restoration and modernization (FSRM) accounts took the brunt of cuts imposed last year on base operating support as a result of sequestration.
 - 2020s readiness stretched too thin; family sacrifice again and again
- Energy efficiency
 - Support of electric grid (robust energy supply, vulnerable/poorly protected infrastructure)
- Calls for new BRAC growing louder – savings painful, but before installations become obsolete
 - Thoroughly fleshed out from all stakeholders; reform BRAC process – will truly create savings
- Defense transit/roads

Throwing Lawyers Under the Bus: Understanding the Legal Challenges to P4

Summary: Session featured legal representatives from each of the service branches to discuss legal challenges that are preventing many installation-community partnerships from moving forward. The adoption of Section 331 did not have the desired effect and failed. Installation Support Agreement §2679 created new legal authority for partnerships – how will this work?

MODERATOR: George Schlossberg, Partner, Kutak Rock; ADC General Counsel; ***SPEAKERS:*** Mark Connor, Associate Deputy General Counsel, Department of the Army; Tom Workman, U.S. Navy; Carolyn White, Chief Counsel, Installations, Energy & Environment

Air Force Comments

- Carolyn HQ USAF (enterprise wide support) – What is the role of the base attorney?
 - Support Active Duty Air Force JAGs, civilian, reserves
 - Mixed experience. Not likely to have a lot of experience with partnerships.

- USAF needs to have a resources checklists for lawyers at the local level including contracting officers
 - **May not know what they are doing – be patient.**
- Attorneys are like traffic cops
 - Earlier you get a lawyer involved the better off you are
 - Attorneys are naturally risk adverse
- Command driven – military – sometimes lawyers can back channel issues to address them and not commit the USAF to a certain position
- What do I wish the client would address?
 - What’s the requirement? Is it a true need? Tell me what you *really* need.
 - We’re not reinventing the wheel. Rely on what other installations have done.
 - 170 agreements only 6 under Section 331.
 - If we need to go that route, then we’ll use but there may be other options
- Biggest challenge: Resource allocation (people and \$) contract support program
 - Checklists
 - Partnership “bang for the buck” signals shift in program
- Quick reference guides and standard templates under development (i.e., sanitation services)
- Not the “what” but the “how”
 - Jennifer Miller: Approving agreements is clumsy, piecemeal
 - “We’re attorneys” obligation is to provide legal advice (versus process advise)

Army Comments

- Army – Several signed ISAs
 - Army appears to be a greater level of support and interest in fulfilling maximizing Section 331 resources.
- Interesting that Monterey finally developed an agreement, not a FAR after all of these years.

State of the State Survey – Matt Borron (ADC)

Summary: Session summarized findings of an ADC state support survey distributed to members in 2016.

Link ADC Publication: [State of the State Report](#)

Summary

- 37 states participated
- More states support off base infrastructure projects (water, access, roads)
- **More states spending funds on base. Is this sustainable?**
 - MILCON by state bond
 - State of Oklahoma paid for new runway
 - Massachusetts approved a \$177million bond for projects
- **Public affairs – half states hire firms for defense advocacy**
- **More states are funding local/regional support organizations**
- On the ground linkages are critically important
- Many states employ lobbyists
- States are examining their Defense Supply chain/industry
- **New Jersey – new group can’t be part time ad hoc occurrence, volunteers are not enough**
- New advocacy groups emerging

- # studies increasing
- Small reduction in encroachment issues

Defining Policy Issue Forum: Responding to Evolving Missions, Emerging Threats and New Technologies

Summary: Panel discussed how resource challenges, new foreign military capabilities and an evolving battlefield are changing the way the USA prepares for and fights wars.

MODERATOR: Tim Ford, CEO, Association of Defense Communities; *SPEAKERS:* Bob Hale, Senior Fellow, Booz Allen Hamilton; Michael O’Hanlon, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institution; David Berteau, President and CEO, Professional Services Council

- Mike O’Hanlon: World status...Russia, China, ISIS, etc. Does this require a big defense bill?
 - No - some additional resources personnel and equipment.
 - Proposed 2018 budget is \$35 billion above the caps
- **Berteau: Red horse squadron is more important to the senator from MT than the Red Horse in Guam**
- Not doing enough to fight ISIS – less of a home threat. See no end to it in the foreseeable future
- Emerging threat...cyber attacks
- Hale: Russia, China, ISIS is frightening (but not worrisome) not existential. More people die in traffic accidents daily than are killed by terrorism
- Next president: Trump – making military stronger; less support to other countries
- Clinton – Obama model
- Budget control Act – debt a concern
- Two-year budget deals create turmoil – mission effectiveness (long-term, improvements) broad budget deal needed including addressing national deficit. Tax reform, higher caps for defense budget
- No danger in shortfalls DOD; billions in efficiencies could be implemented
 - Opportunities well known, “attack some core requirements” maybe a BRAC could force that
 - Can’t afford huge defense spending increases without a total budget overhaul (social security, etc.)
 - Not enough money to go around – reduce size of infrastructure, number of bases.
 - Who will congress trust to review an implement that?
- **If I were a community, I would spend by time improving infrastructure outside the base (third conference reference)**
- **Do not forget the importance of the National Guard element in your community.**

Tuesday, June 21, 2016

P4 2.0: Advanced Ideas for Public, Private, and Military Collaboration, Part II

Summary: Panel discussing military/community partnership and collaboration ideas. Case studies included joint planning, leasing, exchanges, mutual aid, collaborative use, and diverse shared service arrangements.

MODERATOR: Fred Meurer, Consultant, Booz Allen Hamilton; **CASE STUDIES:** William Albro, Associate Director, Installations, Air National Guard; Diane Rath, Executive Director, Alamo Area Council of Governments; Robert Hosford, North Carolina Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services

- 911 Commission Report included failures/successes
 - Relationship between local and federal emergency approach was a success because of trust and collaboration.
- Chattanooga – threats off installation, protecting soft targets, being prepared (physical hardening, training)
 - DoD communication between branches important
- Soft target Concerns
 - What about utilities?
 - Mission assurance
 - Defense Threat Reduction Agency (EMPs, etc.) www.dtra.mil
- Communication is critical – Individual relationships, using local and state law enforcement assets/intel to identify potential risks/threats
- Buckley AFB
 - Encroachment prevention
 - Utilizing P4 as an innovative opportunity
 - Partnerships with outside groups to appeal to the state legislature
 - Here’s what we want (use a map; one of the few times they have received funds)
 - City and county adding some funding as well.
 - Trusts for public land; trail system (GOGO; state interest) tangible benefit; ACUZ, sound
- Maryland
 - Maryland – training , EMS response, shared command
 - Primarily a defense contractor state
 - Close group of officials who interact/connect/communicate
 - Delegation lives and works in same place
 - Singular focus on issues and advocacy one voice “team Maryland”
 - 7 Alliances in state since 1990’s BRAC
 - Partnering
 - Communication
 - Education
 - Investing social/physical infrastructure
 - Public safety
 - Organizational preparation – identifying a target/goal
 - Video the military in Maryland protecting the nation
 - [Maryland Military Department](#)
 - [Department of Commerce - Military Business Page](#)

Air Force Service Leader Briefing

Speaker: Sec. Richard Hartley, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment, and Energy

Key Points

- Very difficult fiscal environment
- Mission assurance challenges
- Tough to cry poor when your department spends more than 11 nations combined (\$600 billion)
- Very busy across the globe – diversity of missions
 - More requirements than resources
- Budget Categories of priority:
 - Modernization
 - Readiness
 - **Infrastructure**
 - **Deal mostly with this - most strained account**
 - **“Dire news right now – worse on the infrastructure”**
 - **Near, mid, and long-term concern no light at the end of the tunnel**
 - **Long-term concerns strategic plan 20/30 years – resource allocation into the future, constrained for next ten years....**
 - **No relief with current plans and identified needs**
- Why do we get the short end of the stick? Perception or reality?
- Readiness – life and limb (easier to identify) see impact
 - Story harder with infrastructure – direct impact not as clear
- Not as appealing as other priorities or “sexy” communication infrastructure, roof on building versus new bomber
- **Advice to attendees: Understand and communicate impact of installation infrastructure funding to your delegation**
- Taking risk with infrastructure for readiness – not full spectrum ready until 2023
- Large portion of air fleet – would qualify for antique license plate
- 4% off top of budget make a big difference
- Increased MILCON, FRSN down to update mission critical infrastructure
 - “Things are tough in our infrastructure account”
- New mission MILCON – Asia/Pacific pivot; F-35, very little for existing infrastructure; worst first mission critical
- FY18 and beyond – no relief in sight...1.5 % growth
 - Hangar fire suppression
 - Underground utilities failing
 - Can’t maintain current infrastructure, never mind future.
 - Runway Andrews repairs...**need your help to tell our story**
- How can you help?
 - Support BRAC
 - Explores EULs
 - Develop Community Partnerships
 - Look for base of the future opportunities

- You're helping us to build the base of the future – will evolve in time
- Review/read/understand Air Force Strategic Planning documents
 - Air Force Strategic Plan
 - “like turning an aircraft carrier...takes time”
 - [2015 USAF Master Plan](#)
- **Two strategic vectors: strategic agility and inclusiveness**
 - **Installation more capable of adapting and improvising**
- Inclusiveness total force, (less duplication), leverage of service assets; - DoD, private sector, community, international partners
- Adapt and respond in a dynamic environment constrained by resources
- **Adversaries closing the gap**
- Conscious decision to risk readiness for future planning
- What happened?
 - Tried to divest low end – drones, A-10
 - Pivot to Asia – rejuvenated Russian threat
 - Joint work force training efforts commended
- Force of the future – different type of force structure (pilots)
- **Cyber warrior**
 - **Personnel may leave the USAF for private sector, may come back as needed**
- **Partnering with Guard/Reserve component**
 - **Savings available if Congress finds right balance**
- Strategic posture annex (Web Link: [Strategic Posture Annex](#))
- Worldwide presence
- Mission assurance
- Is USAF Resilient enough?
 - Communications infrastructure; power supply
 - Multi-domain solutions/role capability – cyber, laser, new weapon systems
 - **Bases need to be able to support these new strategic posture;**
 - **Is your base capable?**
 - **What is in the future?**
 - **What does the base of the future look like – how does your base fit in?**
 - Fuel access, base hardening
 - Cyber – network security
- Air Force future operating concept – climate change – operating cost
- Air Force Partnership Program
 - 1000 initiatives 300 at work; shift in program – higher return on investment; less resources allocated; support bottom up initiative;
 - Snow removal, small arms, medical training
- Private sector to lease space
 - Leasing off infrastructure
- **BRAC**
 - **“We need your help on BRAC” 150 votes on BRAC – thank you, never would have had that...30% excess capacity no matter how you look at it.**
 - Congress challenges BRAC, may need capacity after closure, USAF believes it will be o.k.
 - BRAC cost savings

- **More winners than losers - communities/airman win by stopping the thinning of resources**
- **Air Force will study to determine military value (pre-BRAC look)**
- **How do you measure military value?**
 - **Mission utility – what kind of missions are possible at base?**
 - **Air space land and infrastructure...how well equipped is the base to do that?**
 - **Accessibility to respond in a crisis, access to training....who gets me there faster for training and to the fight...what are area cost factors?**
- What can you do?
 - Address encroachment issues; climate change; energy issues; build good will
- Energy
 - Mandated to mission assurance energy consumption on target, renewal energy ESPC
 - Energy saving performance contracts
 - Mission assurance through energy assurance cyber secure microprocessors (cyber, drone)
 - National energy infrastructure threat greater – generator (long term threat instead of temporary outage)

2016 Defense Community Awards Luncheon

KEYNOTE SPEAKERS: *Sen. Lindsey Graham (SC), U.S. Senate*

Highlights

- How can you modernize your force without readiness?
- If you love the troops – “We’re failing and I’m tired of it.”
- “Political jihad in 2017”
- Cannibalize the fleet to keep operating 17% F-18s not ready to fly
- Not about your individual community, more about country
- You need to weigh in to tell congress that they need to act
- Cuts alone won’t save every base in room
- Cutting our own throats with sequestration
- Come back to congress with the facts
- Thanks for the award one team one fight

Air Force Community Leadership Meeting

Summary - Discussion with key Air Force leadership about a wide range of issues affecting the USAF and installations.

FACILITATOR: *Kay Rasmussen, Associate Director, Economic Development Council, Okaloosa County, FL; John Schueler, Co-Founder and Chairmen, Tampa Bay Defense Alliance* **GUESTS:** *Sec. Richard Hartley, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment, and Energy; Sec. Jennifer Miller, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment, and Energy; Maj. Gen. Theresa Carter, Commander, Air Force Installation and Mission Support Center; Tim Bridges, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Engineering and Force Protection, U.S. Air Force*

Community Partnerships

- Art of Possibility – P4
- What do you want? How do we overcome the legal challenges?
 - Not sure what we want – hard to answer – five year agreements restrict ability of community to capitalize service (11)
- Grassroots up type initiatives (P4 installations in program)
- Having conversations that we just haven't had... high investment return...saves the Air Force money
 - Mutually beneficial?
- **Hartley - Want everything we can get...value proposition**
- High return on investments – enterprise wide more into practice
- Maturing the program – difficult first time through
- New charter – governance – functional representatives
- Other communities can replicate
- Hoping process will become easier

Military Value

- Military value analysis – internal review
 - Geographic; what missions could be there? Traffic, weather, encroachment
 - What does the base have? (in terms of munitions, test assets, equipment)
 - Infrastructure – Can the base grow?
 - What could it grow into (RPA, air/space limitations) communications, air strips
 - Cost characteristics
- Audience warned about an earlier comment made by Hartley about an internal effort to perform its own “pre-BRAC” study. Advised to be “incredibly cautious” with how the rank and use the list.
 - **Hartley: “Can’t sit back any longer and wait for a BRAC”**
 - (Non BRAC/BRAC)
 - “Fallback position – one tool in a tool kit to use.”
 - **Use of list?**
 - **For BRAC like activities...downsizing (tall order, don’t expect to go there)**
 - **Allow info to contribute to resource decisions.**
 - **Well short of MILCON funding to fix needed/make needed repairs**
 - **Prioritize high military value v. low military value (broad spectrum)**
 - **Miller: We need to protect our air ranges because of their value**
 - A little nervous perceived as threat to installations, favoritism, not a full transparent process...must set ourselves up in the event we don’t have a BRAC.
 - P4 implications (5 year limit Sect. 331; EUL 15 years for property)
- Success in P4 – reduced funding contract support
 - Mr. Edwards group active transition plan (program management)
 - Functional more affected program self sufficient
 - Make it as simple and painless as possible
 - Assumption 1 size fits all was wrong
- Total Force – “use more where we can”
 - Study active duty, guard, reserves

- Cannot achieve the savings desired by just using them
- **Using Guard/Reserve big push on associations**
 - **Current and new missions**
 - **KC-46 have unit associations**
- High velocity analysis mission sets between guard, reserves, active
- Unity in leadership with total force

One-on-One Meeting with Air Force Representatives

Attendees: Sec. Richard Hartley, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment, and Energy; Sec. Jennifer Miller, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations, Environment, and Energy

Issues Discussed

- Housing at MAFB
 - EUL Challenges for housing options
 - Great Falls has been advised it cannot be done because housing has to be open to public and will not benefit the installation
 - Moving the gate won't work either – security
 - Balfour Beatty first right of refusal
 - Directed to contact Bob Morriato, USAF contact on privatization AFCEC
- MAFB Encroachment
 - Discussed three sides of encroachment
 - Discussed REPI opportunities
- Community Partnership
 - ICMA – National League/cities towns
 - Local posture – continuing
 - Does the Air Force engage communities (engaging Army, but what about state and local government)
 - How are folks trained?
 - Base commander not familiar with program, type of government, etc.
 - Security collaboration
 - Tharen Judd (P4 Lead)

Wednesday June 22, 2016

Defining Policy Issue Forum: Understanding the Impacts of Force Restructuring, Budget Challenges and New Policy Directions

Summary – Panelists discuss budget challenges, BRAC, and force restructuring impact on local communities.

MODERATOR: *Tim Ford, CEO, Association of Defense Communities* **SPEAKERS:** *Hon. John Conger, Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Comptroller; Rep. Randy Forbes (VA-4), U.S. House of Representatives; Rep. Adam Smith (WA-9), U.S. House of Representatives*

- Forbes:
 - Force strength – Army challenged; deployment schedule difficult. Navy o.k.
 - Operations tempo – Reduced forces are transferred to other units for support then upon return, cycle on their original units deployment schedule

- Troop fatigue is a concern
- Smith:
 - Force structure, national defense plan threats, what do we have to be prepared for?
 - War games scenarios, (Korea, Russia, Iran etc.) identify needs, fund accordingly
 - We don't have the money for the force structure needed – debt/taxes?
 - No entitlements. Reality smaller military and we need to address our national security threats within that reality. What do we actually have?
- Conger:
 - There are efficiencies; BRAC is one of them....accept risk with building maintenance, same capability for less money
- Forbes:
 - A heart to heart conversation is needed about budget realities.
 - How do other nations view the US and finding its military?
 - Playing a game with military budget for 14 years.
 - Infrastructure Study – Excess capacity valid?
- Smith:
 - Political structure – public wants \$10 of service for every \$1 revenue with no new taxes; perpetuates service expectations
 - 2019 capacity dates; BRAC will increase efficiencies and save some money
 - Makes no sense not to have a BRAC with DoD 20+% capacity
- Forbes:
 - When base is closed it's never coming back
 - Can't easily condemn property for installation construction
 - These decisions that last forever
 - Logistics of replacing an installation in a remote location is expensive and does not always make sense
 - Future capacity, force strength, and readiness or capability of reconstituting installation if needed all needs to be considered
- Smith:
 - Cannot have a BRAC – don't even think about it. How can you plan properly without allowing some process?
- Conger:
 - 2005 BRAC – \$35 million to save \$4 million? Basic premise is to save money
 - Change your war structure 5-10% it won't really affect your ability
 - Can fit 30% on installations, not that they have 30% extra bases. Wasn't meant to do something stupid
 - Navy 7% excess capacity
- Forbes:
 - Many members are not comfortable with a BRAC. This round ultimately will close bases
 - What are we trying to achieve? Permanent decision. Difficult reality
 - Strict analysis cost, need, etc. basic makes sense. Can get there...depends on approach
- Smith:
 - Proposed BRAC Bill (2019) – no “dark of night” with 24 hour news cycle
 - Leadership makes a decision and if they don't like it they kill it – (unlike old days)
 - Democracy on steroids. Be hard to get there big emphasis on savings

- Main reason members oppose BRAC because it is politically bad to close something in their district. Adult conversation required
- Congers:
 - General direction positive. Five years ago “hell no” – legislation proposed to try to have conversation. Study on excess in NADA excess good step. Have to be responsible and BRAC; communities who support BRAC and think they will win – far and few between
- Forbes:
 - Advice: Challenging world we live in...we can balance things and right size our base
 - Full spectrum readiness 2021
- Conger:
 - Stay engaged. Talk to congress. Be engaged with local base – partnership opportunities
- Smith :
 - Push for predictability, seek to understand the challenges with debt
 - Transparency
 - Communities can plan and prepare for a downsizing

Defense Community Public Safety: An Emerging Issue

Session - Discussed new threats and challenges faced by base and civilian police/security forces.

MODERATOR: Kathleen Ferguson, Senior Advisor, The Roosevelt Group *SPEAKERS: Tim Bridges, Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Engineering and Force Protection, U.S. Air Force (Presentation); Jane Castor, Former Tampa Police Chief; Dr. Kathleen Kiernan, CEO and Founder, Kiernan Group Holdings; Capt. Roy “Cowboy” Undersander, N3C Director, Fleet Operations, Navy Installations Command (Presentation)*

Undersander

- Assistance from community regarding gate access (one road in)
 - Large exercise, sent letters if traffic was a concern.
 - Base sandwiched between Orange Park and Jacksonville.
- Moat – river biggest security concern
 - Port operations, no harbor patrol
 - River security from local law enforcement (FWP, Coast Guard)
- Air show security NCIS, Hwy Patrol – 300k in attendance 3 days
- Security force on installation 3800 acres
- Law enforcement assists with sexual assaults, public events, traffic issues, cyber, drugs, human trafficking
- Installations provide equipment, dog teams, and training

Castor

- MacDill AFB - 116 square miles; 400k pop
- Port top ten size capacity and dangerous chemicals, fuel, fertilizer
- #2 for crime US major cities - focus on “big 4”: homicide, burglary, auto theft, property theft
- Worked Intel: Working relationship with MacDill; national/community engagement award
- High profile security events included change of command, political conventions
- Join base for training on hurricanes, active shooter, explosives

- Relationships important can't exchange business cards during an event
- Know what resources are available

Other Comments

- DOD threat software – possible use for city/urban applications
- Relationships and communication are critical!
- Don't know what's going to happen...who's the next person?
 - Copycat predictability impossible security taken every step you can to secure community...so little you can control
 - Take control over what intelligence comes through relationships level of trust – people
- Intel: Will engage outside the fence with specific intel
- Colorado springs – software cyber attack

Managing Community-Installation Encroachment and Training Impact Issues

Session covered installation encroachment issues.

MODERATOR: Amy Caramanica, Lead Associate, Booz Allen Hamilton **SPEAKERS:** David Duma, Principal Deputy, Operational Test and Evaluation, Office of the Secretary of Defense Frank DiGiovanni, Director, Force Training, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Readiness; Ron Tickle, Executive Director, Department of Defense Siting Clearinghouse Jon Toomey, Professional Staff, House Congressional Range & Testing Center Caucus; Keith Graf, Director, Texas Military Preparedness Commission, Office of the Governor;

- Frequency spectrum – digital military – bandwidth access.
 - Feds sold off a bunch for air training.
- Endangered species.
 - Impact of designation, conservation easements, foreign investment purchases near training or military sites (China);
- Airspace preservation
- Incompatible land use
 - Texas – negative impact, height restrictions, wind turbines (aviation easement), urban encroachment, development (Bear County; AFB - \$5 million loan to purchase land)
- Outreach/communication property owners, wind turbines
- Arizona statewide compatibility study – to avoid land use conflicts, etc.
 - DoD site clearing house web site link and will review projects.
- DoD Geospatial inform helpful to maintain maps regarding conflict and training ranges
- Seafloor encroachment surface activity

Federal Outreach Advisory Committee (FOAC) (final meeting)

FOAC is an advisory committee of the ADC comprised of ADC members. The committee typically meets during conferences to discuss and advise on a variety of issues. The primary purpose of this conference was meeting was to provide input on an ADC position paper for the new president.