

**JOURNAL OF JOINT WORK SESSION MEETING OF THE GREAT FALLS CITY  
COMMISSION AND CASCADE COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
CIVIC CENTER, GIBSON ROOM 212  
OCTOBER 26, 2011**

**CALL TO ORDER:** 2:00 p.m.

City Commissioners present: Mayor Michael J. Winters, Commissioners Bill Bronson and Mary Jolley.

Cascade County Board of Commissioners present: Joe Briggs, Bill Salina and Jane Weber.

Also present were the City Manager, Deputy City Manager, Planning and Community Development Director, and the City Clerk.

County Commissioner Joe Briggs summarized key elements gathered from many hours of conferences, briefings and meetings that he attended with other local leaders over the last three years, as well as information he presented at the 2009 OEA Defense Communities Conference, the 2010 Association of Defense Communities Annual Conference, the 2011 Association of Defense Communities Annual Conference, and the 2011 DOD Sustaining Military Readiness Conference.

Commissioner Briggs presented a PowerPoint and discussed the following:

A JLUS is:

- A cooperative land use planning effort between military installations and the surrounding communities.
- A tool to promote compatible community growth that supports military training and operational missions.
- A method of identifying potential conflicts and resolving them before they occur.
- A process to develop strategies to deconflict existing incompatible land uses.
- A tool for the development of land use regulations.
- An asset in base and mission retention efforts.

A JLUS is NOT:

- Is NOT a regulatory document.
- Is NOT a demand letter or wish list from DOD.
- Is NOT a land grab or a taking of private property rights.
- Is NOT a Growth Policy by another name.
- Is NOT zoning or subdivision regulation of any kind.
- Is NOT something to be frightened of.

Please remember:

- It carries no weight of law, it is only a menu of options and potential strategies for review by local government officials.

- It is still in draft form and is still subject to change.

Why should Local Government care?

- Malmstrom means jobs and economic opportunity for our local civilians and students for our schools.
- Malmstrom provides a steady source of new talents in the form of active service members, retirees, children and military spouses.
- Malmstrom brings vast amounts of dollars to our community and the loss of Malmstrom would be a devastating blow to our economy.
- The men and women of Malmstrom are an integral part of our community whose absence would be greatly felt.
- Wing One labors each and every day to keep us free.

Is Malmstrom in danger? The simple answer is yes!

- All branches of the military are being required to reduce their facility footprint by at least 10%.
- DOD has to cut \$489 billion dollars over the next few years while also having to be more historically and environmentally friendly as well as invest billions in renewable energy.
- If the “Super Committee” fails in its efforts, an additional \$600 billion in cuts will be automatically triggered within DOD.
- The number of air frames and the need for bases in the Air Force is rapidly declining. Cost analysis favors megabases.

Is Malmstrom in danger, YES! New Start Math:

- The total number of ICBMS, SLBMS and nuclear capable bombers under New Start is 700. Currently we deploy 450 ICBMs, 336 SLBMs (submarine) and 60 nuclear capable bombers for a total of 846.
- Each ICBM missile silo or SLBM launch tube or nuclear bomber counts as one launcher but a bomber can carry 16-20 independent nuclear weapons.
- The math says that we have 146 too many deployed launchers. Each of the three remaining missile bases has 150 deployed launchers. This option could be an easy and cost effective fix.

Is the loss of a Missile Wing certain? NO!

- The future remains unclear. The reduction of 146 deployed launchers could occur in a number of ways.
- The current version of the Trident Submarine has 24 missile launch tubes.
- The Navy opposes reducing the fleet below the current 14 submarines due to the logistics of keeping two submarines within each of the two patrol boxes at all times.
- The number of missiles on each sub could be reduced although such a reduction yields no cost savings.
- It has been proposed that reducing the bomber fleet to only 20 nuclear capable aircraft would be adequate to provide the third leg of the triad because each aircraft can carry multiple nuclear weapons.

- As a result of these options the number of missiles lost could be as low as 30 or as high as 150 depending on the mix. This means an entire wing or a few missiles from each base, but there is more to the story.

#### Additional unilateral cuts in launchers?

- The administration is conducting an additional review of our nuclear capability.
- The goal is to propose additional unilateral cuts in deployed nuclear weapons and launchers. How low below the 700 launcher level these cuts might be is currently unknown.
- The position of Global Strike Command is that any cuts in missile forces should come equally from each of the three bases so as to not cripple the command structure and nuclear surety process.
- The unofficial position of the Secretary of the Air Force's facility and logistics command is "that don't save no money." In order to save money, cuts have to involve entire squadrons or wings.

#### Threat summary:

- If the "Super Committee" on the deficit does not complete its task, the danger of losing a squadron or an entire wing drastically increases.
- If the "Super Committee" on the deficit completes its task but calls for additional cuts in DOD, the danger of losing a squadron or an entire wing drastically increases.
- If the Administration orders additional unilateral cuts in our nuclear deterrent force, the danger of losing a squadron or an entire wing drastically increases.
- If the triad is reduced to a dyad there is no way at this point to predict how that might affect the three ICBM bases.

#### Bottom line assessment:

- Malmstrom has three missile squadrons that comprise its single wing. The loss of a single squadron would have a large impact on our community and the other missile counties.
- The loss of a wing means our base closes and the impact would be massive.
- Malmstrom is likely to lose at least some of its missiles.
- If the cuts call for the reduction of a significant number of ICBM's we will be competing with F.E. Warren AFB and Minot AFB for Malmstrom's survival.

#### Comparing the three bases:

- All three bases have 450 Minuteman III Missiles deployed.
- Malmstrom's missile field is nearly the size of the other two combined which are both an asset and a liability in base closure discussions.
- F.E. Warren has two major missions, the missile wing and the HQ for 20<sup>th</sup> Air Force. Closing their missile wing would require relocation of the HQ in order to affect the costs savings of closing the base.
- Minot also has two major missions, the missile wing and a bomber wing. Like F.E. Warren, closing their missile wing alone does not produce the savings of closing an entire base.

#### More Comparisons:

- Malmstrom is a single major mission with a small tenant mission that is often deployed. Decommissioning of “Wing One” would allow full closure of the base with only small relocation costs for the Red Horse Squadron.
- F.E. Warren does not have a runway.
- Minot has an active heavy lift runway.
- Malmstrom has a decommissioned heavy lift runway in operational condition with no ILS.
- Malmstrom has the oldest silos in the inventory.

#### What are our advantages?

- Although all three communities do a fine job of welcoming and supporting the Air Force missions, Great Falls is consistently ranked as the best.
- Malmstrom is “Wing One” and enjoys a historic sentimental advantage in many senior Air Force leaders’ eyes.
- Our missile field is more widely dispersed than the others offering a more difficult target to our adversaries. This gains in importance as the number of deployed launchers is reduced. This is however, also a negative in that it raises the daily cost of operations due to the greater distances traveled.

#### More advantages:

- We are recognized as the leader among the missile bases in dealing with the potential issues of wind power in a missile field.
- Malmstrom has a consistently better record on nuclear surety than the other two bases.
- Our senior Senator sits on the “Super Committee” for deficit reduction.
- We are the host community for next year’s “50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Minuteman System” convention.
- We are the only Missile Base with a JLUS!

#### OK, so what is in the JLUS?

- The JLUS contains information about the communities of the missile field and about the missions of the base.
- The JLUS identifies a number of issues of joint concern to the civilian and military segments of our community.
- The JLUS outlines potential land use incompatibilities and provides a menu of potential ways to address the problems before they occur.
- The JLUS places particular emphasis on increasing formal communication between the civilian and military planners so as to avoid potential conflicts in the future.

#### What else is in the JLUS?

- The JLUS provides strategies to assist the military in increasing the understanding of their mission in the civilian community as well as ways they can lessen their negative impacts on the civilian portion of our community.
- The JLUS examines methods to strengthen and formalize the existing strong relationship between the military and civilian leadership.

- The JLUS contains a matrix of identified issues within each of the jurisdictions and a series of suggested strategies to address the issues.

What is attracting attention?

- There is a fear the JLUS is somehow regulatory in nature.
- Significant amounts of misinformation that has been spread throughout the community.
- The discussion regarding expansion of the 1200 foot safety zones surrounding the launch facilities to 1200 meters.
- The status of the Malmstrom runway, accident safety zones and FAA imaginary surfaces.
- “The Big Red Dot”
- Incompatible land use issues regarding the I-2 zoning adjacent to the new base housing.

Lack of understanding and misinformation:

- As has been said repeatedly the JLUS is NOT a regulatory document and many are convinced that it is.
- Some people have not understood that Chapter 3 is a discussion of identified issues and fear that anything said in that chapter is a recommendation for action. All recommendations are contained in Chapter 4.
- There are some who want the study to ignore identified issues that are inconvenient to their development efforts.
- In order for concerns to be addressed they must first be identified. The acknowledgement of an issue does not guarantee that any action must be taken.

1200 Feet versus 1200 Meters:

- Without some background, this does seem to be an odd request and the draft version of the report does not adequately address the fundamental question of why it is being requested.
- The existing 1200 foot safety area is based on the explosive power of the solid fuel boosters. Although there has never been an incident with a Minuteman booster exploding in the silo, the Air Force purchased 1200 foot easements around each silo as a precaution.
- The 1200 meters on the other hand deals with providing a free fire zone should terrorists take over a missile silo. The 1200 meter zone would reduce the risk to our security Airmen by allowing them to land outside of enemy weapons range as well reduce the potential of collateral damage to the public.

Status of the runway:

- This is not a new issue, but the JLUS has brought it to the surface once again.
- Cascade County continues to recognize the existence of the runway and the required Accident Potential Zones (APZ), Clear Zones and FAA required imaginary surfaces that go with an airport. The County Attorney’s office supports this decision on the basis of state law and the continued operations of rotary wing aircraft from the air field.
- The existence of the APZs in particular is viewed as a impediment to development by the owner of land directly off the South end of the runway.

Zoning around the runway:

- Cascade County has zoned the APZs to match the historic use of the property (Agricultural). This designation substantially matches the compatible land use recommendations for APZs.
- The owner of the land has in the past approached the City of Great Falls for annexation and subsequent rezoning of the parcel for high density housing. Cascade County opposed his request. Ultimately the decision on such a request lies with the City Commission but the JLUS process confirms the concerns expressed by the County in the past regarding the construction of high density housing at the end of the runway.

Physical status of the runway:

- There are those who would say the runway can never be reopened or that the cost is prohibitive. There are others who would say it can be reopened easily. The truth lies between these two poles but in my opinion the truth is closer to second version.
- The concrete runway itself is in very good condition according to a DOD inspection done two years ago, but the unused asphalt taxi ways and apron areas would need rehabilitation.
- Additionally, the facility would need a ground control tower and an ILS system installed to be fully functional. Relative to the asset value of the runway these costs are quite modest.

If the Air Force wanted it they would have used it by now!

- This is a common argument used by those want to declare the runway gone however it ignores several important things.
- The Air Force is not the only potential user of the runway. It could be reopened for use by a private firm cleared by DOD.
- If the base were to be closed the runway would become a valuable asset for the city or county to open as a cargo center or for other purposes. If we allow the runway to be encroached on now and the base closes at a later date, we will have thrown away the single most valuable asset that the community would have received from DOD.
- DOD paid to have the runway included in the JLUS process so it would appear they do still have some interest in its protection.

Yes - Imaginary surfaces do exist:

- Imaginary surfaces are defined by the FAA based upon the glide paths and exit corridors of aircraft from any airport.
- The Great Falls International Airport has the same imaginary surfaces for each of its runways that Malmstrom has for its single runway.
- Basically, they are height restrictions that are less restrictive the further you get from the Airport.
- The imaginary surfaces are the same for military and civilian airports; this is not a DOD related issue.

### The “BIG RED DOT”

- For many years wind development in Great Falls has been influenced by the presence of a “No Build zone” delineated on FAA maps as a “Big Red Dot” covering most of Cascade County.
- Neither the developers nor Cascade County had been able to track down the source of this designation. Our JLUS contractors did succeed in getting to the bottom of this issue and included the information in the JLUS.
- It is not the military as most believed; it was NOAA who placed the “no build recommendation” on the FAA maps because of their NEXRAD weather radar.

### Incompatible Land uses Adjacent to base housing:

- Placing heavy industrial zoning adjacent to high density residential use is not generally desirable. DOD considers heavy industrial development adjacent to base housing an incompatible land use.
- During the JLUS process Malmstrom personnel expressed concerns about the proposed ethanol plant and the Agritech Park.
- The JLUS identifies the concerns and accurately describes the situation in Chapter 3 including a notation that the ethanol plant parcel was zoned I-2 prior to the base housing being built. Chapter 4 suggests possible mitigation strategies and calls for cooperation and compromise to reach a mutually acceptable outcome.

### Public Outreach:

- Matrix Design Group has completed the required research and interviews with both civilian and military stakeholders.
- Three series of public workshops have been held over the past 18 months with each occurring in three towns throughout the missile field. These were held in Choteau (2), Lewistown (2), Fort Benton (1), Simms (1) and Great Falls (3).
- Presentations on the JLUS were given by Commissioner Briggs at each of the Great Falls Neighborhood Councils, at the MACO mid-winter conference and at several area civic groups.

### JLUS Team Meetings:

- The Technical Committee and Policy Committee each met twice face to face to craft the preliminary draft document.
- The committees continued their work via email and phone to produce additional refinements to produce a preview working document for committee review.
- Commissioner Briggs and Planning Director Susan Conell met with the County Commissions of each of the other 6 missile counties to get their inputs on the working document.
- The working document was reviewed by members of the TC and PC, edited and has now been released for public comment following the third set of face to face meetings of the committees.

#### Next Steps:

- The Draft JLUS is now available for public review and we are soliciting public comment in either written or electronic form. The [malmstromjlus.com](http://malmstromjlus.com) website contains both a downloadable pdf of the report and a comment form.
- A limited number of CD versions as well as hard copies of the report are available at the Cascade County Planning office.
- The public comment period has been extended to 60 days to encourage a strong public involvement. The comment period now ends on December 5, 2011.
- The TC and PC will review the public comments, make any changes they view as necessary and publish the study in May of 2012.

#### Implementation?

- Once the document is completed each of the eight jurisdictions will decide what elements of the recommendations they wish to pursue.
- Each jurisdiction will implement on its own time schedule and will hold whatever public meetings on the proposed implementation items that are required by Montana law.
- Many of the most important strategies deal with formalizing communications with Malmstrom or referring potential wind and cell towers developers to Malmstrom. This type of strategy can be implemented immediately as it has no regulatory impact.

#### Wrap up:

- The JLUS is not a regulatory document. It changes no laws or regulations.
- Having a completed JLUS may be a competitive advantage in efforts to retain Malmstrom AFB.
- Retaining an unencroached runway at Malmstrom provides not only the potential for future military missions but also civilian ones in the event the base is closed.
- Malmstrom AFB is currently in danger of reductions or perhaps closure but there is no way to assess the severity of the threat.

#### ADJOURN

There being no further discussion, Mayor Winters adjourned the informal joint work session meeting of October 26, 2011, at 3:00 p.m.