

HEADQUARTERS
UNITED STATES EUROPEAN COMMAND
UNIT 30400
APO AE 09131

DIRECTIVE
NUMBER 56-24

19 June 2001

PLANS AND POLICY

Theater Basing Planning

-
1. **Summary**. This directive outlines theater basing planning policies, responsibilities, and procedures for USEUCOM Directorates, the Theater Basing Planning Committee (TBPC), and Components.
 2. **Applicability**. This directive is applicable to all forces under the combatant command of USCINCEUR.
 3. **Internal Control Systems**. This Directive contains no internal control provisions and is not subject to the requirements of the internal management control program. For HQ USEUCOM and subordinate joint activities, the applicable internal control directive is ED 50-8, Internal Management Control Program.
 4. **Suggested Improvements**. The proponent for this memorandum is ECJ5. Users should forward recommended changes to ECJ5-P.
 5. **References**.
 - a. Defense Planning Guidance (DPG), Update for Fiscal Years 2002-2007, Apr 00.
 - b. CJCSI 2300.03, Realignment of Overseas Sites, 19 Feb 99.
 - c. CJCSI 2300.02B, Coordination of Overseas Force Structure Changes, 1 Apr 99.
 - d. USEUCOM Directive (ED) 62-3, Real Estate and Utilities, Real Estate Operations, 2 Feb 97.
 - e. ED 61-4, Construction, Military Construction/Engineering in USEUCOM Area of Responsibility, 6 Apr 98.
 6. **Scope**. To provide coordination at all levels for planning, budgeting and implementing basing decisions in the European Command Area of Responsibility (AOR), to ensure the enhancement of combat capabilities in support of plans and strategy. All recommendations or decisions will consider the impact on long-, mid-, and short-term operations and requirements. This directive identifies HQ USEUCOM-specific procedures that enable USEUCOM to:

- a. Ensure comprehensive coordination of component basing plans.
- b. Define the interface between basing, operational planning and execution.
- c. Assess the theater environment to determine/valid long term basing requirements.

7. **Charter.** To provide coordination at all levels for planning, programming resources and implementing basing decisions in the European Command AOR, ensuring the enhancement of combat capabilities in support of existing plans and strategy. All recommendations or decisions will consider the impact on long-, mid-, and short-term operations and requirements.

8. **Discussion.**

a. The Defense Planning Guidance (DPG) points out that, "Joint and interservice regional consolidation offers the potential to increase infrastructure management efficiencies and associated savings.... The Services, in a joint forum, should seek to develop interservice regionalization proposals for study or trial over the program period." Furthermore, CJCSI 2300.03, Realignment of Overseas Sites, 19 Feb 99, requires CINCs to review Service and other DOD Component realignment actions and the recommendations of their theater subordinate commands. The CINC oversight requirement helps ensure USEUCOM maintains sufficient overseas sites and infrastructure to support the force in accordance with the NMS and DPG. The dispersed nature of USEUCOM's infrastructure, its inherent inefficiencies and continuing degradation due to aging, politico-military (pol-mil) considerations, and lack of sufficient funds for continued capital investment during the Cold War draw down, punctuate the need for a joint forum to coordinate proposed changes in infrastructure within the AOR. A USEUCOM joint forum will ensure consideration of all pertinent factors by all appropriate participants prior to USCINCEUR's action on proposed realignments and changes in USEUCOM basing

b. Basing decisions are made to support national and theater strategy. At the same time, resource constraints are often primary drivers. Clarification of the principles and factors by which proposed changes in USEUCOM AOR basing are weighed will assist in making better decisions when pressed to do so by resource considerations. The joint forum must consider the following:

(1) Will relocating/consolidating significantly improve mission effectiveness (warfighting capability)?

(2) Will troop/family quality of life (QOL) remain the same or improve at a new location?

(3) Will it be more efficient (less expensive) to operate and maintain infrastructure at a new or consolidated location?

(4) Are there major strategic or pol-mil factors?

9. **Basing Principles.** The effectiveness of the process for making basing decisions relies on the consideration of several key principles and essential driving factors affecting the AOR. Key principles include:

a. **Combat Capability:** All decisions must be made in light of the impact on USEUCOM readiness and operational capability. Any decision must maintain, or improve, USEUCOM's ability to respond to mission requirements. Decisions must consider the anticipated future operational and training requirements of the United States and USCINCEUR (contingency operations, Noncombatant Evacuation Operations, humanitarian relief, major regional threat, support of another warfighting CINC).

b. **Assure Theater-Wide Access:** This principle can be satisfied through various means while still assuring optimal efficiencies are realized. The European En Route Infrastructure (EERI) concept, and various OPLANS and CONPLANS must be considered in all basing decisions. The possibility of USCINCEUR's supporting role for one or more other CINCs remains a major consideration in any decision with respect to infrastructure within the AOR.

c. **Support of Existing Plans and Strategy:** The results must be consistent with and support the vision detailed in the NMS, Joint Vision 2020, JSCP, DPG, and USEUCOM's Strategic Vision. It must also ensure all active plans remain supportable. Planners must weigh the impact on operations, communications supportability, warfighting capability, mobilization, logistical and medical readiness, basing of Intelligence/Surveillance/Reconnaissance (ISR) assets, and sustainability when considering changes to Theater infrastructure.

d. **Pol-Mil Impact and Alliance Commitments:** Political and military influences and impacts should be considered early, and at all command levels, in any actions of closure, construction of new bases, and other realignments. These actions will involve host nation notification, as well as dealing with host nation concerns. Because the internal processes of each host nation vary, thorough planning and programming (to include funding) need to occur prior to host nation notification. Our European partners are very sensitive to perceived or actual changes in "coupling/linkage." Basing decisions to keep, add or close infrastructure will be seen as a signal of commitment to partners within the NATO Alliance as well as to our allies and friends in other security organizations such as the European Union (EU), and Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). The impact upon overseas presence posture and regional engagement, especially those supporting alliance and coalition commitments, must be considered. These factors could, in the end, far outweigh the calculus involved in a strictly military or financial cost-benefit analysis. Procedures are detailed in Reference c.

e. **Enduring Bases:** Component efforts to consolidate forces and reduce the overall AOR infrastructure footprint must continue. USEUCOM needs to identify the key locations at which we expect to remain for a long time and capitalize on the efficiencies of fully utilizing the resources at those locations, not just by a single Service but also by multiple Services.

10. **Factors Affecting Basing.**

a. **The Time Horizon, Plus Ten to Twenty Years:** This time horizon permits decisions which could be considered and staffed in the Joint Strategic Planning System (JSPS) cycle, realizing that approval of new basing infrastructure, the sourcing of contracts, and construction would push the actual completion of any project well into the second decade of the 21st century. Several strategic planning documents, including Joint Vision 2020 and USEUCOM 2020, designate a twenty-year window as a realistic planning horizon. The lead time required for MILCON planning, the need to manage the effects on service members and their families, and the JSPS cycle, dictate that the planning horizon be this far away.

b. **Threat Considerations:** The current USEUCOM infrastructure remains rooted in the Cold War threat scenario on which it was built. Specific forces and capabilities may be better suited for realignment to the southern tier or Southeastern Europe in response to current and foreseeable threat axes. Creating MOBs and Contingency Operating Bases (COBs) in the southern tier requires we consider the possibility of an increased European role in Balkan stabilization over the long term, and progress by the EU and OSCE in promoting democratic reforms within the FRY. Improved power projection from next generation weapon systems and strategic lift assets, as well the possibility of improved air deployability of Army units due to development of a more mobile and rapidly deployable Objective Force, may alleviate the reliance on large forward operating bases by 2020.

c. **Ongoing Force Transformations:** The conversion to rapidly deployable, expeditionary style forces, such as the Air Force's Aerospace Expeditionary Forces (AEFs), reachback, and the Army's Objective Force could significantly affect the requirements for European Theater infrastructure. Because of the desire to reduce the force presence and increased reliance on expeditionary type forces, Components must have focused engagement strategies that complement basing initiatives and allow access when needed.

d. **Reduction of Infrastructure Costs:** USEUCOM, in conjunction with other Defense Agencies and its own Components, must work to ensure its infrastructure supports U. S. Forces both effectively and efficiently. Any proposed construction, return, or closure of facilities must be considered in light of any known or proposed changes in Component force structure, as well as other DOD requirements in the AOR. Base Communications Support issues (telephone switching assets, transmission bandwidth access, etc.) are just one example of factors associated with significant costs of any MILCON project or closure. Equivalent Theater-wide QOL support infrastructure must be assured. Accessibility, service, and improvement of QOL at AOR facilities must be at a level equal to CONUS standards. Future basing decisions should aim for minimum theater footprint through consolidation of infrastructure and exploration of expanded use or development of contingency bases and potential Intermediate Staging Bases.

e. **Efficiencies of Joint Basing, Shared Base Operations, Combined Basing:** The TBPC must consider cost sharing with NATO, or perhaps the EU, via creation of national/multinational or bi-national basing. Investigate options to lease specific facilities, airfields or equipment for specific contingencies. Explore cost-sharing options amongst tenants to create maximum synergies in improving performance at reduced costs. Examination of infrastructure and basing as a cohesive system is essential to identifying the resource needs and availability within all Component Commands in USEUCOM's AOR. This ensures, for example, consideration of the

impact of basing decisions on tenancy of SOF assets and their required availability of suitable training ranges, land, sea and air access. Components must vet their basing plans and other proposed basing actions in a joint forum.

f. **Availability of NATO Funds for Infrastructure:** The TBPC must consider how to leverage NATO infrastructure to benefit all Components. NATO infrastructure is funded through the NATO Security Investment Program (NSIP) and is based on Capability Packages (CPs). A CP includes a combination of National and NATO funded infrastructure and associated running costs that, together with the designated military forces and other essential requirements, enable a NATO commander to achieve a specific NATO military required capability. NSIP is the overall common funded program that covers the process and procedures from conception of the required capabilities through package definition, resource analysis, investment proposal, implementation, acceptance and management to deletion and removal from the NATO inventory. The goal of the NSIP program is to acquire complete and usable infrastructure according to established policy and current procedures that meet minimum military requirements and contribute to a valid required capability. USEUCOM must also ensure all applicable forces and missions are assigned to NATO Capability Packages. By doing this, additional means are created to use NSIP funds for future facility and communications improvements.

g. **QOL Effects:** Any realignment or closure action should consider and minimize the negative impacts on service members and their families early in the process.

h. **Budgetary Effects and Opportunity Costs:** The budget programming cycle is 6 years. Therefore, facilities and infrastructure planning, design and construction processes must start early to provide for proper programming of resources. When orienting forces and infrastructure along the current threat axis, we must weigh certain opportunity costs, such as comparative construction expense, weather and topographical comparisons with existing infrastructure, force protection tradeoffs, impact on reaction time, increased need for training areas, improved operational flexibility, Status of Forces Agreements, and Host Nation input.

i. **European Security and Defense Identity (ESDI)/EU/NATO's Defense Capabilities Initiative (DCI) Impact:** The ESDI and DCI are two avenues through which the U.S. supports and encourages our allies to modernize and expand their military capabilities and roles in European security concerns. For the foreseeable future, though, NATO will remain the preeminent security vehicle for the region and will depend upon U.S. leadership and presence. The possible effect on U.S. presence in the theater will take several years to become clear.

11. Component Basing Planning.

a. Because of Title 10's division of responsibilities, most basing planning is done by Components. Component basing plans have been developed using best estimates of the size and design of the future force structure in the USEUCOM AOR and are attached as appendices to this document. These plans are maintained by the Components and may change at any time. Component basing actions (i.e., realignments, acquisition of additional space and infrastructure, closures of sites and relocation of existing forces) should be reviewed with due consideration of the foregoing principles and factors affecting theater basing decisions.

b. A number of assumptions must be made in the development of the basing guidelines and Component Basing Plans. Significant assumptions include:

(1) Current overseas manpower authorization ceilings and presence in the USEUCOM AOR will not change significantly over the next decade.

(2) The threat focus will be more to the south and east than that on which the current overseas infrastructure support is based (Central Europe).

(3) Major infrastructure changes will require demonstration of significant positive impact on military effectiveness and evidence of long-term efficiencies in order to garner support in the OSD budget.

(4) The Balkans should be treated as a contingency operation when considering major basing decisions.

(5) Components should use a capabilities-based, rather than a solely plans- (threat) based, view of force structure when making related basing decisions. As an example, a rapid response mission such as the Army's Southern European Task Force (SETAF) is a continuing critical USCINCEUR resource in the AOR, even though not specifically identified in current plans.

(6) Host Nation constraints, increasingly saturated European airspace, and environmental concerns will require looking at nations such as Croatia, Slovenia, Poland, Turkey, Bulgaria and Hungary for "small footprint" bases and training range access.

12. **Responsibilities.**

a. **All mandatory representatives. (See Para. 13.b.3)**

(1) Appoint a representative to attend all TBPC meetings.

(2) Review all proposals and draft products before the meetings and be prepared to discuss issues, work toward resolution and respond to taskers identified at the meetings.

(3) Nominate basing issues for discussion that may affect multiple Components, and prepare products to clarify pros and cons of various courses of action.

b. **ECJ5-P.**

(1) Schedule TBPC meetings to include coordination of location and establishment of date and time of meeting. Prepare and distribute agenda and read ahead material.

(2) Chair the TBPC meetings as the ECJ5 delegate.

(3) Maintain the TBPC Point of Contact list and Web Site
http://www1.eucom.smil.mil/ecj5/j5_plans/natoforces/theater_basing/theater_basing_plan_committee.htm
for posting of relevant material.

(4) Produce and distribute minutes of each meeting, and maintain them for 5 years.

c. Components.

(1) Present to the TBPC aspects of developing or already approved basing plans that may impact on other Components.

13. **Policies and Procedures.** USEUCOM basing planning is a two-tiered consultation process, sponsored by the Director, ECJ5, which ensures proper oversight of USEUCOM AOR Theater basing decisions.

a. TBPC Objectives.

(1) Conduct an annual review of USEUCOM Component basing plans.

(2) Provide an enduring joint forum to address basing issues in light of USEUCOM's basing and strategic plans and provide recommendations to USEUCOM's senior leadership.

b. Procedures.

(1) The Basing Planning Executive Group (BPEG) consisting of USEUCOM COS, ECJ5, ECJ4, ECPLAD, USAREUR COS, USAFE XP, NAVEUR DCINC, and SOCEUR CC, reviews and coordinates all recommendations and proposed courses of action of the TBPC.

(2) BPEG-approved recommendations are submitted to the USEUCOM DCINC and USCINCEUR for information, proposed implementation, review by Component Commanders, or submission to the Joint Staff IAW CJCSIs 2300.03 or 2300.02B, as appropriate.

(3) The TBPC, chaired by ECJ5-P, consists of members representing ECJ1, ECJ2, ECJ3, ECJ4, ECJ5-S, ECJ6, ECCM, USAFE, USAREUR, MARFOREUR, NAVEUR, and SOCEUR. Applicable Defense Agencies, ECJA, OCD/USDR and USEUCOM Country Desk Officers serve as ad hoc members on an as needed basis.

(4) The TBPC will meet as needed, and at least semi-annually, to review pertinent basing issues and strategic plans. Members will bring issues that affect more than one Component or US agency, as well as proposed actions that would have a long term or future effect on one or more service Component or unit, to the TBPC for consideration. The TBPC considers proposals for near-, mid- and long-term realignments, closures, and basing changes as they affect Components' basing plans.

(5) The TBPC performs an annual review of Component basing plans, considering any recent changes in National Military Strategy or other guidance. The annual review is drafted as

an MFR, coordinated with the HQ USEUCOM staff and Component Commands. The coordinated product is submitted to USCINCEUR for review.

(6) Semi-Annual TBPC Meeting.

(a) Purpose. To coordinate Component basing planning efforts to improve USEUCOM's ability to jointly manage the AOR infrastructure.

(b) Location. Meetings will normally be held at USEUCOM Headquarters at Patch Barracks, Stuttgart-Vaihingen, Germany in Building 2301, 3rd floor, the ECJ5 Conference Room. ECJ5-P will publish the exact location of the meeting.

(c) Time/Date. Meetings will normally be held during the months of August and February. ECJ5-P will publish the exact time and date of the meeting.

(d) Membership/Audience. The mandatory attendees are those listed in Para. 13b(3). Others may attend to provide input and participate in discussions on specific issues.

FOR THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF:

OFFICIAL:

DANIEL J. PETROSKY
Lieutenant General, USA
Chief of Staff

DAVID R. ELLIS
LTC, USA
Adjutant General

DISTRIBUTION:
P