



LEGISLATIVE
AFFAIRS

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1300

September 19, 2003 4:30 PM

FOR: SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

FROM: Powell A. Moore, Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Legislative Affairs) 697-6210

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Powell A. Moore", is written over a horizontal line.

SUBJECT: Response to Snowflake #091103-13 regarding 9/11/01
Meeting with Members

- You had breakfast with the following members:
 - Rep Doug Bereuter (R-NE)
 - Rep Chris Cox (R-CA)
 - Rep Randy 'Duke' Cunningham (R-CA)
 - Rep Kay Granger (R-TX)
 - Rep Robin Hayes (R-NC)
 - Rep John Hostettler (R-IN)
 - Rep Mark Kirk (R-IL)
 - Rep John Mica (R-FL)
 - Rep John Shimkus (R-IL)
 - Rep William 'Mac' Thornberry (R-TX)
 - Rep Roger Wicker (R-MS)

Attachment:

Read Ahead for September 11, 2001 SecDef Breakfast with House Supporters



LEGISLATIVE
AFFAIRS

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-1300

September 10, 2001, 6:00 PM

READ AHEAD FOR SECRETARY RUMSFELD
SecDef Breakfast with House Supporters

FROM: Powell Moore, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs

Tuesday, September 11, 8:00 AM, in the SecDef Dining Room

Attendees: Key House Republicans as well as key DoD / OSD officials and I will join you.

- This breakfast is an opportunity to seek the continued support and active promotion of Department priorities by House Republicans who have indicated a willingness to support your efforts.
- Members who have accepted: Rep. Bereuter, Rep. Cox, Rep. Cunningham, Rep. Granger, Rep. Hayes, Rep. Hostettler, Rep. Kirk, Rep. Mica, Rep. Shimkus, and Rep. Wicker. Bios are at Tab A. *+ Rep. Thornberry*
- The House FY '02 National Defense Authorization Act is scheduled for Floor Debate the week of September 10th, 2001. You should ask the invited members to assist you explain the importance of key provisions in the President's defense request including missile defense, pay raise, military construction and family housing, transformation, and other priority defense issues.
- Talking points on missile defense and public affairs materials on key aspects of the Departments' FY02 Defense Authorization Bill issues are at Tab B.

Prepared by: (b)(6), Director, House Affairs (b)(6)

HOUSE SUPPORTERS
INVITED TO BREAKFAST
SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

TAB A



Rep. Doug Bereuter (R-Neb)
Elected: 1978 (12th term)
Committees: Financial Services; International Relations; **Select Intelligence**
- vice chairman (**Intelligence Policy & National Security** - chairman);
Transportation & Infrastructure
Military Service: Army, 1963-65
Military Bases: None



Rep. Henry Bonilla (R-Texas)
Elected: 1992 (5th term)
Committees: Appropriations (FDA & Related Agencies - chairman;
Defense;)
Military Service: None
Military Bases: Fort Bliss, (shared with the 16th District); Laughlin AFB



Rep. Ken Calvert (R-Calif.)
Elected: 1992 (5th term)
Committees: Armed Services (DOE Reorganization - vice chairman;
Military Installations & Facilities; Military Research & Development;
Terrorism Oversight); Resources (Water & Power - chairman); Science
Military Service: None
Military Bases: None



Rep. Christopher Cox (R-Calif.)
Elected: 1988 (7th term) **Note: Policy Committee Chairman**
Committees: Energy & Commerce; Financial Services
Military Service: None
Military Bases: None



Rep. Randy 'Duke' Cunningham (R-Calif.)
Elected: 1990 (6th term)
Committees: Appropriations (Defense); Select Intelligence
Military Service: Navy, 1966-87
Military Bases: Marine Corps Air Station Miramar



Rep. Rodney Frelinghuysen (R-N.J.)
Elected: 1994 (4th term)
Committees: Appropriations (Defense)
Military Service: Army, 1969-71
Military Bases: Picatinny Arsenal (Army)



Rep. Porter J. Goss (R-Fla.)
Elected: 1988 (7th term) **Note:** Will retire at end of current term
Committees: Rules; Select Intelligence - chairman
Military Service: Army, 1960-62
Military Bases: None



Kay Granger (R-TX)
Elected: 1996 (3rd term)
Committees: Appropriations (Vice Chairman, Military Construction); Budget
Military Service: None
Military Bases: Naval Air Station Fort Worth, Joint Reserve Base, Fort Worth



Rep. Robin Hayes (R-N.C.)
Elected: 1998 (2nd term); Defeated Mike Taylor, D, to succeed Rep. W.G. "Bill" Hefner, D, who retired
Committees: Agriculture; Armed Services (Military Installations & Facilities - vice chairman; Military Research & Development; Morale, Welfare & Recreation; Terrorism Oversight); Transportation & Infrastructure
Military Service: None
Military Bases: Fort Bragg (Army); Pope Air Force Base



Rep. J.D. Hayworth (R-Ariz.)
Elected: 1994 (4th term)
Committees: Resources; Ways & Means
Military Service: None
Military Bases: None



Rep. David L. Hobson (R-Ohio)
Elected: 1990 (6th term)
Committees: Appropriations (Defense; Military- chairman)
Military Service: Ohio Air National Guard, 1958-63
Military Bases: Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (shared with the 3d District)



Rep. John Hostettler (R-Ind.)
Elected: 1994 (4th term)
Committees: Armed Services (Military Installations & Facilities; Military Research & Development; Terrorism Oversight - vice chairman); Judiciary
Military Service: None
Military Bases: Naval Surface Warfare Center



Rep. John L. Mica (R-Fla.)
Elected: 1992 (5th term)
Committees: Government Reform; House Administration; Transportation & Infrastructure (Aviation - chairman)
Military Service: None
Military Bases: None



Rep. John Shimkus (R-Ill.)
Elected: 1996 (3rd term)
Committees: Energy & Commerce (Environment & Hazardous Materials - vice chairman)
Military Service: Army, 1980-86; Army Reserve, 1986-present
Military Bases: None



John Sununu (R-NH)

Elected: 1996 (3rd term)

Committees: Appropriations (Foreign Operations & Export Financing; Treasury, Postal Service & General Government; VA, HUD & Independent Agencies); **Budget** - Vice Chairman

Military Service: None

Military Bases: None (Portsmouth Naval Shipyard does employ some of his constituents)



William M. 'Mac' Thornberry (R-TX)

Elected: 1994 (4th term)

Committees: Armed Services (DOE Reorganization - chairman; Military Personnel; Military Procurement); **Budget**; Resources

Military Service: None

Military Bases: Sheppard Air Force Base



Rep. Roger Wicker (R-Miss.)

Elected: 1994 (4th term)

Committees: Appropriations

Military Service: Air Force, 1976-80; Air Force Reserve, 1980-present

Military Bases: None



Rep. Heather A. Wilson (R-N.M.)

Elected: 1998 (2nd full term)

Committees: Armed Services (DOE Reorganization; Military Procurement; Military Readiness); Energy & Commerce

Military Service: Air Force, 1978-89

Military Bases: Kirtland Air Force Base

TAB B

Why The Missile Defense Program Should Be Fully Funded

- North Korea has demonstrated a capability for intercontinental reach with its rockets. Iran has hundreds of short-range missiles and is building the Shahab -3 which will reach Israel, most of Saudi Arabia, and Turkey. The Shahab -4 and -5 are on the drawing boards, the latter with intercontinental range.
- Building missile defenses takes time and persistence. Opportunities lost today cannot be regained later, once vulnerabilities become more pressing.
- The Ballistic Missile Defense Program is a balanced and responsible program. Failure to fund the program could produce potentially grave consequences to our national security. Given that we have no defense whatsoever against medium and long range ballistic missiles, those consequences could be severe.
- A layered system of defenses is necessary to protect against the potentially catastrophic consequences of letting a hostile missile through. The BMD system is designed to create just such layers by enabling interception of a hostile missile along its entire flight path, maximizing opportunities and chances of success. Reduced funding could leave gaps in those defenses that could perhaps be exploited by those with hostile intent, or at least minimize the challenges facing those with threat missiles.
- Rigorous and realistic testing is an essential component for developing a missile defense system with demonstrable capability. Failure to fund these rigorous testing requirements could result in either deployment delays or deploying systems with greater risk.
- The current program engages in multiple paths to reduce risk, combined by rigorous annual reviews to assess progress and to decide on what should be stopped, truncated, kept on course, or accelerated. Shortchanging funding for these efforts could increase both program and security risk.
- Failure to create conditions for flexibility in the program could unnecessarily delay schedule, sub-optimize performance, and raise costs in the nation's BMD effort.
- Missile defenses are an important tool in the national security toolbox, one for which we do not now have other alternatives.
- Because of the increasing threat, we cannot afford a reduction in funds which would ultimately delay fielding an effective ballistic missile defense system.



Upcoming Issues

AUGUST 13-17, 2001

Office of
Public Affairs
703-697-9312

Missile Defense

- We must defend ourselves, our friends and allies against the real and growing threat of ballistic missiles and other weapons of mass destruction.
- Several nations including Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Iran and Syria are developing ballistic missiles.
- For 2002, \$8.3 billion is proposed for missile research & development. The funding for missile defense is approximately 2.5% of the total defense budget. By comparison:
 - The United States spent approximately \$11 billion last year on counter-terrorism efforts, nearly twice last year's missile defense research costs.
 - For 2002, \$17 billion is proposed for Department of Defense health care.
 - \$9.3 billion is proposed for building ships.
 - \$8.3 billion is proposed for building aircraft.
- Leaders from several nations including the United Kingdom, Japan, Australia, Italy, Spain, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary and Georgia have acknowledged the need for new defenses to counter 21st century threats.

A New Relationship With Russia

- We will continue to seek cooperation with Russia to move beyond the ABM treaty to a new framework for peace and security in the 21st century.
- On Aug. 7-8, senior U.S. and Russian advisors met at the Pentagon for consultations that grew out of talks in Genoa last month between President George W. Bush and President Vladimir Putin on developing the U. S./Russian relationship. The delegations discussed a broad range of issues related to strategic stability and international security in the 21st Century. The focus was on the interrelated subjects of offensive and defensive systems.
- As a continuation of these discussions, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld meets with Russian Defense Minister Ivanov in Moscow in the coming week to discuss cooperation on a new political, economic and strategic relationship between the U.S. and Russia.
- These talks pave the way for future consultation between Presidents Bush and Putin on a strategic framework between the U.S. and Russia for the 21st century.

POCKET CARD ON MISSILE DEFENSE

MISSILE DEFENSE:
TO PROTECT OURSELVES, OUR ALLIES
AND OUR FRIENDS IN THE 21ST CENTURY

- **No system exists to defend Americans against missile attack.**
 - 64% of Americans believe we already have missile defenses (*CBS/NYTimes poll, 3/01*).
 - 11 years ago in the Persian Gulf War, a SCUD missile killed 28 Americans & wounded 99.
- **The missile threat is real and growing.**
 - Nations with nuclear weapons programs: 12.
 - Nations with ballistic missiles: 28.
 - Countries with missile programs include Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Pakistan, Iran, China and Syria.
 - For the first time in history, political leaders with no political structure around them or free press to temper a decision to launch will soon possess nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons and the means to deliver them.
- **The U.S. is engaged in robust research & development to deploy missile defenses.**
 - With July's test, missile defense "hit-to-kill" technology has been successfully tested a dozen times.
 - 20 more intercept tests are scheduled between now and 2006.
- **Missile defense is part of a broader deterrent strategy for the 21st century.**
 - To counter a real and growing threat.
 - To deter or defend against rogue states.
 - To establish a strategic relationship with Russia based on trust and cooperation.



Upcoming Issues

September 9-15, 2001

10-F-1729 (9)

Office of Public Affairs 703-697-9312

Department of Defense 2002 Amended Budget Proposal

- A total of \$328.9 billion is proposed for DoD in 2002. This request represents a \$32.6 billion increase over 2001. The budget begins to reverse a decade of overuse and under-funding, and fulfills the President's pledge to stop the decline of our armed forces and begin building a 21st Century military that will deter aggression, extend peace & sustain prosperity.

Quality of Life

The DoD budget proposal includes critical funding for military quality of life: housing, military pay and health care. It includes:

- \$82.3 billion for a military pay increase and improved housing allowance, a \$6.9 billion increase over 2001.
- \$4.1 billion to improve family housing.
- \$17 billion for military health care, an increase of \$5.8 billion over 2001 – a 48% increase, the majority of which is mandated by Congress.

Training & Readiness

This budget will boost readiness, which has been strained by a high tempo of operations and escalating maintenance costs for aging equipment. Funding for training and readiness will climb from \$108 billion in FY 2001 to \$125.7 billion in FY 2002. The 2002 funding request includes:

- \$11.5 billion for aircraft operations.
- \$2.7 billion for Army operations.
- \$2.9 billion for ship operations.
- \$9.3 billion for depots.
- \$9.3 billion for training.

Maintenance & Repair

Included in the \$125.7 billion for training and readiness is funding for maintenance and repair, including:

- \$5.9 billion for military construction, up from \$5.3 billion in FY 2001. Funding will construct or renovate barracks, medical treatment facilities, schools, and physical fitness centers.
- \$20.7 billion for improving military bases and infrastructure.

Modernization, Transformation and R&D

Included in the budget are reforms that will help build the military of the 21st Century, including:

- \$47.4 billion for R&D, an increase of \$6.3 billion over 2001. This funding will help restore the Department of Defense to its status as a technological leader. Research and development funding also includes a request for \$8.3 billion for missile defense.
- Reducing the fleet of B-1 bombers from 93 to 60 aircraft and concentrating those aircraft in two bases will free up \$1.5 billion to modernize the aging B-1 fleet over the next five years.
- Deactivation of the Peacekeeper missile system over a five-year period, saving \$320 million in the first year, and \$150 for each year thereafter.