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Dear Reader:

Communities with military installations face many unique challenges. The International City/County Management Association (ICMA) is pleased to partner with the Department of Defense and National Association of Counties (NACo) to work with these communities and their local governments to promote practical solutions to such challenges. ICMA is the professional and educational association for over 7,000 chief appointed administrators and other professionals serving local governments all over the world. Our mission—to create excellence in local governance by developing and fostering professional local government management—is greatly enhanced by our military programs and capabilities. Members, local governments, and communities rely on ICMA for information, research, and technical assistance on many issues of special interest.

Communities are more than geographic locations on a map. They are about people—their lives, their families, and their homes. Local governments and installation management exist to enhance their respective communities and protect their “missions.” Issues of encroachment, however defined, affect the sustainability of communities, both military and civilian. For this reason, localities and installations must work cooperatively and coordinate their efforts to address issues of encroachment and sustainability in their region. Quality of life, military mission capability, and regional economic, and environmental health are dependent upon such efforts. There is no bigger challenge facing local governments and installation management than planning for the long-term sustainability of their communities and region.

This challenge becomes more daunting than ever with the planned realignment and closure of numerous bases around the country and overseas. As troops move and missions change and grow, new issues and concerns will arise within and around military bases. This will require even more cooperation and communication among installations, municipalities, and their regional, state, and federal partners. Only with a coordinated effort can communities maintain and enhance their long-term health and sustainability.

These guides are meant to inform and guide all stakeholders, providing a basis for a common understanding which can lead to greater cooperation. A dialogue on the basic roles and responsibilities of the management leaders at the installation and within local government provides an excellent starting point for creating and maintaining the relationships that serve both communities. I urge all local government and military installation leaders to recognize the fence that used to divide the installation from the local government no longer exists. Only by allocating time and resources, resolving conflicts, and creating realistic expectations can the entire community become sustainable.

Robert J. O’Neill, Jr.
Executive Director,
ICMA

The National Association of Counties (NACo) partnered with ICMA and DoD on this primer.
FRAMING THE ISSUE

The Need for Communication

Two-way communication between the military and stakeholder groups is crucial to successful compatible land use planning. State and local government officials have the authority to pass land use legislation and strengthen growth planning, and it is vital for military planners and commanders to participate in the planning process. Without adequate input from the military, state and local government officials will not have sufficient information to adequately assess the impacts of their growth management and land use decisions on military operations. By working together, the military, state, and local government planners can strike the appropriate balance of growth, environmental protection, and military operations.

This guide is designed to:

• Help Department of Defense (DoD) officials and military installation commanders gain a better understanding of how state and local governments make land use decisions that may impact military operations
• Facilitate communication and potential collaboration among stakeholders on encroachment issues

The chart on the following page provides a summary and clarification of common misperceptions about what installation personnel can do to engage state and local governments in dialogue on issues.
### Common Issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>True/False</th>
<th>What the Law Says</th>
<th>What This Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| “DoD personnel cannot provide information to state and local governments about legislation that would protect our military bases and ranges.” | FALSE      | • “No part of the money appropriation...shall be used directly or indirectly to...influence...a Member of Congress, a jurisdiction, or official of any government, to favor ...or oppose any law, policy or appropriation.”  
[18 USC 1913]  
• Applicable to lobbying at the state and local level AND with regard to regulations and policy, not just legislation and appropriations  
• “No part of any appropriations contained in this Act shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes...”  
[DoD FY05 Appropriations Act]                                                                 | IT IS OK TO:  
• Share information about Administration positions  
• Share information necessary to the administration of laws for which a government agency is responsible  
• Provide pre-existing materials  
• Give speeches on Administration positions (as long as not exhorting the public to contact government officials in support of position)  
• Send letters from agency to members of Congress  
• Make statements to news media on Administration positions  
IT IS NOT OK TO:  
• Use appropriated funds to generate “grass roots” support, i.e., attempt to mobilize citizens or networks to call, write, email, or otherwise contact lawmakers in support of DoD initiatives |
| “Providing information on impacts of local development action on our installation is lobbying.” | FALSE      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | IT IS OK TO:  
• Testify or provide information to governmental agencies about impacts of actions on military operations  
• Make recommendations or otherwise be persuasive about actions  
• Prepare draft ordinance/legislation  
IT IS NOT OK TO:  
• Be part of a panel that VOTES on land use matters  
• Threaten, deceive or recommend others do what we cannot do |
| “Giving speeches on legislation is considered lobbying.” | DEPENDS    |                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | IT IS OK TO:  
• Participate, communicate, build relationships, and share information  
IT IS NOT OK TO:  
• Avoid all interactions with local planners and organizations about land use issues |
| “If state and local governments take the military’s advice, the military may become liable for takings.” | FALSE      | “Nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.”  
[U.S. Constitution, Amendment 5]                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                                                    |
| “Testifying to a local land use planning authority makes the government liable for takings.” | FALSE      | “The United States may use its position as a landowner to influence local zoning authorities without incurring liability for a taking.”  
[Persyn v. United States, 32 Fed. Cl. 579, 585 (1995)]                                                                                              |                                                                                                    |
| “Working with state and local governments to combat encroachment is DoD policy.” | TRUE       | “I recommend you direct more active involvement at the installation and Regional Environmental Coordinator level in all aspects of state and local planning that could impact readiness.”                                                                 | IT IS OK TO:  
• Participate, communicate, build relationships, and share information  
IT IS NOT OK TO:  
• Avoid all interactions with local planners and organizations about land use issues |

The Issue

Encroachment on United States (U.S.) military installations and training and testing ranges is a serious and growing problem for DoD. Encroachment – a term used by DoD to refer to incompatible uses of land, air, water, and other resources – is the cumulative impact of uncontrolled urban development that hampers the military’s ability to carry out its testing and training mission.

The rapid pace of urban growth into rural areas around military installations and ranges presents two sets of encroachment problems. As residential and commercial development increases in areas near military installations, residents may be exposed to aircraft over-flights, dust, and noise from military activities. Important military training exercises may be compromised due to incompatible land use adjacent to or near installations and ranges. For example:

- Night training can be compromised when light from nearby shopping centers interferes with a trainee’s night vision
- Parachute training can be halted when housing developments are built near drop zones
- Usable testing and training areas can be segmented and diminished if development forces endangered species to migrate inside the military installation fence lines

Other issues that can lead to degradation of testing or training capabilities include:
- Competition for frequency spectrum
- Cell phone towers or wind energy towers in military use airspace
- New highways near or through training areas

In 2002, the General Accountability Office reported that nearly 80 percent of the nation’s military bases were witnessing growth around their fence lines at a rate higher than the national average.
The Implications

The U.S. military is responsible for protecting the American people and U.S. interests around the world. To maintain the country’s premier military edge, troops must have the best and most realistic training and preparation for the challenges of combat before they go to war. Restrictions caused by increased growth and development can have a detrimental impact on the military’s ability to “train as we fight.” If trainees receive restricted or inadequate training, they are more likely to misunderstand combat strategies and tactics, leading to poor skills and unsafe practices on the battlefield.

State and local governments have responsibility for managing urban growth and development through their land use management authorities. Land trusts, the agriculture community, and conservation organizations can leverage their respective interests in open space conservation areas and work cooperatively with the military to establish compatible land use buffer areas around DoD lands. Working collaboratively, the military, state and local governments, and other stakeholder groups can protect military training capabilities while conserving important natural resources and maintaining community well-being.

To date, various groups have taken action in response to the growing issue of encroachment:

- State and local governments have formed military advisory boards to facilitate discussion and develop compatible land use policy for areas around military installations
- States have passed legislation to minimize incompatible development and promote compatible resource use around military installations
- Specific installations have engaged with conservation-oriented non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as land trusts, as well as state and local governments, to establish conservation areas surrounding military lands
INTRODUCTION

"Since becoming a civilian, and starting work with the city of Killeen, I’ve realized how great a working relationship we really had between the two entities and how much we both profited. After some reflection and some exchange with my new counterparts, I’m convinced that there is more that we could collectively be doing to improve both our capabilities. The more local governments and installations work together, the better, collectively, I think we’ll become.” David Hall, former Army Garrison Commander, serving as deputy city manager, Killeen, Texas, 2002

The relationship between military installations and communities is a symbiotic one because the success of one is invariably linked to that of the other. Gone are the days when a military installation can retreat “back inside the fort, and close the gates” when faced with a deteriorating relationship with a local government. Neither local governments nor installations can afford the costs associated with poor relations.

Until recently, relationships between municipalities or local governments and installations focused on lawlessness, problems in the areas bordering the installation, and competition for services and resources. Today, issues that affect the military’s ability to conduct training also impact the relationship between installations and their surrounding communities. These include:

• Encroachment
• Increased public scrutiny of installation operations
• Lack of a mutual regional vision to sustain installations
• Lost opportunities for sharing services and cost avoidance
• Perceived non-responsive or controversial management decisions

The majority of decisions made by installation management and local government leadership have serious and real consequences for their respective installations and local jurisdictions. Because local government and installation relationships are interconnected, leadership is responsible for making management decisions that minimize conflict and promote mutual understanding.

“Local governments and military installations can better utilize limited resources, in many cases, when they participate in jointly sponsored projects and programs to serve their citizens’ common needs.” Developing Exemplary Civilian-Military Relations, ICMA MIS Report, Vol.20 No. 12, December 1988
LOCAL GOVERNMENT

What is Local Government?

Local government is dynamic and responsive, and municipalities and counties are the most likely point of contact between government and citizens. Local governments fund services of concern to residents, including quality drinking water, pothole repair, snow removal, recreation, and emergency medical care. Citizens depend on the effectiveness and quality of local governments to make their lives safer, healthier, and more livable.

Today’s citizens demand that local governments provide quality resources and services in a responsive, cost effective, and professional manner, and local government processes are often influenced by elections and constituents’ demands. Local government leaders must be aware of broad community issues, provide strong leadership and effective management, and foster a vision for what the community can become.

“Most cities want to have a good relationship with adjacent military installations. Cities are departmentalized in a manner not too dissimilar to base operations. City departments, like their base counterparts, deal primarily with technical issues. Unlike military bases, policy issues are handled by an elected body of the city council or county board. Often decisions at this level require public input and public discourse, and require time to resolve.”

Steven R. Jepsen, City Manager, Oceanside, California.

Responsibilities and Services

Military installations share many similarities with local governments, especially in terms of management and operation. The installation provides basic necessities for the average soldier, sailor, airman, marine, and their families, while maintaining services and space for civilians and uniformed employees to work, live, and play. Similar to local government’s interaction with its citizenry, military installations have very close ties to their residents.

Military installations and municipalities often mirror one another in services they provide such as:

- Public safety
- Fire protection
- Waste collection
Because the services offered by both military installations and local governments are similar, the heads of the installation’s various departments should be encouraged to establish good working relationships and have open communication with their counterparts in local government. Two-way exchange of information will uncover important opportunities for sharing resources, saving costs, and improving the quality of life for all residents.

**Forms of Local Government**

Understanding the political background as well as the cultural, social, and economic situation of a neighboring jurisdiction is crucial to creating good working relationships. By learning about the form of local government in a given community, installation leaders can better understand key leaders of local government.

The form of government adopted by a jurisdiction usually depends upon the role of the state government and the degree of home-rule powers it grants to cities in running their own affairs. Typical types of local governments at the city level include:

- Strong Mayor
- Weak Mayor
- Mayor-Council
- Council-Manager
- Commission
Typical types of local governments at the county level include:

- Board of Commission
- Commission-Administrator
- Commission-County Executive

Each of these has its own unique strengths and weaknesses. No matter what form it takes, the local government holds important land use decision-making powers that influence development near military installations.

**City Government**

**Strong Mayor.** In many large cities, the mayor is elected to lead the city. The strong mayor has the authority to prepare and control administration of the budget, appoint and remove department heads, and direct the activities of city departments. The mayor may also have the power to appoint a chief administrative officer to assist in managing the local government.

**Weak Mayor.** This form of government is characterized by fragmented authority. The mayor has limited powers of appointment; a number of principal offices are filled by direct election or by the council. The mayor lacks authority to develop the budget and has little or no administrative control over operations.

**Mayor-Council.** The legislative body is elected either at-large, by ward or district, or by some combination of the two. For example, some members are at-large and others represent specific districts (See Figure 1).

The distinguishing characteristics of this form of city government are two-fold. First, the mayor is elected separately, and second, the Office of Mayor is designated as the formal head of the city government. Depending upon local laws, the powers of the mayor may vary greatly, from limited ceremonial duties to full-scale authority to appoint and remove department managers. The mayor may also have veto power over the city council.

**Council-Manager.** Council-Manager government vests the policy-making authority in the elected council (See Figure 1). The administration of the community resides with a professional manager who is appointed and removed by the council. The council, which is usually small, not only serves as the legislative body, but also provides political leadership. In most council-manager communities, the mayor is directly elected. The mayor’s formal powers are usually restricted to presiding over council meetings and making appointments to boards and commissions. As part of the council, the mayor usually votes as a regular member and has either limited veto power or none at all. In many council-manager communities, the mayor’s role as a political leader is expanding.

“Ceremonial relationships are just that, ceremonial. The mayor playing golf with the base commander doesn’t mean you have a good working relationship. It may mean nothing.”

—Former County Commissioner and Military Officer
Commission. Municipalities with a commission form of government elect commissioners to serve collectively as the policy-making body, and to serve individually as heads of various administrative departments such as public works or public safety. The municipal reform movement has led to the near demise of this type of local government. Its weaknesses are obvious, since few elected leaders possess the necessary requirements to operate large portions of a municipal organization.

**County Government**

**Board or Commission.** Most counties function with the traditional board or commission form of government, which has a central governing body often referred to as a “board of commissioners” or “supervisors.” As a rule, the board or commission selects one of its members to serve as the presiding officer whose authority is limited to presiding over commission meetings. Frequently, board members or committees oversee or head county departments responsible to the commission. No single administrator supervises county operations. The commission shares administrative and policy-making responsibilities with a number of independently elected officials such as the sheriff, district attorney, county clerk, treasurer, tax collector, recorder, assessor, and coroner. In addition, state or county law may establish numerous independent boards and authorities to administer various county-level programs such as health, hospitals, housing, parks, and libraries.

**Commission-Administrator.** The Commission-Administrator form of government has become increasingly popular. The administrator may be called a county
manager, chief administrative officer, administrative assistant, or some other title. The difference among these positions is the amount of power granted to the administrator. A **county manager** holds most of the same type of authority as a city manager, and is appointed and removed by the board of commissioners. A **chief administrative officer** has some, but not all, of the powers of a city manager, and is usually appointed and removed in the same way. The **administrative assistant** is similar to the chief administrative officer, but ordinarily does not appoint or supervise heads of departments. The number of independently elected county officials and appointed boards varies.

**Commission-County Executive.** This form of government has legislative and executive branches with the chief executive being elected by the voters. The commission operates as the legislative body in much the same way as the council in a Strong Mayor form of government. The executive prepares the budget, appoints department heads, and administers county operations, frequently with the assistance of an appointed professional administrator. Often, there are fewer independently elected officers under this form than under the two mentioned above.

*Please see Appendix A: Working with Local Governments Checklist at the end of this guide for more information on how to collaborate with local governments.*

**Mechanisms Inside Local Governments**

The typical community in the U.S. is served by many different official entities that do not necessarily have common boundaries. School boundaries rarely coincide with city or county boundaries. A city may be located in parts of two or more counties. A park district may serve several villages. The city police department may take the lead on law enforcement, but the 911 calls may be handled by the county sheriff’s department. A planning authority may serve several counties and all of local governments within those counties.

**Planning and Zoning**

In addition to establishing a relationship with the leaders of a local government, it is important for military installation managers to know the city planner and the planning and zoning laws of nearby communities. Planning is an official function of local government, and it plays an important role in overall future development within a locale. A planner will most likely be the point person regarding the layout of the city or county and its effects on the military installation. When planners from overlapping or adjacent jurisdictions share information and jointly develop creative alternatives to current policies, potential conflict can be avoided and everyone can benefit. Likewise, a military installation manager and a city planner can establish a similar type of professional relationship.

"An effective working relationship must be tiered and institutionalized at multiple levels." – ICMA Board Member/ City Manager

"The city’s plans are out there for the next 20 years. Everything is public. But I don’t know what the [base] is going to do tomorrow." – City Manager, adjacent to military base
Land Use Decision-Making Powers

The U.S. Constitution makes no reference to cities, counties, villages, or towns. Local governments are entities of the state in which they are located, and their authority is derived entirely from state law. Their powers may be enlarged, abridged, or completely withdrawn by the state legislature, except where home-rule provisions in state constitutions vest them with local sovereignty independent of the legislature. While states determine local government authorities, they often work cooperatively with local agencies in administering policy areas, including economic development, human services, land use, transportation, natural resources, and the environment.

Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA) Guidebook

Encroachment from incompatible civilian development is a problem that can affect the operation and mission of military installations across the nation. In an effort to encourage compatible civilian development near military installations, the Office of Economic Adjustment has released a Practical Guide describing the roles of local, state and federal governments in conducting collaborative local land use planning and the various tools and methods that can be utilized by state and local governments to prevent encroachment. Working together, military installations and local decision making bodies can enact policies and guidance that are beneficial to both parties.

To view the guide book, visit: www.oea.gov/oeawebo.nsf/PG?readform

The degree of power a local government possesses is further defined by state courts. Most states adhere to the so-called Dillon’s Rule (See Page 13) when construing the powers of local governments. A local government cannot perform any act, make any contract, or incur any obligation not authorized by law.

When dealing with the local government, especially in zoning and planning processes, it is important that military installation managers know a state’s established laws governing the functions and activities of city and county governments. If an installation manager is dealing with two different municipalities, it is wise for him or her to understand the structure and functions of each individual municipality in relation to the state.
**Home Rule**

Many states provide **home rule** as an optional method for organizing and empowering municipal governments. An increasing number of states have extended the home-rule option to counties. Under the provisions of home-rule, communities are usually given the authority to draft, adopt, and amend their own charters or governmental structures, and to exercise local government powers within the limits imposed by the constitution and general laws of the state. These limits are usually much broader for home-rule governments.

The essence of home-rule is recognition of the local authority to act without prior specific legislative authorization. That authority is reinforced by the limitation of state power to enact laws regarding matters falling within the home-rule grant. Although home-rule cities and counties ordinarily possess more authority over local affairs than do non-home-rule governments, they are still subject to considerable state control.

**Economic and Community Development**

Major participants in development are market players, government officials, and advocates of community and private interests. **Market players** include landowners, developers, builders, financiers, businesspeople, and others seeking to profit from development by (1) selling and buying land, or (2) financing, building, and marketing houses and business facilities.

---

Dillon’s Rule (named for Judge John F. Dillon) states that local governments have only three types of powers:

- Those granted in express words
- Those necessarily or fairly implied in or incident to the powers expressly granted
- Those essential to the declared objects and purposes of the corporation, not simply convenient, but indispensable

The second part of the rule states that if there is a question as to whether or not a power has been conferred on a local government, then the power is deemed to NOT have been conferred.

Source:

**Government officials** include elected and appointed officials at the federal, state, regional, and local levels. These individuals frame laws, invest public funds, administer regulations, and make decisions on plans and projects while seeking to maintain their power bases and appointments.

Advocates for **community and private interests** include:

- Neighborhood representatives
- Environmental groups
- Economic development organizations
- Farmers’ groups
- Taxpayers’ coalitions
- Other associations promoting various social and political goals

All of these groups view development in light of their group’s particular values, and advocate for government development decisions that will support their aims. Some of the participants in land use and development can be more powerful than others, and can dominate the direction of growth.

Development is controlled by rules that include constitutional provisions, laws, and regulations that govern planning, spending, taxing powers, and governmental decision-making procedures. While elected officials and the courts are the final arbiters of these rules, planners are the ones who must understand the legal, fiscal, and procedural checks and balances that shape rule-making and strategies.

Because the process and its outcomes are ultimately governed by the local democratic governmental system, angry speakers at a public hearing and telephone calls from constituents may carry more weight with elected officials than statistical analyses, impact assessments, and other supporting documentation for a proposed course of action. This is why it is important for military installation managers to educate the public and elected officials about the direct benefits military installations afford municipalities, as well as issues concerning installations. Various groups, including community and business, are important allies in the battle to ward off encroachment.
Environmental Advisory Boards and Citizen Interest Groups

Many local governments have environmental advisory boards consisting of local citizens whose appointments usually last a few years. The boards advise the local government and can delve into subjects such as public health and safety, environmental protection and quality, waste management and recycling, and pollution control. If there is an environmental advisory board in the locality bordering the military installation, the military installation manager and his or her staff should communicate with the board members on a regular basis, especially when confronting encroachment issues. Military staff should request the opportunity to present supporting materials to the board. The environmental advisory board needs to be aware of encroachment problems if they exist, and could be an important ally in creating a buffer zone between the military installation and the community.

UNDERSTANDING THE COMMUNITY

Constituents and Groups

Community building is the art and science of proactively involving citizens in important issues surrounding the military installation. Community building requires a spirit of inclusiveness. Community members should feel they are part of the decision-making process, especially when they are being impacted by an issue. The objective of community outreach is to give all stakeholders timely, accurate, and appropriate information about the issue, as well as an opportunity to have a voice in the process. Building a relationship with the community
(including neighborhoods, businesses, schools, and other affected groups) helps secure the public’s confidence and trust in the military, and can help avert confrontation should problems or issues arise. Through effective outreach efforts, military installation managers may find and create allies in the community.

A manager should not wait too long to speak with the community. He or she may discover that someone with a conflicting agenda has framed the issue first, thereby making it difficult for the manager to take the initiative.

Military installation managers should encourage staff to seek out and make presentations to community groups such as the Chamber of Commerce, neighborhood boards and associations, civic groups such as Rotary Club and Kiwanis, and planning and zoning boards. Since important and active community groups vary from region to region, it is necessary to be proactive in searching out the active groups in a specific community. Military installation managers have an obligation to educate citizens on projects that may impact their lives before the project begins.

It is important to remember that local government managers are significant figures not only in their governments, but also in their cities or counties as a whole. People who fill the top manager or administrator positions in cities and counties are community leaders in three respects:

1. They help shape the agenda of the local government, and propose policies for adoption by elected officials.

2. As both individuals and representatives of their governments, they interact with people outside of government and contribute to the overall life of the community.

3. They shape the orientation of their governmental organization to the needs of the citizens. They consider how the organization treats citizens and how it facilitates citizen participation in governmental affairs.

Military installation leaders need to have a firm understanding of how decisions made by local governments directly affect the installation’s mission. The long-term sustainability of the military installation will depend largely on installation leaders’ ability to effectively communicate and resolve conflict with local and regional entities.
State-Sponsored Regional Military Organizations

Certain states have developed organizations to strengthen relationships with military installations and handle specific issues such as encroachment. Most of these organizations exist as a result of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and the detrimental economic impact that can result from the loss of a military installation. If a state does not have such an organization, local officials and the installation commander can work together to encourage the state governor’s office to create one.

Some states that have created such groups are:

Arizona

Arizona established the Military Affairs Commission in March 2004 to monitor development surrounding military installations. The commission is charged with making recommendations to the governor on executive, legislative, and federal actions necessary to sustain and expand Arizona’s network of military installations, training and testing ranges, and associated airspace.

Florida

Enterprise Florida, a statewide public-private partnership, created the Florida Defense Alliance in 1998 to position Florida, along with its military installations and their host communities, to successfully support and enhance DoD transformation initiatives. The alliance is comprised of designated representatives from each local base retention and re-use committee, local military installation commanders, state agency liaisons, and a number of individuals and groups with statewide perspectives and national experience.

Georgia

The state of Georgia’s Military Affairs Coordinating Committee is charged with improving installation residents’ quality of life and the mission value of the state’s thirteen military installations. The committee works to reduce encroachment, improve business practices, and help secure resources to improve infrastructure.

North Carolina

The North Carolina Advisory Commission on Military Affairs was created in 2002. It advises the governor on strengthening the state’s relationship with the military and protecting the state’s existing military infrastructure, particularly with respect to urban and rural encroachment issues. The commission is made up of 30 members who serve two-year terms.
Texas

The state of Texas created the office of the Texas Military Preparedness Commission to develop a proactive statewide strategy to assist defense-dependent communities in the prevention of future base closures and realignments, and to assist defense-dependent communities in preparing for the next generation of military in Texas. The commission is also charged with offering assistance to defense-related businesses.

Legislation

Certain states across the United States have passed legislation to ward off encroachment around their military bases. The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) produced a report that delves into which states have taken such action, and provides specifics on the legislation. In addition, the National Governors Association’s report, State Strategies to Address Encroachment at Military Installations, can be downloaded from their Web site (www.nga.org/cda/files/032403MILITARY.pdf), or refer to the NCSL Primer, Working with State Legislators. Finally, to view a map indicating which states are actively pursuing range sustainment legislation, visit https://www.denix.osd.mil/denix/Public/Library/Sustain/Ranges/StateLeg/usamap.html.

Sustainability Partnerships

Because the urbanized world has encroached on military installations and wildlife habitats, environmental and military communities are forging new partnerships to create buffer zones that give the military a safe distance from residences and businesses during testing and training exercises, while also safeguarding important wildlife habitats. For an extensive look at partnerships being formed between the military and environmental groups such as The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Trust for Public Land (TPL), Land Trust Alliance (LTA), and American Farmland Trust (AFT), please refer to the Primer on Working With Land Trusts.

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this guide is to offer suggestions and solutions for installation management when working with local governments. It is the responsibility of both parties to ensure that decisions being made are advantageous for both the installation and the community. By engaging with local government officials, both formally and informally, the result will be cohesive, mutually beneficial regulations that adequately represent what is best for the entire locality.
### Appendix A: Working with Local Governments Checklist*

| What is the local government structure? | ______ Strong Mayor  
| | ______ Weak Mayor  
| | ______ Mayor-Council  
| | ______ Council-Manager  
| | ______ Commission  
| | ______ Other: ______________________________ |
| Who are the key members of the local government and what is their contact information? | Mayor: ________________________________  
| | Council Members: ____________________________  
| | Commissioner: _____________________________  
| | Other: _____________________________ |
| Who are the local planners? | Set up a meeting with them to discuss the overall city/county plans. |
| Who actually makes land use decisions? |  
| Who are the active community and neighborhood groups? |  
| Who are the key members of the local media outlets? | Television station contacts: ___________________________  
| | Radio contacts: _____________________________  
| | Newspaper contacts: ___________________________  
| | Local Chamber of Commerce: ___________________________ |
| Is there a local environmental advisory board? If so, who is the contact? |  
| Who should receive updated installation news? | ______ Community groups  
| | ______ Key members of the local government  
| | ______ Local media contacts  
| | ______ Other: ______________________________ |

Professional Resources

APA—American Planning Association
1776 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202.872.0611
Fax: 202.872.0643
www.planning.org

TCF—The Conservation Fund
1655 N. Fort Myer Drive
Suite 1300
Arlington, Virginia 22209
Tel: 703-525-6300
Fax: 703-525-4610
www.conservationfund.org

CSG—Council of State Governments
Hall of States
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 401
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: 202.624.5460
Fax: 202.624.5452
www.csg.org

ICMA—International City/County Management Association
777 North Capitol Street, NE
Suite 500
Washington, DC 20002
Tel: 202.289.4262
Fax: 202.962.3500
www.icma.org

NCG—National Conference of State Legislatures
444 North Capitol Street, NW
Suite 515
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: 202.624.5400
Fax: 202.737.1069
www.ncsl.org

NGA—National Governors Association
Hall of States
444 N. Capitol Street
Washington, DC 20001
Tel: 202.624.5300
www.nga.org

NLC—National League of Cities
1301 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 550
Washington, DC 20004
Tel: 202.626.3000
Fax: 202.626.3043
www.nlc.org

U.S. Conference of Mayors
1620 Eye Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Tel: 202.293.7330
Fax: 202.293.2352
www.usmayors.org

AFT—American Farmland Trust
1200 18th Street NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202.331.7300
Fax: 202.659.8339
www.farmland.org
LTA—Land Trust Alliance
1331 H Street, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
Tel: 202.638.4725
Fax: 202.638.4730
www.lta.org

TNC—The Nature Conservancy
4245 North Fairfax Drive
Suite 100
Arlington, VA 22203
Tel: 703.841.4850
www.nature.org

TPL—The Trust for Public Land
116 New Montgomery Street
4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: 415.495.4014
Fax: 415.495.4103
www.tpl.org
This primer is one of a series designed in cooperation with DOD’s Range Sustainment Initiative to facilitate a better understanding among all stakeholders, including military installation leadership, state and local government officials, land trusts, and communities, of how each operates within the context of encroachment and sustainability decision making. It is our hope that this information will facilitate communication and collaboration among those stakeholders to discover ways to engage in compatible land use planning. The primers in this series provide tools and suggestions for establishing and maintaining effective relationships and partnerships to address the challenges of encroachment. By working together, these stakeholders can find mutually beneficial solutions to encroachment and other sustainability issues.

The initial primer series includes:

- Working with Local Governments: A Practical Guide for Installations
- Understanding and Coordinating with Military Installations: A Resource Guide for Local Governments
- Collaborative Land Use Planning: A Guide for Military Installations and Local Governments
- Working with State Legislators: A Guide for Military Installations and State Legislators

These primers are available online at www.denix.osd.mil/SustainableRanges

To obtain hard copies or for more information, contact:

Range Sustainment Outreach Coordinator
DUSD (I&E)
1225 South Clark Street, Suite 1500
Arlington, VA 22202
703-604-1890