



Neighbors Opposed to Privatization at Earle

www.orgsites.com/nj/nope

Suggested Questions to Ask Regarding Civilian Housing at NWS Earle

The Navy's Draft Environmental Impact Statement (D-EIS) report issued November 28, 2008, does not address several key issues. Below are sample questions NOPE suggests you ask your elected official or the Secretary of the Navy to answer before the Navy issues its final EIS.

1. How does adding 300 civilians to NWS Earle (with unimpeded access and no background checks) enhance the mission of NWS Earle and does not jeopardize national security?
2. Why would the Navy put families at RISK by allowing them to live less than 300' from ordnances and 200' from a toxic waste site?
3. Given the chosen access route to the housing, why does the Navy think its proposed new fencing system with two electronic openings will be sufficient to keep the base safe? Note: British National Garry McKinnon (recently charged with hacking into NWS Earle's computer system and disabling its network after 911) had no trouble stealing computer passwords given the existing security measures, including fencing, that were in place.
4. Why does the Navy think that privatization from 2010 to 2040, then demolition of units, will save any money? The capital outlay alone has already cost Congress \$8.16 million aimed at anti-terrorism and force protection to improve the existing guardhouse and fencing. This astonishing expenditure has occurred before any civilians have moved in.
5. Why hasn't the Navy considered the added stress and duties placed on its military personnel on base and the stress and financial burden the Navy will impose on its neighbors?
6. Why hasn't the Navy considered terminating the contract under the National Emergencies Act?
 - During any National Emergency declared by Congress or the President pursuant to Title II of the National Emergencies Act 9-14-1976 (P.L.S4-412), 90 stat.1255, the Government shall have the right to suspend or terminate this outlease, at any time, without prior notice, and regardless of any lack of breach by Lessee of any of the terms and conditions of the outlease.
 - From September 23, 2001, by Executive Order 13224 until today, President Bush has evoked the National Emergencies Act (50 USC 16229d).



Neighbors Opposed to Privatization at Earle

www.orgsites.com/nj/nope

- The Secretary of the Navy has a duty and obligation under the law to promote the national defense or take action that would be in the public interest. Allowing civilians with no security clearance access on NWS Earle does neither.
7. Scenario: An Al Qaeda cell manages to gain access to Laurelwood (heavily armed), takes several residents hostage, inflicts many civilian casualties and manages to attack the base, causing widespread devastation in neighboring areas. Would the Navy be liable for all costs associated with the attack and aftermath cleanup, civil law suits, etc. because they were forewarned what might arise when they rented Laurelwood housing units to civilians?
 8. Scenario: Children and adults develop long-term health problems associated with living in such close proximity to 29 Superfund cleanup sites. What liabilities would the Navy face when they knowingly put families at risk?
 9. When the homes are marketed to the public will the Navy or Laurelwood LLC be responsible to fully disclose the risks attached to renting (e.g., security, operating ammo depots, 29 Superfund cleanup sites)?
 10. Why does the Navy, with an operating budget in the billions, feel that two small towns, Colts Neck and Tinton Falls, should bail it out of a bad business deal? Both towns' operating budgets per year are less than the asking price for a Laurelwood, LLC buyout. With the nation's economic situation in free fall how, can the Navy burden its neighbors with such an enormous debt?