



THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR FEDERAL POLICY RESEARCH

419 New Jersey Avenue, SE, Washington, D.C. 20003 202-546-3700
fax: 202-546-2390 e-mail: randsell@calinst.org web: <http://www.calinst.org>

California Capitol Hill Bulletin

Volume 12, Bulletin 8 – April 7, 2005

To expand communications between Washington and California, the California Institute provides periodic faxed bulletins regarding current activity on Capitol Hill which directly impacts our state. Bulletins are published weekly during sessions of Congress, and occasionally during other periods.

COALITION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT GROUPS OPPOSE MTBE WAIVER

A broad coalition of ten local government organizations has sent a letter to the members of the House Energy and Commerce Committee opposing the inclusion of an MTBE (methyl tertiary butyl ether) liability waiver in the Energy bill. The group consists of: The National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Towns and Townships, the American Water Works Association, the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies, the National Water Resources Association, the Association of California Water Agencies, the Western Coalition of Arid States, and the American Public Works Association.

The House Energy bill, now being marked up by the Energy and Commerce Committee, contains a provision that would exempt MTBE manufacturers from liability if the product is found harmful. MTBE is a fuel additive that is used as an oxygenate in gasoline. Although it makes gasoline burn more cleanly, MTBE has contaminated drinking water supplies in several areas of California, including Santa Monica and Lake Tahoe, as well as in other states. Its continued use in California has been banned.

The Coalition letter argues that the provision constitutes a “huge unfunded mandate” on local governments and consumers. The groups cite experts that conservatively estimate that the clean up costs from MTBE contamination will be \$29 billion.

The MTBE liability exemption was included in the House’s Energy bill last Congress. The provision, however, was opposed in the Senate and the resulting stalemate was one of the reasons an Energy bill was not acted on before the 108th Congress adjourned. The MTBE liability waiver provision is expected to remain a sticking point during consideration of the Energy bill this year.

The House Energy and Commerce Committee is expected to complete its mark up of the Energy bill next week.

CONTENTS:

Coalition of Local Government Groups Oppose MTBE Waiver	1
Members Circulating Letter re NASA Ames Research Center Funding	2
Judiciary Subcommittee Holds Digital Music Oversight Hearing	2
California Council on Base Support and Retention Releases Report; <i>California: The Key to Transforming America’s Military</i>	3
Senate Homeland Security Formula Markup Moved to Next Week	3
House Subcommittee Examines Brownfields Status	4
Senate and House Committees Hold Head Start Hearings	5
Bush Administration Announces New Rules for Broadening No Child Left Behind Act Flexibility, Citing California Efforts	7
PPIC Releases Study of English Learners in California Schools	7
Senate Indian Affairs Committee Examines Lytton Tribe’s Bid for Urban Casino in San Pablo	7
U.S., California Wine Sales Up In 2004	8
California Institute Publishes Special Report on State’s Base Closure History and 2005 Closure Round Process	9

MEMBERS CIRCULATING LETTER RE NASA AMES RESEARCH CENTER FUNDING

Reps. Anna Eshoo (Atherton), Zoe Lofgren (San Jose), and Mike Honda (San Jose) are circulating for signature a letter in support of funding for the NASA Ames Research Center, which is facing significant spending reductions this year.

Addressed to Chairman Frank Wolf and Ranking Member Alan Molohan of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Science, State, Justice, and Commerce, the letter asks support “in funding the core competencies that are the basis for NASA Ames Research Center and its critical contributions to our nation’s future.” Those core competencies include astrobiology, advanced supercomputing, intelligent adaptive systems, entry systems, and air traffic management systems. The letter states that “All but entry systems are uniquely resident at NASA Ames, and they represent the critical skills, facilities and people that are needed to meet NASA’s mission, including the Vision for Space Exploration.” It adds that the proposed cuts will “severely and irrevocably harm” the center’s ability to help fulfill NASA’s vision and may lead to a “financial disaster.”

Specifically, the letter suggests funding needed to address shortfalls, including \$23 million in astrobiology to create a level playing field to allow NASA Ames astrobiologists to compete effectively, \$40 million for Basic Research in New Technology stem erosion of staff from aeronautics, intelligent systems, nanotechnology and thermal protection systems; and \$60 million to restore funding for life sciences research.

Offices of Members who may wish to sign the letter should contact Tim Carey with Rep. Eshoo (tim.carey@mail.house.gov or 5-8104). Deadline April 7.

JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE HOLDS DIGITAL MUSIC OVERSIGHT HEARING

The House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property held an oversight hearing on Wednesday, April 6 on “Digital Music Interoperability and Availability.” The following witnesses testified: Mark Cooper, Director of Research, Consumer Federation of America; Ray Gifford, President, The Progress & Freedom Foundation; Dr. William Pence, Chief Technology Officer, Napster; and Michael Bracy, Policy Director, Future of Music Coalition .

Mr. Gifford testified that because the digital music market was still nascent and emerging, with different platforms, file formats, and digital rights management systems competing for dominance, Congress should be wary of attempting to establish one standard for interoperability. With that in mind, he set out three long-term goals: “first, protect the . . . incentives to innovate and compete for, not just in, the market; second, allow open and closed platform business models to compete; and, third, permit the freedom to use digital rights management technology so digital music will be brought to market.”

Dr. Pence also cautioned against government intervention in the still emerging digital music field, stating: “Government intervention in the innovation business can lead to politicizing and inhibiting such innovation, rather than allowing the marketplace, based on actual demand, to select “winners” that must continue to provide viable solutions or lose their market — deservedly — to the next great offering that someone develops in his or her garage or corporate lab.” On the other hand, he endorsed Chairman Lamar Smith’s and Ranking Member Howard Berman’s (North Hollywood) conclusion that “Congress has a critical role to play in facilitating the legitimate online music marketplace, by modernizing the Copyright Act,” particularly, as it relates to music publishing rights and royalties.

Testimony of all the witnesses can be obtained through the Committee’s website at:

<http://www.judiciary.house.gov> .

CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON BASE SUPPORT AND RETENTION RELEASES REPORT; CALIFORNIA: THE KEY TO TRANSFORMING AMERICA'S MILITARY

In anticipation of the upcoming Base Realignment and Closure round, on Thursday, April 7, 2005, the California Council on Base Support and Retention released its final report on the military in California. Included in the 73 page report are the Council's findings and recommendations to Governor Schwarzenegger, a comprehensive inventory of California's principal military installations, and a detailed analysis of California's unique military strengths. Additionally, the report presents the Council's suggestions for best approaching the 2005 BRAC round.

Governor Schwarzenegger hailed the report as an important step in the state's preparation for BRAC. "As this report points out, California is vitally important to our nation's defense strategy," said the Governor. "California's federal, state and local leaders must continue to work together to ensure the BRAC process takes our state's unique advantages into consideration. This report will help accomplish that mission," he continued.

The Council, co-chaired by Leon Panetta, ex-Congressman and former Clinton chief-of-staff, and Donna Tuttle, a former Commerce Department official during the Ronald Reagan Administration, was created by Governor Schwarzenegger in November 2004 to better prepare California for the 2005 BRAC round. As part of its mandate, the Council held six public meetings throughout the state to hear the concerns and comments of California's military community. With the final report to the Governor, the Council has fulfilled its duties; however, all 19 members of the Council have agreed to continue serving through the entire 2005 BRAC round in order to insure that military installations within the state are as prepared as possible.

The Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, will publish a list of recommended bases for closure and realignment by May 16, 2005. After that, the nine-member BRAC Commission will have approximately four months to review, revise, and alter those suggestions. By September 8, the Commission must submit its modified list of closures and realignments to the President for his approval. If the President approves, he passes the closure and realignment recommendations on to Congress for final approval.

To view the full report, see the following link: <http://www.omas.ca.gov/Retention/pdf/report.pdf> Additionally, the California Institute recently published its own report addressing California's base closure history and the upcoming BRAC round. That report is available at <http://www.calinst.org/defense.htm> .

SENATE HOMELAND SECURITY FORMULA MARKUP MOVED TO NEXT WEEK

After postponing legislative action by one week due to key Senators' attendance of funeral services for Pope John Paul II, the Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee is expected to mark up S. 21 during the week of April 11, 2005. Legislation sponsored by Committee Chair Susan Collins (ME) and ranking Democrat Joe Lieberman (CT) would alter the formula structure for funding federal homeland security grants that benefit state and local first responders.

Although new Collins bill language has not been made official, it reportedly will include a slight compromise compared to last year's hard-line stance on small state minimums in the grant programs. An unusually large 0.75 percent minimum in the USA Patriot Act's formula provides far more funding to some smaller, rural states as compared to large and urban states. (In 2004, California received \$5 per capita from the main grant program, whereas Wyoming received \$38.) According to initial reports, the 2005 Collins bill revision will propose a 0.55 percent floor, rather than the current 0.75 percent level.

However, it appears likely that the Collins bill will retain the current, unusual distribution method, whereby all states receive a floor funding amount (including states for which much of the funds are

excess) and then all states receive additional funds on top of the excess. Distributing funds via a more standard small-state minimum (whereby small-state funds are increased only to and not beyond the minimum amount) would go a long way toward quieting criticism of the formula's excesses.

Last year, both houses of Congress approved legislation to rewrite grant formulas, but the issue could not be resolved in conference before adjournment. In 2004, legislation by House Homeland Security Committee Chairman Christopher Cox (Newport Beach), entitled the "Faster and Smarter Funding for First Responders Act," proposed to alter the frequently-criticized formula for allocating federal homeland security funding to state and local first responder agencies that includes an unusually large 0.75 percent minimum, providing a more typical common state minimum share of 0.25 percent, with a higher minimum for states with an international border. The Bush Administration has weighed in as supporting most elements of the Cox approach. Although it still retain a state-level funding minimum regardless of threat or risk, the altered formula provisions of the House bill would likely lessen the funding gap between large and small states.

Last year, Senator Collins' bill included a complicated homeland security grant restructuring, which would have resulted in fewer dollars flowing through the discretionary, threat-based, Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) program and more through the formula grant, known as the State Homeland Security Grant Program (SHSGP). (California typically receives 8 percent of SHSGP and nearly 20 percent of UASI funds.) Last year's Senate bill proposed retaining the current-law floor of 0.75 percent, and also required that an additional amount, above the 0.75 percent per-state floor, be distributed to every state (even those already receiving a large windfall by just reaching that 0.75 percent mark).

Reportedly, the Collins bill also will distribute funding in part according to population density at the state level. (Initial reports indicate that minimums in densely populated states might be pegged higher than the bill's 0.55 percent level.) Because terror attacks are unlikely to be directed at entire states, but rather at focused areas, distributing federal terrorism prevention and response funding according to population density would likely misallocate a substantial portion of the funds. For example, using a population density calculation at the state level would direct more than twice as many dollars per capita to the Providence area (Rhode Island is the second most densely populated state) than to New York City (where the state ranks sixth for density. For the same reason, Providence residents would be counted 5 times as much by population as either Los Angeles or San Francisco, because California ranks 12th largest in population density. New York, Los Angeles, and San Francisco are far more densely populated than Providence but are located in less densely populated states – significant portions of California are uninhabited desert or mountain areas.

In the House, Homeland Security Chairman Cox will hold a hearing regarding first responder legislation on April 14, 2005.

For more information on homeland security grant programs and on California's share thereof, see "Federal Formula Grants and California: Homeland Security" -- one of a series of joint publications by the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) and the California Institute reviewing state's share of formula funds -- available at: <http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?i=481> .

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE EXAMINES BROWNFIELDS STATUS

The House Government Reform Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census held a hearing on Tuesday, April 5 entitled "Lands of Lost Opportunity: What Can Be Done to Spur Redevelopment at America's Brownfield Sites?" Brownfields are abandoned parcels of property spread across the United States that contain substances that contaminate the environment and, therefore, are not desirable for redevelopment.

The Subcommittee heard from a number of witnesses: Thomas Dunne, Deputy Assistant Administrator in the Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response, Environmental Protection Agency; John Stephenson, Director, Natural Resources and Environment, Government Accountability Office; The Honorable Don Plusquellic, President, U.S. Conference of Mayors; James E. Maurin, Chairman, International Council of Shopping Centers, and Board Member, The Real Estate Roundtable; Jonathon Phillips, Senior Director, Cherokee Investment Partners, LLC; and Douglas Steidl, President, The American Institute of Architects.

Mr. Stephenson discussed GAO's report "Brownfield Redevelopment: Stakeholders Cite Additional Measures That Could Complement EPA's Efforts to Clean Up and Redevelop Properties." (GAO-05-94, December 2, 2004). The EPA provides grants to state and local governments and others for site assessments, job training, revolving loans, cleanups, and for assisting state efforts. GAO surveyed stakeholders on EPA's contribution to brownfield cleanup and redevelopment. It recommended that EPA develop additional measures of the Brownfields Program's achievements and consider stakeholder suggestions for improving and complementing the program. Mr. Stephenson testified that the EPA agreed with the report's recommendations and has begun steps to implement them. Among its recommendations are revising a restrictive provision of the Brownfields Act that could expand the number of eligible grant applicants, as well as make changes to address the underutilization of revolving loan fund grants. Finally, GAO found that stakeholders generally supported a federal brownfields tax credit, which would allow developers to offset a portion of their federal income tax with remediation expenditures, to complement EPA's Brownfields Program and encourage brownfields redevelopment.

Administrator Dunne detailed EPA's Brownfields Program, including the grants and the landowner liability protections it can provide. He also addressed GAO's report in his testimony, stating that EPA is working to develop and implement performance measures that will gauge the impact of EPA funding on cleanup and redevelopment. He also testified that EPA supports GAO's recommendation that legislation be enacted which revises the Brownfields Law to eliminate statutory restrictions on pre-January 2002 eligibility of purchasers of brownfields property. Finally, EPA also supports closely monitoring revolving loan fund grants to determine if they have been underutilized and what changes, if any, are needed to encourage their use.

The testimony of all the witnesses can be obtained through the Committee's website at:

<http://www.reform.house.gov> .

SENATE AND HOUSE COMMITTEES HOLD HEAD START HEARINGS

Dual hearings held by Senate and House education panels on the federal Head Start program on April 5, 2005 examined the effectiveness of Head Start center financial practices that have recently been called into question. Witnesses from the early education community gave their assessment of Head Start in light of recent financial management lapses (found in a Government Accountability Office (GAO) report) among facilities throughout the country. Greater financial accountability to prevent future Head Start finance management abuses are likely to be included in a forthcoming Head Start reauthorization proposal.

Head Start, a \$6.8 billion comprehensive early health and education program for low income children and families serves 919,000 kids through 1,680 locally run Head Start grant operations, that provide either home-based or center-based care. Head Start grantees receive federal dollars directly and are required to abide by a series of federal financial and instructional guidelines in order to be eligible for grants. Funds are generally allotted to states based on their share of poor children below age 5, although states do not usually play a large role in Head Start program management. California's share of Head Start grants in 2003 (13.67%) tracks its share of poor children below age 5.

The program has come under criticism lately from Republican education leaders who suggest that Head Start does not go far enough in meeting its education objectives and closing the achievement gap between Head Start children and their more affluent peers. What is more, several Head Start centers were brought under scrutiny after reports of financial abuse at those centers raised concerns about the integrity of Head Start. The only California case where alleged fraud was discovered was at a center in Stockton.

The GAO's assessment revealed a number of financial weaknesses in the program and incidences of noncompliance with federal standards. The report recommended more rigorous methods of oversight by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) to develop risk assessment indicators and the introduction of greater competition for grants once low performing grantees have been identified. In his opening remarks, John Boehner (OH), Chair of the House Education and Workforce (E&W) Committee expressed his concerns for lack of competition in HHS' selection of Head Start centers, "the federal government has essentially granted monopoly power to some Head Start operators", said Chair Boehner, "and as often happens in monopolies, that power has been abused."

In her remarks to E&W, panelist Olivia Golden of the Urban Institute commented that 15 percent of Head Start centers exhibited serious financial or programmatic problems. She agreed with GAO's findings, but stated that Head Start's current competition standards were effective. The Committee's Ranking Democrat, George Miller (Martinez) was skeptical of the degree of urgency surrounding Head Start, noting that the GAO report found most Head Start programs to be effectively managed. Mr. Miller supported the current standards and procedures already in place, however, he believed that implementation of those standards was lacking.

Head Start was last reauthorized in 1998 and was scheduled for renewal in 2003. Ideological disagreements over a White House plan to shift greater Head Start accountability to the states, however, brought the reauthorization effort to a halt. A Republican written bill in the House would have introduced a pilot project, giving certain states greater authority in the management and coordination of Head Start programs. Democrats oppose the plan because they say it would reduce federal oversight, dilute more stringent federal standards, and transform the program into a block grant.

In an apparent shift in stance, both Chair Boehner and Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions (HELP) Subcommittee on Education and Early Childhood Development Chair Lamar Alexander (TN) expressed a desire to work with Democrats to find common ground on the topic of Head Start operation and coordination. Chair Alexander at a hearing on the same day suggested that a pilot project would not be contained in any Senate reauthorization proposal, "I don't sense most senators want that" said Sen. Alexander. Chair Boehner's opening statement also included some support for a bipartisan solution to the current standstill. Referring to the Head Start bill in the House that passed by one vote in 2003, Boehner stated "In those areas where there was disagreement, I'm more than willing to look at alternatives . . . if they might be effective."

No comprehensive reauthorization bills on Head Start have been introduced this year, however Sen. Michael Enzi (WY), Senate HELP's Chair has indicated that Head Start is one of his committee's priorities.

For more information on the House Education and Workforce committee hearing on Financial Accountability in the Head Start Early Childhood Program, visit the committee website at <http://edworkforce.house.gov/> . For more information on the Senate HELP hearing entitled "Head Start: Ensuring Dollars Benefit the Children" visit the committee website at: http://help.senate.gov/bills/edu_72_bill.html . To view a copy of the GAO report, visit the GAO website: www.gao.gov/cgi-bin/getrpt?GAO-05-176 .

For a detailed discussion of how California fares under the Head Start formula program, see *Federal Formula Grants: Head Start*, a publication from a joint venture series with the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), available at <http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?i=469>

BUSH ADMINISTRATION ANNOUNCES NEW RULES FOR BROADENING NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT FLEXIBILITY, CITING CALIFORNIA EFFORTS

On Thursday, April 7, 2005, U.S. Department of Education Secretary Margaret Spellings announced new rules for implementing the No Child Left Behind Act. Under the new rules, states that can show rising student achievement and narrowing achievement gaps will be granted additional flexibility and policy implementation alternatives.

Touting a “More Workable, ‘Common Sense’ Approach To Implementing NCLB,” the new guidelines were given the title “Raising Achievement: A New Path for No Child Left Behind. The policies will reportedly focus on four principles: 1) Ensuring students are learning -- raising overall achievement and closing the achievement gap; 2) Making the school system accountable -- including all students in all schools and districts in the state are part of the accountability system and are tested; 3) Ensuring information is accessible and parents have options -- informing parents in a timely manner about the quality of their child's school and their school choice options and identifying schools and districts that need to improve; and 4) Improving teacher quality: Providing parents and the public with accurate information on the quality of their local teaching force and implementing a rigorous system for ensuring teachers are highly qualified.

Singling out California for its efforts, Secretary Spellings said that “States seeking additional flexibility will get credit for the work they have done to reform their education systems as a whole.” She said that states could be rewarded with additional flexibility if they “have sound state education policies.” As the first example, she cited “Choosing policies that go above and beyond current law, such as assessing students annually in at least three high school grades, as Texas, California, and Colorado do.”

For the Secretary’s remarks, the guidelines, and additional information, visit <http://www.ed.gov/> .

PPIC RELEASES STUDY OF ENGLISH LEARNERS IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

On April 7, 2005, the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) released a new report entitled “English Learners In California Schools.” Using a variety of analytic tools, the authors, Christopher Jepsen and Shelley de Alth, provide a comprehensive picture of California’s more than 1 million English Learner (EL) students.

Whereas California represents about 12 percent of the nation’s population, California’s schools house more than 40 percent of the country’s EL students. Particularly because EL students factor into whether schools meet federal standards imposed under the No Child Left Behind Act, their large presence in the California school system presents a number of difficult challenges.

The full report is available at the PPIC website, <http://www.ppic.org/main/publication.asp?i=487> .

SENATE INDIAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE EXAMINES LYTTON TRIBE’S BID FOR URBAN CASINO IN SAN PABLO

On Tuesday, the Senate Special Committee on Indian Affairs conducted a hearing to discuss the complex and controversial situation concerning the right of the Lytton Band of Indians to construct and operate an urban casino in San Pablo. The Committee, chaired by Senator John McCain (AZ), organized the hearing at the request of Senator Dianne Feinstein (CA), who introduced a bill, S. 113, that seeks to revoke parts of a legislative provision that granted the Lytton tribe special rights to construct the casino. Sen. Feinstein and Representative George Miller (Martinez), in whose the district the tribe plans to build

the casino, testified on opposite sides of the issue. Additional witnesses included George T. Skibine, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Economic Development for Indian Affairs at the Department of the Interior, The Honorable Sharon J. Brown, Councilmember for the City of San Pablo, The Honorable Margie Mejia, Chairperson for the Lytton Rancheria, The Honorable Loni Hancock, a California State Assembly Member from the 14th District, and The Honorable Mark Macarro, Chairman of the Pechango Band of Luiseno Indians.

The issue discussed in the hearing and addressed by Sen Feinstein's bill arises from a complex history concerning the Lytton Band's federal status and ambitions for a large, urban casino in the East Bay. For decades, the Lytton Band was denied federal status as an Indian tribe. In 1991, the federal judiciary restored federal recognition and the accompanying rights and sovereignty to the tribe. However, the court ruling included a specific provision precluding the Secretary of the Interior from restoring the tribe's ancestral land in Sonoma County; as a result the tribe had federal recognition, but was landless.

In an effort to remedy the situation, Representative Miller included a provision in the Omnibus Indian Advancement Act of 2000 that placed a San Pablo card room and adjacent parking lot in a trust, held by the Department of the Interior, for the Lytton Band. That provision also included language that backdated the establishment of the trust to 1988. The backdating allowed the Lytton Band to circumvent strict regulations contained in the Indian Gaming Regulations Act (IGRA) pertaining to casinos constructed on tribal lands that were acquired after 1988. Using their exceptional status, the Lytton Band reached an agreement with Governor Schwarzenegger to construct a casino with 5,000 slot machines, more than the MGM Grand in Las Vegas. Since then, the tribe has backed off that ambitious plan, promising to build a facility with no more than 1,000 slot machines. However, Sen. Feinstein insists that the tribe could, at any time, change plans and construct a much larger Class II or Class III casino on the same location.

According to Sen. Feinstein's testimony, S. 113 would only affect the backdating of the trust. The tribe would still retain its sovereignty and the San Pablo land granted to it. However, under S. 113, if the Lytton Band still wanted to pursue a casino, it would be forced to comply with all IGRA regulations, including strict provisions requiring state, federal and local approval for casino construction. Sen. Feinstein's bill has received support from President Bush. Rep. Miller argued that the backdating was justified considering the Lytton Band's unique situation, particularly its inability to reclaim its ancestral land in Sonoma County. Governor Schwarzenegger supports the tribe's position. Witnesses representing the tribe and the town of San Pablo stated that the construction of the casino would do much to alleviate the high unemployment, crime, and substance abuse within the town and the tribe itself. Other surrounding communities worry that a new casino would add to already severe congestion along the East Bay's I-80 corridor. Indian tribes throughout the state, many with existing casinos, believe the provision included in the 2000 bill establishes a dangerous precedent that threatens the stability of relations between the federal government and Indian tribes.

At the conclusion of the hearing, Sen. McCain stated that he would confer with his fellow committee members to see if there was enough support to hold a vote on S. 113.

U.S., CALIFORNIA WINE SALES UP IN 2004

An April 5, 2005 press release from the San Francisco-based Wine Institute states that the U.S. and California wine industries set records for quantities of wine shipped and revenue in 2004. According to a consultant's study, California vineyards shipped 522 million gallons of wine to domestic and international customers, up from 494 million in 2003. In the U.S. market alone, California wineries shipped 428 million gallons of wine, as opposed to 417 in 2003. The Wine Institute estimates that overall revenue for the wine industry reached \$15 billion in 2004, a record level. The growth in the market indicates that the

wine industry has nearly recovered from a large oversupply of grapes in 2002 that severely depressed prices and sales. Much of the industry's growth is due to higher sales of more-expensive premium wines priced at \$7 dollars or more per bottle. Sales of wines priced up to \$7 dollars were flat. Also, for the first time on record, red wine sales edged out white wine sales as a percentage of the market.

For more information, visit the Wine Institute's website at <http://www.wineinstitute.org/> .

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE PUBLISHES SPECIAL REPORT ON STATE'S BASE CLOSURE HISTORY AND 2005 CLOSURE ROUND PROCESS

By mid-May, the Department of Defense will announce which military bases it thinks should be closed as a part of the Base Realignment and Closure process. Expected to dwarf prior closure cycles, the 2005 BRAC round comes 10 years after a series of closures that targeted California for far more cuts than other states. Despite these past reductions, the military in California remains a significant economic force, and the state's base communities are girding for a potentially difficult year.

In that context, the California Institute has prepared a report, *California Past Base Closure Experiences and the 2005 BRAC Round*. The report and accompanying tables (in two files) seek to provide some background regarding past actions, current status, and future processes. We intend it to complement and support the report by the California Council on Base Support and Retention, released April 7, 2005 (see separate article in this *Bulletin*). The Institute's report, support material, and other base and defense information is now available on the Institute's new "Defense and Base Closures" page, at <http://www.calinst.org/defense.htm> .

- Full report in html format: <http://www.calinst.org/defense/base1a.htm>
- Full report pdf format: <http://www.calinst.org/defense/base1a.pdf>
- Supplementary tables: <http://www.calinst.org/defense/base1b.pdf> .