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I. Forward

The Poland-U.S. relationship is extraordinarily strong and based on common values and shared interests. During the Cold War, the affinity between the American people and the Polish people was a source of strength against the Soviet Union. Following the fall of the Soviet Union, the relationship between the American and Polish governments has been based on liberal, western institutions and an unwavering commitment to promoting democracy, respecting human rights, and valuing individual liberties. Like the United States, Poland is deeply engaged in strengthening transatlantic security and supporting NATO’s missions throughout Europe, the Middle East and elsewhere. Polish forces can be found throughout the world providing critical aid to the vulnerable and protecting western interests from threats both near and far. The relationship is, at its core, built on mutual respect, cooperation, and resilience.

U.S. President Donald Trump made clear in his landmark Warsaw address that “there are dire threats to our security and to our way of life... We will confront them... We will win.” A permanent presence of a U.S. armored division in Poland – on dedicated U.S. military installations – will help achieve that goal. Establishing such a force is necessary to present an unequivocal challenge and deterrence to Russia’s increasingly emboldened and dangerous posture that threatens Europe.

The U.S. 2017 National Security Strategy published by the Trump administration identifies Russian aggression as a main threat to the U.S. and global stability. Aggressive Russian actions, as seen in Georgia in 2008 and most recently in Ukraine in 2014 to the present, is destructive for international stability and international legal principles. As shown in Ukraine, Russia is capable of effectively deploying hybrid warfare through its annexation of Crimea, cyberattacks on Ukrainian infrastructure, and fueling separatists in eastern Ukraine. Russia is seeking to strengthen its political and economic relations with key European countries at the expense of U.S. national interests. An increased U.S. permanent presence in Poland will give America the strategic flexibility it needs to confront and deter these threats. It will help secure
American interests it shares with its European partners in the region and preserve western values of freedom and democracy.

Poland is one of just five NATO members to spend at least two percent of its GDP on defense. The Government of Poland understands that spending on NATO security needs to be a shared burden amongst the organization’s member states and Poland wants to do its part to enhance Europe’s security and protect the Eastern Flank. Poland welcomes the United States’ steadfast support for maintaining the country’s safety, security, and sovereignty and is facilitating rotational deployments of U.S. forces throughout the country. While Poland recognizes and commends the significant lengths the United States has taken to strengthen the bilateral relationship and foster greater collective security, it likewise believes that together, the United States and Poland can do more to create a stronger, more resilient alliance, through an enduring presence. The U.S. 2018 National Defense Strategy calls for the strengthening and evolving of alliances with American allies to deter or act to meet shared challenges;¹ the commitment of a U.S. permanent presence in Poland will strengthen and evolve the current U.S.-Poland relationship to meet shared challenges. Permanent U.S. troops in Poland will send a clear message to Russia of U.S. support for its Eastern European allies.

This proposal outlines the clear and present need for a permanent U.S. armored division deployed in Poland, Poland’s commitment to provide significant support that may reach – 1.5 – 2 billion USD – by establishing joint military installations and provide for more flexible movement of U.S. forces. Together, the United States and Poland can build an even stronger bond – one which guarantees the safety, security and freedom of its people for generations to come.

II. Poland-U.S. Relationship

Background

Poland has served as a key ally to the United States since its inception, with Polish military officers aiding the United States in the Revolutionary War, from Poland’s independence in 1918 to World War II and since the fall of the Soviet Union. Even during the Cold War, the Polish people were remarkably pro-Western, forming the Solidarity movement against Communism. After gaining its independence in 1989 from the USSR, Poland was able to reembrace western norms by holding free and fair elections and opened its economy, which transformed the country.

In a September 2017 meeting with then-Polish Minister of National Defence Antoni Macierewicz, U.S. Secretary of Defense James Mattis said of Poland, “...Today, [Poland is a] valued member of NATO, and Poland leads by example. And an American-led NATO battle group, with troops from the United Kingdom and Romania, stands with your nation that came to our aid in 1776. So the work to protect freedom continues, as we stand together against any threat from the East, two countries that are bound by democratic values and by the NATO alliance. And our government here in Washington notes proudly that Poland continues to meet the NATO pledge, leading by example.”

The U.S. State Department describes Poland as “a stalwart ally in Central Europe and one of the United States’ strongest partners on the continent in fostering transatlantic security and prosperity regionally, throughout Europe, and the world.” Poland was part of the first round of NATO enlargement, having joined in 1999, and has supported NATO’s mission of promoting democratic values and guaranteeing the freedom and security of its allied members. Poland is one of only five NATO members to spend two percent of its GDP on defense. To this end, Poland adopted legislation that expands this level to
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2.5 percent of GDP by 2030. Additionally, Poland regularly spends more than 20 percent of defense budget on modernization, what provides healthy structure of the overall budget. Poland took a further step in advancing Western values by joining the European Union in 2004. U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs A. Wess Mitchell, wrote in his 2016 book he co-authored with Jakub Grygiel, entitled, The Unquiet Frontier, noted, “For the foreseeable future, the overwhelming focus of U.S. policy in the [Central and Eastern Europe] region should be the deepening of the U.S.-Polish security relationship both diplomatically and militarily.”

President Trump emphasized Poland’s strategic importance and recommitted U.S. support for the region in his July 2017 visit to Warsaw, noting that “Our strong alliance with Poland and NATO remains critical to deterring conflict and ensuring that war between great powers never again ravages Europe, and that the world will be a safer and better place. America is committed to maintaining peace and security in Central and Eastern Europe.”

Among Poland’s contributions to safeguarding its national security as well as the interests of the United States and allied Western nations, the State Department notes the following:

“Poland jointly hosts the NATO Multinational Corps Northeast in its territory, hosts a NATO Force Integration Unit (NFIU) in its territory, will be a framework nation under the very high readiness joint task force (VJTF) in 2020, and hosted the 2016 NATO Summit in Warsaw. Poland has contributed to operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, Kosovo, and countering the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (C-ISIL). Poland hosts a U.S. aviation detachment and will host a ballistic missile defense

---

Additionally, Poland now hosts units from a rotational U.S. Armored Combat Brigade Team, elements of the U.S. Armed forces and a NATO enhanced Forward Presence battalion as well as the Mission Command Element which coordinates U.S. troops deployments through NATO’s Eastern flank. The country has further demonstrated its unwavering commitment to Western defense by hosting over 16,000 U.S. military personnel for various military exercises last year.

The United States has significant interests in maintaining and expanding upon its current bilateral engagement and cooperation with Poland. The European Deterrence Initiative (EDI) has been successful in this regard. The Trump administration’s FY2019 EDI request is $6.531 billion, which is a 36 percent increase in the Trump administration’s FY2018 request of $4.777 billion, and a 91 percent increase from the FY2017 enacted level of $3.419 billion. However, the U.S. Department of Defense Inspector General has outlined numerous recommendations that would allow for not only more efficient use of U.S. resources, but also create a stronger, more resilient security environment in countries such as Poland, which participate in Operation Atlantic Resolve (OAR), the U.S. military operation to reassure European allies in light of Russia’s invasion of Ukraine.

Given Moscow’s predilection for aggressive posturing, now is not the time for a reduced U.S. presence in Europe, particularly on NATO’s eastern flank along Poland’s border.

Elevating the Relationship

The need for a larger, permanent U.S. military presence in Europe – and Poland in particular – is clear. Former U.S. European Command (USEUCOM) commander General Philip Breedlove has spoken to this effect, testifying before the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee in April 2015 that “Permanently

---

6 Ibid.
stationed forces are a force multiplier that rotational deployments can never match.”  

One year later, in March 2016, General Breedlove added in testimony before the committee that “The challenge EUCOM faces is ensuring it is able to meet its strategic obligations while primarily relying on rotational forces from the continental United States.”  

More U.S. forces are needed to enhance the security of Europe and Poland and will strengthen the transatlantic relationship.

Additionally, high-ranking military officials note the need for additional forces to counter Russian aggression. U.S. Army Chief of Staff General Mark Milley, the Army’s highest ranking military officer, stated in November 2017, “We, the Army, think that additional capability is probably needed [in Europe], in combination with our NATO allies, to ensure deterrence of further Russian territorial aggression.” Milley added that “heavy, armored forces” are best in the environment Europe presents.  

When asked in March 2017 before the House Armed Services Committee whether permanent – rather than rotational – forward stationing of an Armored Brigade Combat Team in Europe would help deter Russian aggression, USEUCOM commander General Curtis Scaparrotti said:

“I would prefer to have an enduring armed force in Europe. ...I’d prefer to have an enduring one because the force then becomes accustomed to the environment. It forms relationships with our allies, they become well-known over the period of time of several years that our service members are then stationed there and [they] have a greater appreciation for the problem set.”

---


A permanent American military presence in Poland would significantly reduce security vulnerabilities in the region, particularly in the Suwalki Gap. U.S. military leaders, like U.S. Army Europe commander Lt. Gen. Ben Hodges, have noted that a narrow piece of land connecting two NATO member states Poland and Lithuania (the Suwalki Gap) could be a target of Russian military aggression, thereby needlessly exposing Polish and NATO forces in the region to a period of potentially escalated conflict. Permanent U.S. troops will also help increase interoperability with Polish forces. Poland started a program in 2015 modernizing its forces and will benefit from increased participation in exercises with U.S. troops.

U.S. EDI funding for the constant presence of a U.S. Army Brigade Combat Team in Central and Eastern Europe, bilateral and multilateral exercises, and the pre-positioning of combat equipment has proven extraordinarily helpful in maintaining a strong U.S. posture to deter against a threat by Moscow, yet the need for a more significant, permanent presence has become apparent.

Proposal for Permanent U.S. Presence in Poland

This document outlines a proposal for the United States to develop a permanent presence in Poland. The Government of Poland requests to enter into a joint-basing agreement with the United States to host one U.S. armored division. The Government of Poland will offer significant funding for this action, ranging from 1.5 – 2 billion USD, as it is important to share the burden of defense spending, make the decision more cost-effective for the U.S. Government, and allay any concerns for Congress in uncertain budgetary times. This document provides initial information on infrastructural contribution, geopolitical considerations, and summarizes the current level of military-to-military cooperation. The attachment gives an example of the potential location of a main part of the U.S. division deployment to Poland.

---

III. Geopolitical Considerations

Russia’s strategy under President Vladimir Putin is to openly disrupt and change the European security structure and decrease the level of U.S. leadership and involvement throughout the continent to weaken the transatlantic relationship. Following Russian invasions in Georgia and Ukraine, countries in Central and Eastern Europe are concerned that they are next in Moscow’s crosshairs. The European Union cannot defend itself without U.S. support. U.S. European Command in Stuttgart, Germany, serves as a critical hub for U.S. operations in Europe, as well as a deterrent for potential Russian aggression in the region. However, a U.S. permanent presence in Poland, a more forward operating location than Stuttgart provides, would greatly alleviate well founded fears that fellow Eastern European and Baltic governments have that Moscow would be able to overtake defending forces prior to the support of U.S. and NATO forces in Stuttgart could provide to the current rotational forces in the Poland because of longer deployment times. U.S. troops will benefit from training in Poland, as it presents many unique and strategically important locations for U.S. troops to gain training experience. A U.S. permanent presence in Poland would help provide more protection for the Suwałki Gap, counter Russian permanent forces that could be stationed in Belarus following future exercises and would be a justified U.S. security initiative given that the Russian Federation has egregiously violated the NATO-Russia Founding Act by invading both Georgia and Ukraine.

Suwałki Gap

A permanent American military presence in Poland will significantly reduce security vulnerabilities in the Suwałki Gap. U.S. military leaders, like U.S. Army Europe commander Lt. Gen. Ben Hodges, have noted that a narrow piece of land connecting two NATO member states Poland and Lithuania called the Suwałki Gap could be a target of Moscow military aggression, as it could be used to create a land bridge between Belarus and Kaliningrad. Hodges noted in July 2017: “The gap is vulnerable because of the
geography. It’s not inevitable that there’s going to be an attack, of course, but ... if that was closed, then
you have three allies that are north that are potentially isolated from the rest of the alliance.”

In September 2017, Russia held a military exercise, ‘ZAPAD 2017,’ which may have been the largest
Russian military exercise since the Cold War. It spanned form the western front of Russia, to Belarus, to
the Baltic and Black Seas. Some analysts believe that upwards of 100,000 Russian troops participated in the
exercises. NATO also declared that Moscow misled the West over the size of the exercise, which is a
violation of the Vienna Document. The Vienna Document is a treaty from the Cold War that allows for
observers to monitor exercises. Such a forward permanent presence in Poland would serve as a deterrent
to Russian aggression in the Suwalki Gap and stop Russian forces from invading Poland and cutting the
vulnerable Baltic states off from Europe.

THE SUWALKI GAP
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NATO-Russia Founding Act

The 1997 NATO–Russia Founding Act (the Act) is a political declaration that outlines the commitment by NATO and Russia to “build together a lasting and inclusive peace in the Euro-Atlantic area on the principles of democracy and cooperative security.”16 With respect to the permanent basing of NATO soldiers in Central and Eastern European countries, the Act stipulates:

“NATO reiterates that in the current and foreseeable security environment, the Alliance will carry out its collective defence and other missions by ensuring the necessary interoperability, integration, and capability for reinforcement rather than by additional permanent stationing of substantial combat forces. Accordingly, it will have to rely on adequate infrastructure commensurate with the above tasks. In this context, reinforcement may take place, when necessary, in the event of defence against a threat of aggression and missions in support of peace consistent with the United Nations Charter and the OSCE governing principles, as well as for exercises consistent with the adapted CFE Treaty, the provisions of the Vienna Document 1994 and mutually agreed transparency measures. Russia will exercise similar restraint in its conventional force deployments in Europe.”17

Traditional thinking incorrectly assumes that establishing new permanent presence of NATO soldiers in Central and Eastern European countries is prohibited by this provision. The Act is not a legally binding document. Additionally, by engaging in increasingly aggressive hostilities toward NATO states since the Act’s signing, Moscow has definitively created a new geopolitical status quo that is no longer consistent with the “current and foreseeable security environment” of 1997.18 Therefore, the provision barring

17 Ibid. See Section “IV. Political-Military Matters.”
18 Ibid.
“additional permanent stationing of substantial combat forces” in Central and Eastern European countries should, at the very least, be considered moot.¹⁹

The lack of additional permanent NATO basing in Central and Eastern European countries has emboldened Russia’s aggression in the region. The U.S. Congressional Research Service noted in August 2017 that in the last five years, “[t]hese developments include the following:

- Increasingly authoritarian governance since Vladimir Putin’s return to the presidential post in 2012;
- Russia’s 2014 annexation of Ukraine’s Crimea region and support of separatists in eastern Ukraine;
- Violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty;
- Moscow’s intervention in Syria in support of Bashar al Assad’s government;
- increased military activity in Europe; and
- Cyber-related influence operations that, according to the U.S. intelligence community, have targeted the 2016 U.S. presidential election and countries in Europe.”²⁰

Russia’s authoritarian governance has been shown in many ways, from the influence of the Russian FSB to the aggressive posturing throughout Europe and former Soviet states. In a July 2016 report to the U.S. Congress, the U.S. Department of Defense described recent actions taken by the Kremlin as emblematic of:

“...a Russia that is destabilizing the European security order with its occupation and attempted annexation of Crimea and ongoing aggressive actions in eastern Ukraine; supporting separatists in Moldova and Georgia; actively seeking to divide NATO; and modernizing its military capabilities across a range of systems, including its nuclear weapons capabilities.”²¹

Given Russia’s increasingly unjust hostile posture towards NATO, it is incumbent upon the United States to publicly affirm its right – and that of other NATO allies – to establish a new permanent presence in Central and Eastern European countries. Moscow will surely push back against this assertion; however,

¹⁹ Ibid.
the Act is clear. By failing to restrain its conventional force deployments in Europe, violating international agreements and annexing sovereign territory, Russia has demonstrated its willing intent to forego its commitment to building a lasting and inclusive peace as outlined in the Act.

The “current and foreseeable security environment” of 1997 is no longer. Moscow has been on the move for two decades, growing increasingly hostile in the process. The new normal now signals the need for a greater commitment by the United States to deter Russia’s aggressive policies. An additional permanent basing of U.S. troops in Central and Eastern European countries would be a welcome, lawful development and would strengthen the Atlantic alliance.

Counter Russian Permanent Forces in Belarus

Belarus and Russia have a strong relationship, which can be highlighted by deep security ties. There is a risk that Russia may leave behind troops in Belarus in future military exercises. Such an action could constitute yet another violation of the NATO-Russian Founding Act. Deploying a permanent U.S. presence in Poland would send a message to Moscow that the United States has an unwavering commitment to its allies in the region.

---

IV. Burden Sharing

The Polish government is prepared to offer significant host-nation support to cover the majority of costs required to permanently deploy U.S. armored division to Poland.

Establishing an agreed framework for financing the construction and upkeep of military installations will necessitate further deliberations. Existing bilateral agreements provide a basis for how such an arrangement can be achieved. Poland and the United States have adopted broad legal agreements related to the status of forces and supportive activities (SOFA Supplemental and other implementing arrangements). The bilateral and multilateral funding of U.S.-NATO Enhanced Forward Presence in Poland, the U.S.-supported EDI, as well as the construction of the Aegis Ashore ballistic missile defense site in Redzikowo are excellent examples of how U.S. military infrastructure is regularly and reliably funded in Poland. Poland is committed to contributing 1.5 – 2 billion USD to cover the cost of facilitating the stationing of one U.S. armored division or equivalent force in Poland.

The Government of Poland is prepared to offer great flexibility with respect to developing the necessary infrastructure for housing a permanent U.S. military presence in Poland. Aside from constructing permanent installations, Poland may also allow for use of and access to additional infrastructure belonging to the Ministry of National Defence, state and local administrative facilities, as well as other state-owned or state-managed entities.

Prime Minister Morawiecki’s Sustainable Development Plan, a more than decade-long plan he created while serving as Finance Minister, calls for increased defense spending and improvement of infrastructure. This plan will provide additional opportunities that will benefit the permanent presence of U.S. Armed Forces and will strengthen local infrastructure that U.S. troops will be able to utilize. Infrastructure agreements will account for the provision and purchase of supplies, the construction or expansion of wastewater treatment plants, as well as the generation and use of various other utilities.
Additionally, upon consideration of possible improvements needed to facilitate safe and effective transport, the development and/or expansion of local roads may be deemed necessary. Such improvements could be funded, at least in part, by the Ministry of National Defence’s budget and/or local entities using European Union funds.

As is the case with NATO’s presence in Poland, the Government of Poland recognizes the need to provide additional infrastructure which is intended to accommodate not just soldiers and military personnel within military installations, but also family members of those deployed there. For instance, the International School of Bydgoszcz was established with funds from a Ministry of National Defence grant to not only provide excellent education to the children of NATO personnel stationed in Poland, but also employ military spouses and relatives. Similarly, the Government of Poland intends to support construction of a school in addition to other necessary facilities.

According to the Polish Ministry of Finance, the Allied Armed Forces are exempted from most taxes. Therefore, investments made by U.S. companies to help build infrastructure on and surrounding the permanent installations will not be inhibited by the potential added cost of Polish taxes. Additionally, the infrastructure investment process will be planned and executed according to the minimum operational requirements established by the American and Polish partners. Experience indicates that U.S.-backed investments will be fast-tracked and benefit from simplified tax and oversight requirements. Additionally, the Polish government will streamline the time-consuming procurement rules related to the infrastructure development for a U.S. military installation.

The Government of Poland welcomes further discussion with its U.S. counterparts to examine exactly how the United States would like to proceed. As stated above, Poland is prepared to invest a significant portion of the expenses required to construct and operate military installations which will
permanently house U.S. troops in Poland. This venture will only further strengthen the collective bond between our two countries and increase the resolve of our fighting forces.
V. Military and Development Assistance for U.S.-Led Initiatives

Poland is one of the United States’ strongest European allies and has long supported U.S.-led initiatives around the globe. Through both hard- and soft-power cooperation, Polish military and diplomatic forces work directly with their U.S. counterparts to foster greater transatlantic security and regional prosperity. Poland makes significant contributions to U.S.- and NATO-led military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as in various diplomatic and development initiatives aimed at promoting the rule of law, democratic governance and human rights. The Polish society is very pro-American and is supportive of these initiatives. According to the Congressional Research Service:

“Poland has been a leading U.S. partner, for example, in international democracy promotion efforts, and has particularly sought to offer its experience of post-Communist transition in assisting democratic reform efforts in Europe’s eastern neighborhood. Links between the United States and Poland are further anchored by considerable cultural ties, as evidenced by the approximately 9.6 million Americans of Polish heritage.”23

Polish Military Contributions

The Government of Poland has been a steadfast supporter of U.S.-led military operations, despite hesitancy by other U.S. allies at times. The Polish military operates contingent forces in Iraq, Kuwait and Afghanistan in support of the U.S.-led Operation Inherent Resolve and the NATO-led Resolute Support Mission. Additionally, through cooperation in various NATO exercises and deployments, the Polish military has acted as a stalwart partner in combatting Russian aggression.

In Iraq, Polish forces aid coalition partners in executing Operation Inherent Resolve’s mission of eliminating threats posed by the so-called Islamic State. These forces are primarily tasked with advising and

---

training members of Iraq’s military forces. Approximately 100 Polish soldiers and military personnel are currently participating in Operation Inherent Resolve.

In Kuwait, as well, Polish forces aid coalition partners in executing Operation Inherent Resolve. Poland’s main contingent force in Kuwait consists of four (4) F-16 aircraft which regularly conduct aerial reconnaissance. The Polish contingent in Kuwait supporting Operation Inherent Resolve comprises approximately 130 soldiers and military personnel.

In Afghanistan, Polish forces aid NATO’s Resolute Support Mission in Afghanistan through provision of advisory services, as well as assistance in conducting special forces combat operations. The Polish military contingent in Afghanistan is operationally subordinate to the Resolute Support command. Currently, approximately 400 Polish soldiers and military personnel are participating in the Resolute Support Mission.

In addition, Poland has contributed extensive resources in countering Russian aggression throughout Europe. Poland continues to welcome the presence of rotating U.S. troops and is working with its U.S. counterparts to develop further opportunities for joint training and defensive exercises.

**Polish Development Assistance Contributions**

The Republic of Poland recognizes the critical role U.S. foreign assistance played in helping the country flourish after gaining its independence from the Soviet Union. As Poland has transitioned from a recipient country to a donor country, Poland has followed this U.S. model and provided funding to other countries in need.

**Bilateral Development Assistance**

Pursuant to the Republic of Poland’s Multiannual Development Cooperation Program 2016–2020, Polish development assistance has been divided among two key groups.

First, development assistance was provided to Eastern Partnership countries: Belarus, Georgia, Moldova and Ukraine. This assistance proved invaluable as Polish development agencies and partnered organizations implemented several good governance initiatives, as well as efforts to safeguard human
rights. Development assistance to the aforementioned countries also assisted in promoting opportunities for increased private investment in key sectors including, but not limited to, agriculture and rural development.

Second, assistance was provided to six countries which suffer from high levels of poverty: Ethiopia, Kenya, Myanmar, Senegal, and Tanzania. This aid supported development of human capital, environmental protections, as well as private sector investments. Polish aid also supported the efforts of the OECD Development Assistance Committee.

**Multilateral Development Assistance**

The largest portion of Polish development assistance allocated to multilateral institutions and organizations went to European Union funds intended for external development assistance and entities in the United Nation. Funds allocated to regional development banks amounted to $55.8 million. Poland also provides significant aid and assistance to victims of the Syrian war located in Jordan, Lebanon and the Autonomous Region of Iraqi Kurdistan (Iraq), and support numerous non-government organizations operating in Syria and Afghanistan.
VI. Conclusion

Poland is a steadfast ally of the United States and is committed to advancing our shared interests and values, which are increasingly being threatened by Russian interference. A permanent U.S. presence in Poland will ensure that both nations can continue to advance, strengthen, and protect these values and interests.

The Government of Poland understands that such a burden must be shared, which is why the Government is committed to providing significant host-nation support for this undertaking. Such expenses cannot and should not be financed by one country alone.

A U.S. permanent presence in Poland will provide U.S. allies on NATO’s Eastern flank with increased security and strengthen transatlantic security. Additionally, it will underscore U.S. commitment to maintain peace and security in Eastern and Central Europe and serve as a deterrence against Russia, which has shown its increasing propensity for violating international norms by invading Georgia and Ukraine.

Embarking on this initiative will help usher in a stronger and deeper Poland-U.S. alliance. The Government of Poland welcomes the opportunity to discuss this proposal further with its U.S. counterparts.
Appendix

See attached document.
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I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY


2. Polish regions of Bydgoszcz and Toruń meets all necessary requirements regarding ranges and training accessibilities, infrastructure, accommodations, as well as morale & welfare and are examples of the possible location of U.S. permanent presence in Poland.

3. The regions of Bydgoszcz and Toruń ensure immediate Force integration within NATO Command and Control (C2) and provides best possibilities to cooperate with NATO Force Integration Unit, U.S. Army Brigade Combat Team (ABCT), NATO’s Enhanced Forward Presence (eFP), and the NATO Signal battalion.

4. There is strong support from the Polish Government and the Polish society for a permanent American military presence in Poland.

5. The U.S. Government will be able to lease the land identified as the most appropriate location.

II. POLITICAL AND MILITARY ENGAGEMENT IN POLAND IN THE U.S. 2017 NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

The 2017 National Security Strategy published by the Trump administration identifies Russian aggressive policy and China economic expansion as a main threat to the US and global stability.

Aggressive Russian actions, executed in Georgia and Ukraine, is destructive for international stability and international legal principles. Russia negates the existing global security system and aspires to become a global superpower. In Europe, Russia is trying to strengthen its political and economic relations with European powers and marginalizing U.S. presence and influences.

American presence in Poland also influences U.S. policy in Pacific and Asia. The economic growth of Eastern Europe is increasingly attracting Chinese investment. An increase in American presence in Poland will help balance Chinese expansion and provides opportunities to monitor and control Chinese actions.

A U.S. permanent presence in Poland will help secure American interests in the region and preserve western values of freedom and democracy.

Poland and its current strategic position in Europe provides relevant infrastructure for any allied deployment, logistic support and reinforcement. Convenient geographical location guarantees freedom of movement and redirection of forces into enemies threatened areas.

Polish society is fully aware of challenges and threats from Russia and accept government’s policy to build regional stability by Allied deployment.
III. LOCATION OF U.S. PERMANENT PRESENCE BYDGOSZCZ AND TORUŃ

The area that includes the cities of Bydgoszcz and Toruń is one example of an ideal location for the establishment of a permanent U.S. presence in Poland.

Highlights Include:
- Strong opportunities to cooperate with NATO Force Integration Unit, U.S. Army Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT), NATO’s Enhanced Forward Presence (eFP), and the NATO Signal Battalion.
- The NATO’s Joint Force Training Center is headquartered in Bydgoszcz.
- The area also includes an Aerial Port of Debarkation (APOD).
- Additionally, there is a civilian airport in Bydgoszcz that could be outfitted to military transport.
- The area is a short distance to ABCT headquarters, and it presents access to training facilities.
- There is also opportunities available for aviation industry development, and there is an increasing number of NATO entities in the area.
- Infrastructure in the area includes public transportation, quality highways, access to numerous airports in the region.
- There are also includes 15 hospitals between the two cities, 7 public universities, 2 international schools, and 42 other schools.
- U.S. diplomatic missions are close to this area. The U.S. Consulate in Poznan is 140 kilometers from Bydgoszcz and 167 kilometers from Toruń.
- The region is 150 miles to the Gdynia Naval Base and the Port of Gdynia.
- The location includes strong lines of communication with Germany.
IV. MAPS OF POLAND - DISTANCES AND TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE
V. MAP OF AIRPORTS

1. Drawsko Pomorskie military airport
   - Runway: 2500 yd

2. Mirosławiec military airport
   - Runway: 2730 yd

3. Bednary civilian airport
   - Runway: 2100 yd

4. Powidz military airport
   - Runway: 3800 yd

5. Malbork military airport
   - Runway: 2730 yd

6. Borsk civilian airport
   - Runway: 1640 yd

7. Bydgoszcz international airport
   - Runway: 2730 yd

8. Toruń civilian airport
   - Runway: 1380 yd

9. Inowrocław civilian airport
   - Runway: 830 yd
VI. MAP OF MAIN ROADS

[Map of main roads showing BYDGOSZCZ and TORUN highlighted.]

- in operation
- in construction
- in planning
VII. MAP OF RAILWAYS

passenger railways lines

red

car rolling railways lines

black

mix

BYDGOSZCZ

TORUN
VIII. NATO INSTALLATIONS AND TRAINING AREAS

**LF MTA ORZYSZ:**
- Main area: 16 672 ha
- Depth: 20 km
- Width: 15 km
- Beds: 1800
- DFAC: 650

**LF MTA DRAWSKO:**
- Main area: 36 111 ha
- Depth: 20 km
- Width: 20 km
- Beds: 650
- DFAC: 1200

**Sea Port GDANSK**
- Depth: 20 km
- Width: 20 km
- Beds: 1800
- DFAC: 450

**Joint Log HQ**
- 1 Log Brigade
- JFTC
- DTC PAF
- MP COE
- 10 Military Hospital
- 3 NSB
- NATO MP COE
- MAW No2
- Garizon Shooting Range

**1 Aviation Brigade Land Forces**
- 145 mi

**GRUDZIADZ**
- 170 mi

**Artillery Training Centre**
- 4 Chemical Regiment

**Military Training Area**
- 140 mi

**33 Aviation Transport Brigade**

**POWIDZ**
- 95 mi

**BYDGOSZCZ**
- 140 mi

**WARSZAWA**
- CAPITOL of POLAND

**INOWROCŁAW**
- 150 mi

**FORCES**
- 2 Engineering Regiment

**56 Combat Helicopters Regiment**
- 1 Logistics Base

**56 Geographical Unit**
- 1 Logbrigade Land Forces

**TORUŃ**
- 145 mi

**BRONICA**
- 1 Logistics Base

**33 Aviation Brigade Land Forces**
- 140 mi
IX. BYDGOSZCZ TRAINING & INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES

Most of installations have own facilities: Barracks, DFAC, Garages, Storages
X. TORUŃ TRAINING & INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES

Most of installations have own facilities: Barracks, DFAC, Garages, Storages
XI. GRUDZIĄDZ TRAINING & INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES

Installations have own facilities: Barracks, DFAC, Garages, Storages
Installation has own facilities: Barracks, DFAC, Garages, Storages
XIII. POWIDZ TRAINING & INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES
XIV. INOWROCŁAW TRAINING & INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITIES

Most of installations have own facilities: Barracks, DFAC, Garages, Storages
## XV. BYDGOSZCZ – TORUŃ GENERAL DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Geographic coordinates LATLONG</th>
<th>Infrastructure and transportation</th>
<th>Military units</th>
<th>Morale and welfare infrastructure</th>
<th>Airports, sea ports</th>
<th>Diplomatic missions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BYDGOSZCZ</strong></td>
<td><strong>Latitude: 53°07′24″N Longtitude: 18°00′27″E A.S.L.: 37 m</strong></td>
<td>Bydgoszcz Public transport TRAM, BUS Main roads: S10, S5 Railway</td>
<td>Bydgoszcz NATO Signal bat Joint logistic HQ, 1 Log Brigade 1 Military Hospital PSYOPS MP COE</td>
<td>Bydgoszcz Hospitals: 12 Toruń Hospitals: 3</td>
<td>Air Port: 2500 m, concret apron</td>
<td>Bydgoszcz U.S. Consulate POZNAŃ at distance 140 KM U.S. Consulate KRAKÓW at distance 451 KM U.S. Embassy Warsaw at distance 310 km</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TORUŃ</strong></td>
<td><strong>Latitude: 53°00′49″N Longtitude: 18°35′53″E A.S.L.: 51 m</strong></td>
<td>Toruń Public transport: TRAM, BUS Main roads: S10, A1 Railway</td>
<td>Toruń Art Training Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toruń U.S. Consulate POZNAŃ at distance 167 KM U.S. Consulate CRACOW at distance 401 KM U.S. Embassy Warsaw at distance 260 km</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## XVI. BYDGOSZCZ – TORUŃ SOCIAL DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>GENERAL DATA</th>
<th>EDUCATION, SOCIAL</th>
<th>U.S. COMPANIES</th>
<th>SOCIAL DATA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BYDGOSZCZ</strong></td>
<td><strong>Population: Bydgoszcz 355 600 Unemployment rate: 5.5% - 12.9 %</strong></td>
<td>Bydgoszcz: Public universities - 4 International School -2 non-universities - 22</td>
<td>Air Company Bydgoszcz / Lockheed Martin</td>
<td>Bydgoszcz Morale and welfare facilities available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TORUŃ</strong></td>
<td><strong>184 000 Unemployment rate: 5.5% - 8.8 %</strong></td>
<td>Toruń: Public universities - 3 International School -1 non-universities - 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>Toruń Morale and welfare facilities available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XVII. MAP OF BYDGOSZCZ

10 MILITARY CLINICAL HOSPITAL
- 23,000 hospitalized every year
- 476 beds

CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL
- 100,000 hospitalized every year

UNIVERSITY HOSPITAL
- 40,000 hospitalized every year
- 1570 beds

INFECTIOUS HOSPITAL
- 6,000 hospitalized every year
- 116 beds

CITY HOSPITAL
- 20,000 hospitalized every year
- 265 beds

UNIVERSITY KAZIMIERZ WIELKI
- studies in English

COLLEGE OF ECONOMY
- studies in English

UNIwersytet TECHNOLOGY-NATURE
XVIII. MAP OF TORUŃ

PROVINCIAL HOSPITAL
- available from 2018
- 1150 beds

PROVINCIAL HOSPITAL
- 10,000 hospitalized every year

CITY HOSPITAL
- 14,000 hospitalized every year

BANKING COLLEGE

LANGUAGE COLLEGE OF TORUŃ

NICHOLAUS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY
- studies in English

POLIGON TORUŃSKI

ALEKSANDRÓW KUJAWSKI

CIECHOCINEK