

REGIONAL HEARING ISSUE SUMMARY

*Fort McPherson, Georgia
 Naval Air Station, Atlanta, Georgia
 Naval Supply Corp School, Athens, Georgia
 Naval Station Kings Bay, Georgia
 Fort Gillem, Georgia
 Fort Benning, Georgia
 Marine Corps Logistics Base, Albany, Georgia*

Atlanta Regional Hearing
 June 30, 2005

- **Witness 1: Senator Saxby Chambliss**

- Fort Gillem and Fort McPherson are key southeastern bases with cost effective world class facilities that are located close to a world class airport.
- Flaws in the COBRA analysis: DoD dramatically understated costs associated with closing McPherson, Gillem, NAS Atlanta and Naval Supply School Athens.
- NAS Atlanta benefits from its ability to recruit personnel from airline employees headquartered in Atlanta.
- DoD recommendation ignores NAS Atlanta's synergistic relationship with Dobbins Air Reserve base.
- Naval Supply Corp School (NSCS) Athens is the "epitome" of a joint-training facility; Chief of Naval Operations personally chose to locate the school at Athens.

- **Witness 2: Senator Johnny Isakson**

- Many community development organizations have invested heavily in the military installations scheduled for closure and realignment in order to improve quality of life for military personnel. For instance, NSCS Athens receives free fire and police protection because of agreements with the Clarke County Chamber of Commerce.

- **Witness 3: Congressman John Lewis**

- Fort McPherson is a regional headquarters for Homeland Security as well as four Army commands. It is located in the heart of Atlanta close to the airport.

- **Witness 4: Congressman David Scott**

- Please keep Fort Gillem open for the sake of the all volunteer Army. It is important to National Guard and Army Reserves and closure will result in losing recruitment in Atlanta.
- Atlanta is a terror target which becomes more vulnerable if Fort Gillem closes. All 1st responders are located at Fort Gillem.
- How can the Army walk away from \$200M in new construction?

Ryan Dean/Joint Cross-Service Team/July 14, 2005

Library Routing Slip 2005 BRAC Commission Hearings
 Title of Item: Atlanta Regional Hearing Issue Summary
 Installation or Community: NA
 Source: Communication Generated
 Certified Material? yes X no
 Analyst/Provider: Ryan Dean Date Received: 7/19/05

● **Witness 5: Brigadier General Philip Y. Browning, USA (Ret) & Executive Director, Georgia Military Affairs Coordinating Committee**

- Fort McPherson is a command and control installation with highly skilled manpower.
- Cost: McPherson COBRA analysis questioned After the Army determined the military value using 40 weighted attributes the Joint Service Group moved activities off of the base causing the Army to close it citing cost savings as the reason for closure. The savings is overstated because the actual cost to replicate the headquarters activities is \$277M. The BRAC 93 Commission during its "Adds" process cited costs that were 49% higher than the current cobra analysis. The cost of travel was not considered and it will be 36% higher from Fayetteville, NC than Atlanta for point to point travel. Reconsider the closure based on costs and criteria 1 & 3.
- Co-Location: the proposed relocation breaks a critical command and control link by separating 3rd Army headquarters from FORSCOM and USARC The Third Army Hq move to Shaw AFB appears logical on the surface but when you look at the functions you will find that 3rd Army is a force requester while FORSCOM is a force provider and 3rd Army already has Air Force augmentation. Therefore the synergy of FORSCOM/USARC/3rdArmy Headquarters can only be maintained through co-location.
- Ill-advised move: Atlanta has a pool of skilled labor that is eight times larger than Fayetteville's labor market; and, Fort McPherson's command and control system is sophisticated with \$1B invested with Homeland defense capabilities.
- Fort Gillem: the \$56M implementation cost deviates significantly from the \$350M that the BRAC 93 Commission concluded that it would cost to close and relocate Fort Gillem's activities.
- Movement of the recruiting Bde: Travel costs will be higher for the 2nd recruiting Bde in Huntsville and the 1st Army which will be 156 miles from Chicago's major airport.
- Movement of the EOD unit: the 52nd EOD group's move to Fort Campbell does not make sense from a travel perspective because it has command and control over widely disbursed assets in CONUS and OCONUS and the cost of travel is an issue.
- Enclave security challenge: the security for the enclave pockets at Fort Gillem will be a cost and a security challenge; the argument for central location of homeland defense mission is questioned because of the requirement to closely coordinate with USARC.

● **Witness 6: Congressman Phil Gingrey**

- The city of Atlanta provides NAS Atlanta with an unmatched recruiting demographic.
- Real savings are less than one-half of what the COBRA model suggests, primarily because of overstated personnel savings (i.e. 307 fewer personnel than DoD estimated).
- Closure undermines the synergy between NAS Atlanta, Dobbins Air Reserve Base, and Lockheed Martin.

- **Witness 7: Major General Larry Taylor, USMC (Ret)**
 - Atlanta has the second largest population of aviation-related occupational fields in the United States, and one that is exponentially superior to rural South Carolina.
 - General Taylor believes that the impact on recruitment and retention, as well as operational overhead, will be similar to the negative impact on retention and cost induced by the closure of El Toro in 1995. He contends these impacts will in turn negatively impact combat readiness.
 - NAS Atlanta is highly efficient; it operates well above the Navy's established efficiency standards.

- **Witness 8: Congressman John Barrow**
 - Moving Naval Supply School Athens will increase its operating costs and decrease the military value of its joint training resources.

- **Witness 9: Captain George Huban, USN (Ret)**
 - NSCS Athens hosts three military commands; it teaches students from every branch of the Armed Services.
 - Students can matriculate to the University of Georgia for executive education under a special partnership with UGA.
 - The city of Athens provides the base with free fire and police protection.
 - NSCS Athens has better support facilities than Newport, RI.
 - COBRA model overstates savings; his uncertified analysis showed that closure would result in a net cost (from milcon and higher personnel costs), rather than a net savings, to DoD.

- **Witness 10: Congressman Jack Kingston**
 - Even if the Commission approves realignment of assets to Kings Bay, the installation will still have room to dock more submarines. Kings Bay can be grown for future missions at a very low cost to DoD should the Navy need to alter its 20-year force structure plan.

- **Witness 11: Captain Walt Yourstone, USN (Ret); Former Commander, Kings Bay**
 - Camden County can accommodate growth associated with moving missions to Kings Bay: Camden County grew by double digits in the 1980s and 1990s without compromising the quality of its educational, medical, or residential services. In fact, the magnitude of the impact of the 2005 BRAC recommendations would be inferior to the magnitude of the impact of growth experienced as a result of previous expansions at Kings Bay.

- **Witness 12: Congressman Lynn Westmoreland**
 - Columbus area supports all of DoD's recommendations regarding Fort Benning.
 - A site for the 81st RRC from Fort Gillem has been identified.

- **Witness 13: Colonel John Mitchell, USA (Ret) & Colonel Biff Hadden, USA (Ret)**
 - Columbus community is already organizing to support the moves and a full time taskforce has been established by Fort Benning and Fort Knox to coordinate the Armor School move.
 - The local community has appropriate infrastructure to absorb the planned increases.

- **Witness 14: Colonel James Taylor, USMC (Ret); Former Commander, MCLB, Albany & Representative of the Southwest Georgia Alliance for Progress**
 - Albany and Dougherty County have the residential, educational, medical, and transportation resources to accommodate proposed realignments.
 - The depot also possesses the capacity to expand for future missions; there are no environmental or encroachment issues that might impede growth.
 - Albany is already home to the Marine Corp Logistics Command.

REGIONAL HEARING ISSUE SUMMARY

Redstone Arsenal, Alabama
Anniston Army Depot, Alabama
Fort Rucker, Alabama
Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama
Birmingham International Airport Air Guard Station, Alabama

Atlanta Regional Hearing
June 30, 2005

- **Witness 1: Senator Richard Shelby**
 - Alabama is pleased with DoD's recommendations and their comments are focused on some areas where the Commission could make improvements.
 - The Navy's rotary wing training at Whiting Field should be consolidated at Fort Rucker. This would make it truly joint, since Army and Air Force training is already at Rucker. Fort Rucker is only 45 minutes from the Gulf, so over-water training would not be an issue, and its potential training airspace is as large as the state of South Carolina.
 - Recommendation to move OSSG from Maxwell for Hanscomb will disrupt the synergy between OSSG and DISA and eliminate a necessary operational redundancy

- **Witness 2: Senator Jeff Sessions**
 - Reconsider CECOM's move of aviation avionics and survivability to Aberdeen Proving Ground and consider moving it to AMCOM in Huntsville.
 - Recommendation to move the 117th Air Refueling Wing is premature/unwise: Birmingham runway will soon be 12,000 feet long and therefore capable of receiving heavier fuel loads than the proposed gaining airfield..

- **Witness 3: Ms. Irma Tudor, Representative, Tennessee Valley BRAC Committee**
 - After video of Huntsville's capabilities, she indicated that they fully support the moves concerning the Missile Defense Agency; AMC headquarters; and the Army security assistance program.
 - Does not make sense to move the Joint Robotics' Program to Detroit because Redstone is a center of expertise for EOD training.

- **Witness 4: Mr. Nathan Hill, Calhoun County Chamber of Commerce**
 - Outlined Anniston's capabilities and facilities and cited their leadership and partnership with private industry as evidence of their ability to handle any surge requirement.

Ryan Dean/Joint Cross-Service Team/July 14, 2005

- *Commissioner Gehman subsequently asked about Anniston's rubber capabilities. Mr. Hill responded that milcon would be required to create that capability.*
- **Witness 5: Mr. Charles Nailen, Chairman, Friends of Fort Rucker**
 - Fully supports moving the Aviation School from Fort Eustis to Fort Rucker, which has a successful record of providing joint training and is ranked 7th in the DoD's military value comparison of all Army training installations. The Commission should consider making Rucker a Joint Center of Excellence for Rotary Wing Training by realigning the Navy's rotary wing flight training from Whiting Field.
 - Does not support the move of Aviation Technical Test Center to Redstone.
 - *Commissioners Gehman and Skinner subsequently asked Mr. Nailen to refer to certified studies supporting the idea of making Fort Rucker a Joint Center of Excellence for Rotary Wing Training. Mr. Nailen responded by referring to a study conducted in 1992 which estimated savings from such a realignment at \$80-90 a year.*
- **Witness 6: Brigadier General Paul M. Hankins, USAF (Ret); Former Commander, Air Force Officer Accession and Training Schools, Maxwell AFB**
 - OSSG, an IT support function, should not be consolidated with RDT&E, because of its "disparate" mission; however, there is high military value in co-locating OSSG and DISA.
 - DoD did not properly consider Maxwell's surge capacity.
 - OSSG performs a unique function and the experience of its personnel cannot be replicated without incurring prohibitive costs.
- **Witness 7: Major General Mark Bowen, Adjutant General of Alabama**
 - Military judgment was substituted for military value: Birmingham has a higher military value than 6 other ANG tanker wings that either will not be realigned or will be gainers as a result of realignments. It also has greater capacity than the installations which would receive its aircraft.
 - It is an Air Sovereignty Alert installation.
 - Because of its longer runway, Birmingham can support a greater "global reach" than the installations which would receive its aircraft.
 - The 117th is the only ANG tanker wing co-located with its own depot-level repair facility.
- **Witness 8: Governor Bob Riley**
 - Summarized the main points of the preceding testimony.

REGIONAL HEARING ISSUE SUMMARY

Nashville International Airport Air Guard Station, Tennessee

Atlanta Regional Hearing

June 30, 2005

- **Witness 1: Congressman Jim Cooper**
 - The Air Force conducted a flawed BRAC process by failing to consult with the Adjutants General.
 - The Air Force's 2005 BRAC recommendations will significantly undercut recruitment and retention.
 - Decision to realign Nashville International Airport AGS was based on "military judgment" and not military value.
 - Air Force's analysis neglected Nashville AGS's surge capacity and modern infrastructure improvements.

- **Witness 2: Major General Gus Hargett, Adjutant General of Tennessee**
 - Realignment of the 118th Airlift Wing will lead to a loss of experienced pilots and maintainers: no members of the Aero-Medical evacuation squadron are expected to follow their mission.
 - Realignment will hurt homeland security preparedness by separating the 118th's C-130 transport capability from the Nashville-based 45th Civil Support Team, which depends upon responsive air transportation to conduct its missions.
 - Nashville AGS did not get proper credit for its new state-of-the-art maintenance facility, which – when finished – should result in the consolidation of 6 separate facilities.
 - Nashville AGS should have received a higher score because of the presence of a civilian fuel depot to which it has access.
 - Air Force created a military value model that was biased in favor of large Active Duty installations.
 - Payback from realignment would not be realized for over 100 years, since it is not accurate to claim personnel savings (end strength would not change) and since training costs will increase when experienced pilots leave the service.

REGIONAL HEARING ISSUE SUMMARY

DHS/TAG Hearing

Atlanta Regional Hearing

June 30, 2005

- **Witness 1: RADM Tim Sullivan, DHS**

- On the one hand, the Coast Guard (CG) could achieve operational efficiencies, especially at Ventura, CA, if the Commission approves DoD's BRAC recommendations. On the other hand, the CG's operating costs could increase dramatically in the event that the service loses access to other military facilities, especially those located along the East Coast.
- DHS is interested in pursuing intergovernmental property transfers where efficiencies would improve.
- Closing Fort Gillem could force FEMA to relocate its strategically positioned Southeast Regional Logistics Center, which is located within Gillem's fenceline.
- Regional homeland security responsiveness could become more expensive and less reliable in other parts of the nation where homeland security assets utilize military facilities for basing, maintenance, and command & control.
- DHS is "confident" that DoD's recommendations will not undermine NORTHCOM's ability to secure the U.S. air operational domain.
- *Commissioner Bilbray subsequently asked Admiral Sullivan if DHS had submitted its operational requirements to DoD in order to facilitate the development of mutually compatible BRAC recommendations. The Admiral answered that DHS never provided DoD with any formal guidance.*
- *Commissioner Newton subsequently asked Admiral Sullivan if DHS had been consulted by DoD or the individual services during their respective deliberative processes; the Admiral answered that neither DoD, nor any of its component entities, invited DHS to participate in their respective deliberative processes.*

- **Witness 2: Major General Roger Lempke (TAG-NE)**

- Adjutants General and the Guard Bureau support the overall BRAC process. Moreover, they support the Army's deliberative methodology; however, they oppose the Air Force's recommendations because the Service did not involve the Guard in its deliberative process. **General recommended that the Commission remove all of the recommendations pertaining to the ANG from its final list.**
- *Commissioner Gehman subsequently asked General Lempke if the ANG had developed alternative BRAC proposals regarding the redistribution of ANG assets; the General and his associates answered by saying that they had not yet developed any formal BRAC-related alternatives (they have developed programmatic alternatives), but that they were pursuing analysis and dialogue which would hopefully culminate in the presentation of a formal alternative by the National Guard Bureau itself.*
- The ANG is a dual-mission service component. In other words, it performs homeland security and homeland defense missions. The Adjutants General believe the Air Force's recommendations will negatively affect both state-to-state emergency management assistance agreements and state-to-Federal homeland security/homeland defense operational frameworks.

- **Witness 3: Major General Bruce Tuxill (TAG-MD)**

- ANG accounts for 40% of the Air Force's combat capability (aircraft) and is responsible for 100% of the Service's CONUS air defense mission.
- ANG is uniquely capable of performing these missions because of highly-skilled, volunteer personnel.
- ANG bases have low infrastructure costs because they operate at civilian-owned airports.
- Centralization will negatively impact local/state disaster-response plans and present a challenge to the ANG's ability to operate under Title 32 legal status.

- **Witness 4: Major General Greg Waytt (TAG-OH)**

- Recommendations will hurt Guard's ability to recruit and retain uniquely qualified personnel. Thousands of pilots and maintainers with specialized skills will not follow reassigned aircraft.
- The Air Force did not consider the operational cost of training new personnel in its COBRA analysis.
- *Commissioner Skinner subsequently asked the TAG panel to elaborate on their perception of the impact on recruitment and retention; various Adjutants General responded by saying that some ANG units began experiencing negative impacts on retention following the release of the BRAC recommendations – they also suggested that few personnel would be willing to stay for nondescript “emerging” missions.*

- **Witness 5: Major General Mike Haugen (TAG-ND)**
 - Elimination and reassignment of PAA will create “significant gaps in homeland defense capabilities” and negatively impact the governor’s disaster-response capabilities, especially in rural areas.
 - Will create a training deficit, since only the young are likely to move (according to uncertified Guard analysis), which will in turn lead to inefficient use of airspace in gaining locations.
 - It is the opinion of the Adjutants General that every state should have a flying mission and that only Congress should be making what are essentially programmatic, as opposed to BRAC-related, force structure decisions.
 - *Commissioner Skinner subsequently asked if the National Guard Bureau also believed that the Air Force’s intended force structure could be better achieved programmatically, as opposed to through the BRAC process; General Lempke did not offer a definitive response, but suggested that the Guard Bureau would support major programmatic changes before it would accept restructuring through BRAC.*
 - *Commissioner Gehman subsequently asked if the Adjutants General believed the Air Force was attempting to redistribute aircraft in a way that would be inconsistent with the current distribution among Active Duty/Reserve/ANG components; General Haugen stated that, as a measure of percentage, the pre-BRAC/post-BRAC distribution would be roughly the same.*

- **Witness 6: Major General Allen Tackett (TAG-WV)**
 - Air Force’s military value scoring system was slanted in favor of large Active Duty installations (i.e. runaway-length criteria: Guard units can effectively operate on significantly shorter runways). In sum, ANG units have a different “right size” than Active Duty units.
 - ANG contention: Realignment was driven by future total force plan rather than military value. This contention is apparently substantiated by Air Force BCEG meeting minutes.

- **Witness 7: Major General Frank Vavala (TAG-DE)**
 - The enclave/emerging mission concept has not been adequately defined by the Air Force. It appears to be an attempt to verbally disguising closure decisions based on the Air Force’s “aircraft inventory problems.”
 - *Commissioner Bilbray subsequently asked General Lempke if the enclave concept was consistent with Federal law; the General could not offer a determinative response.*

- **Witness 8: Major General Martha Rainville (TAG-VT)**

- Community basing, which leverages the unique skill level of Guard personnel to train Active Duty personnel, should become an integral component of the Air Force's joint-training paradigm.
- Community basing lowers operational costs, increase combat capability, and enhances efficiency by allowing for the redistribution of human and material force assets.
- The Commission should consider the impact that the Air Force's recommendations will have on the future of community basing.
- *Commissioner Newton subsequently asked the TAG panel if the Air Force could achieve its intended force structure through the BRAC process; General Lempke answered that it was his belief that future force structure goals may be best achieved by dispersing more Active Duty units to Guard bases under a community-basing construct.*