DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION (BRAC)

FINAL DELIBERATIONS

Friday, August 26, 2005

8:15 a.m.

Morning and Afternoon Sessions

Hyatt Regency Crystal City

2799 Jefferson Davis Highway

Arlington, Virginia 22202

COMMISSIONERS:

The Honorable Anthony J. Principi, Chairman

The Honorable James H. Bilbray

The Honorable Philip E. Coyle III

Admiral Harold W. Gehman, Jr., USN (Ret.)

The Honorable James V. Hansen

General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.)

General Lloyd W. Newton, USAF (Ret.)

The Honorable Samuel K. Skinner

Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)

CHAIRMAN:

THE HONORABLE ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI

CERTIFIED

MORNING SESSION

Chairman Principi: Good morning, everyone. The Base Closure and Realignment Commission hearing will come to order. I would ask all members of the staff who will be testifying this morning to please stand for the administration of the oath required by the BRAC statute.

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. All members of the BRAC staff testifying today before the BRAC Commission, please raise your right hand for me.

[All witnesses sworn]

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Mr. Cirillo, perhaps you can advise us on the agreed upon format we'll follow this morning.

Mr. Cirillo: Yes, Mr. Chairman, good morning. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. Today we will finish with the Air Force portion of the Bill and continuing from last night and we will have a session this morning where we will discuss the installations to include some maintenance facilities which is Section 3 -- Section 112, 114, 118, 119 as well as 109, 104, and 194. And at this time I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Ken Small. Mr. Ken Small will go ahead and continue with the Air Force and

CERTIFIED

introduce the next issue.

Mr. Small: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. We will start the morning with four logistics issues. They will be presented by Mr. Art Beauchamp. The first one will be Langley, no, Lackland then Langley in the order shown. Lackland, of course, is located in Texas. The next slide, please.

[Next slide]

This action is a recommendation, realigns the standard air munitions package and the standard tank rack adapter and pile on packages. The function is in Lackland now and at the Medina Annex. It moves the function and materials to McConnell Air Force Base in Kansas. The mission is also transferred to the Air National Guard in Kansas. Mr. Beauchamp will discuss the details of the justification.

Mr. Beauchamp: Thank you, Mr. Small, Chairman, Commissioners. Good morning. According to DoD, this realignment is justified because it facilitates total force participation. It transfers one of only two active duty munitions storage missions to McConnell Air National Guard. The recommendation also eliminates safety and security concerns posed by the fact that munitions stored at the Lackland Medina Annex must be transported about six miles over local and interstate roads to the aircraft loading zone and airfield, both of which are located at Lackland

CERTIFIED

Air Force Base. Moving the STAMP STRAPP mission to McConnell Air Force Base eliminates these concerns. At McConnell the mission's storage sites, loading zone, and airfield are all co-located. The Air National Guard at McConnell currently perform a similar function of the active duty STAMP mission. The total estimate of one-time cost to the Department for this recommendation is $8.1 million with a two-year payback. The net present value of the cost and savings over 20 years is a savings of $32.4 million. This recommendation affects a total of 107 positions.

The next slide, please.

[Next slide}

On this slide the staff has listed significant issues cleared by relevant BRAC selection criteria. Under criteria one, the staff assessed that according to the COBRA data, manpower authorizations are projected to be eliminated by the end of fiscal year '07. The munitions stockpile isn't scheduled to move from Lackland until fiscal year '08. The staff raised this issue to the Department and Air Force assured us that they intend to keep adequate manpower in place until all munitions were moved from Lackland Medina to McConnell.

The staff also assessed that MILCON requirements at McConnell have not been validated. The staff is concerned

CERTIFIED

that the storage requirements may not be fully identified in COBRA since the site survey was not done prior to submitting COBRA input. The concern is that given that they're only two Air Force mission storage sites in the country any delays in MILCON funding due to COBRA oversight could impact the STAMP/STRAPP mission.

In response to this concern the Department noted that a site survey is planned for McConnell and any additional requirements not in COBRA will be identified during the site survey service and addressed programmatically. Staff assessed that the department's response in both cases adequately addressed our concerns. Next slide, please.

[Next slide]

Mr. Small: The Air Force team stands by to answer questions, sir.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Are there any questions?

General Newton: Mr. Chairman, I have a comment. The team has certainly done terrific work here. We should accept this recommendation as presented. I'm very familiar with this particular operation. There is this risk in transportation of those munitions and we should take it to McConnell Air Force Base so I will vote in favor of this recommendation.

Chairman Principi: Does McConnell have the capability

CERTIFIED

to handle these munitions? Do they have the -- is the Guard equipped to take on this mission, this conversion, from the active duty to the Air National Guard?

Mr. Beauchamp: Sir, in the COBRA data there is funding for the training of the Air National Guard. The concern that we have and the mission is suited for the Guard because it's primarily in an in garrison mission. Of course, the Air Force active duty are not tasked in this area as other skill sets so the mission is suited for them. The concern we have is with the MILCON funding for the facilities, but we're confident the Department has addressed our concerns and programmatically they will address them.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Are there any further questions? Are there any amendments?

[No response]

Hearing none, we will vote on the Air Force recommendation 46, Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, appearing at Chapter III Section 112 of the bill. We will vote on whether to approve the secretary's recommendation and find it is consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Is there a second?

General Newton: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

[No response]

CERTIFIED

Chairman Principi: All in favor of the secretary's recommendation.

[A show of nine hands]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response]

Chairman Principi: Counsel?

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous. The motion carries.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. Small: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. If we may proceed to the next item which is Section 114, Langley Air Force Base. The DoD recommendation is to realign Langley by relocating Langley's base level F-15 avionic immediate maintenance to anther location. Next slide.

[Next slide].

Under this recommendation Langley's base level F-15 avionics intermediate maintenance activity moves to Tyndall Air Force Base where the Air Force plans to establish a centralized intermediate repair facility for F-15 avionics. Mr. Beauchamp will discuss the justification.

Mr. Beauchamp: This recommendation standardizes stateside F-15 avionics intermediate maintenance that creates efficiency for economies and creates the expeditionary Air Force by establishing F-15 avionic service at Tyndall. By way of background serves a

CERTIFIED

centralized intermediate repair facility as our regional level maintenance facilities that provides intermediate level maintenance to multiple units. The concept has been used by the Air Force in overseas bases for quite a while and in a deployed environment the Air Force is now implementing this concept statewide. The COBRA data the total estimate of one-time cost to the Department to implement this recommendation is $1.8 million with a three-year payback. The net present value of the cost in savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $8.2 million. This recommendation affects 19 manpower positions. Next slide, please.

[Next slide]

The one concern that the staff identified was that there is a risk to -- a small risk to unit readiness due to transportation delays, however, since the Air Force has employed this concept to the overseas environment and the deployed environment there's experience in planning and expertise in the Air Force to mitigate this impact. Next slide, please.

[Next slide]

Mr. Small: The Air Force team stands by for any questions from the Commission, sir.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Are there any questions? I notice your concern with regard to C-1, yet

CERTIFIED

the justification for this proposal is to actually increase the support to the war fighter. I think that is why they're doing it. It's clearly not a major cost saving initiative but rather something to increase productivity and support the war fighter. Yet you expressed some concern about that.

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman, it does support the war fighter and when we assessed it, it looks - by pooling the resources readiness there is more flexibility to send one unit that may be rated low in mission capable rate to another unit with that commodity, there's no question about that. But the CIRF by its nature is transportation centric so there may be transportation delays that that unit may need that commodity, in this case the avionics package and they may not get it in time because of transportation delays. It's a relatively minor risk and the Air Force has certainly the capability and the transportation network to mitigate against this.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Any further discussion? Any amendments?

[No response]

Chairman Principi: Hearing none, we will move to approve Air Force recommendation 49, Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, appearing at Chapter III Section 114 of the bill. I move the Commission find the Air Force

CERTIFIED

recommendation 49, Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, is consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Is there a second?

General Newton: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

Admiral Gehman: Yes.

Chairman Principi: All in favor.

[A show of eight hands]

Chairman Principi: All opposed.

[No response]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is eight yeas, none opposed, one abstention. The motion is approved.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, Mr. Beauchamp.

Mr. Small: Mr. Chairman, the next item is Section 118, the Air Force Logistics Support Centers. This action establishes Air Force Logistics Support Centers at Langley Air Force Base and Scott Air Force Base, by combining the five major command regional supply squadrons. The flow is depicted in this next slide. Mr. Beauchamp will discuss the justification for this action.

[Next slide]

Mr. Beauchamp: This recommendation is a transformational initiative, and that standardized and improves the Air Force material, management, command and control. The recommendation realigns five regional supply

CERTIFIED

squadrons in base level logistics readiness squadron manpower into two logistics support centers or LSCs. One of which provides dedicated support to the combat Air Force and the other dedicated support to the mobility Air Force. By consolidating, the Department will gain efficiencies. The recommendation also provides a seamless transition from peace to war; it establishes a central point of contact for the customer to contact whether at home or deployed.

The total estimated one-time cost to the Department to implement this recommendation is $9.3 million with a one-year payback. The net present value of the cost and savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $77 million. This recommendation affects a total of 253 positions. Next slide, please.

[Next slide]

On this slide the staff has listed significant issues grouped by relevant BRAC selection criteria. Risk to retail supply support during transition period is likely without detail planning and coordination. By integrating five regional supply squadrons from three separate major commands, and manpower from three separate readiness logistics readiness centers along with the associated systems is a complex task and poses a significant risk of customer support during the transition period.

However, the staff further assessed that for

CERTIFIED

discussing this issue with DoD that they've established a detailed implementation plan. They started planning for this effort about 14 months ago. It is a pre-BRAC initiative. There is sufficient planning and coordination in place to mitigate the risk associated with this recommendation. Next slide.

[Next slide]

Mr. Small: Mr. Chairman, the team stands by for your questions, sir.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Are there any questions or discussion on this recommendation?

General Newton: Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: General Newton.

General Newton: Even though the staff mentioned this risk, again, as was indicated the Air Force has been heading down this path some time now, and this is clearly the right thing to do and I think it is going to help us to support the war fighters and maintenance facilities and personnel much, much better by going to this concept.

Chairman Principi: Is there anything further?

[No response]

Chairman Principi: Hearing no further discussion we will move to approve the Air Force recommendation 53, Air Force Logistics Support Centers, appearing at Chapter III Section 118 of the Bill. I move that the Commission find

CERTIFIED

that Air Force recommendation 53, Air Force Logistics Support Centers is consistent with the final selection criteria and the Force Structure Plan. Is there a second?

General Hill: I second.

Chairman Principi: Recusals?

[A show of one hand]

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of eight hands]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote are eight in favor, none opposed, one abstention. The motion is approved.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Mr. Small: Mr. Chairman, the next action is at Section 119, the F-100 Engine Centralized Intermediate Repair Facilities. This action realigns and creates a centralized intermediate repair facility. Next slide, please.

[Next slide]

The flow is on the slide. This creates causes a move to Seymour Johnson where the DoD intends to establish an eastern region centralized intermediate repair facility. Mr. Beauchamp will describe the justification.

Mr. Beauchamp: According to DoD the F-100 engine

CERTIFIED

centralized intermediate repair facilities or CIRF provides regional intermediate level repair for F-100 engines. According to the Department, CIRFs will standardize stateside and deploy intermediate level maintenance, increase maintenance activity, and support the customer by consolidating dispersed and random workloads. It also improves reliability, creates economies of scale, and supports the expeditionary mission of the Air Force.

The total estimated one time cost to the Department to implement this recommendation is $9.2 million with a nine-year payback with the net present value of the cost in savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings of $7.1 million. This recommendation affects approximately 70 personnel.

[Next slide]

On this slide I've listed the significant issues grouped by relevant BRAC selection criteria similar to the concern we had with the F-15 avionics. Thus by its nature, the CIRF is transportation network centric but again the Air Force has been operating this concept over the past few years and has successfully implemented it overseas and in overseas and in a deployed environment. Next slide, please.

[Next slide]

Mr. Small: Sorry for our sidebar, sir. My apologies.

CERTIFIED

The team is prepared for your questions, sir.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Are there any questions or discussion or amendment?

[No response]

Chairman Principi: Hearing none we'll move to approve Air Force recommendation 55 F-100 engine centralized intermediate repair facilities appearing at Chapter III Section 119 of the bill. I move that the Commission find that Air Force recommendation 55 F-100 engine centralized intermediate repair facilities is consistent with final selection criteria and Force Structure Plan. A second?

General Hill: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

[A show of one hand]

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of eight hands]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the votes are eight in favor, none opposed, one abstention. The motion is approved.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, Mr. Small.

Mr. Cirillo: Mr. Chairman, we will proceed to Section 109 at this time. We're going to be skipping Section 80 which is the Kulis Air Guard Station and Elmendorf. We'll

CERTIFIED

also be skipping Chapter III Section 104, Grand Forks, it looks like till this afternoon, as well as Section 103. They're all interrelated with the Guard issues. Go ahead, Mr. Small.

Mr. Small: Mr. Chairman, we're now at Section 109, Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, and Dyess Air Force Base, Texas. The F-16s from 419th at -- I'm sorry. Pardon me, sir, one moment. Okay, sir, your indulgence, thank you. Five installations are impacted by closure of Ellsworth are all on the previous slide and also illustrated on this slide. The B-1s assigned to Ellsworth are distributed to Dyess Air Force Base where the B-1 fleet is consolidated. The C-130s at Dyess move to three installations. A majority of the C-130s, 24 of them, go to Little Rock Air Force Base, four of the C-130s move north to Elmendorf Air Force Base and four of the C-130s are distributed to Peterson Air National Guard Base, Colorado Springs. Mr. Beauchamp will discuss the justification and issues.

Mr. Beauchamp: Thank you, Mr. Small. The DOD's justification for closure of Ellsworth Air Force Base is that a consolidation B-1 fleet at one location. By consolidating the B-1 fleet at a single location the DoD expects to achieve operational and economic efficiencies. The justification also states that the B-1 activity is

CERTIFIED

transferred to an installation with higher military value and that the recommendation enables the consolidation of the active duty C-130s at one stateside location, Little Rock.

The total estimated one-time cost to the Department to implement this recommendation is over $299 million with a one-year payback. The net present value of the cost in savings to the Department over 20 years is a savings estimated at $1.85 billion. This recommendation impacts over 5,400 manpower positions. The environmental DoD estimates remediation costs at $26.4 million. The next slide, please.

[Next slide]

On this slide I've listed the significant issues grouped by relevant BRAC selection criteria. Under criteria one the Ellsworth community asserts that the department's closing an installation rated high in military value. The staff's assessment is that Ellsworth, like many installations we've looked at, is an outstanding installation. During our visit we saw firsthand the outstanding facilities and capabilities of Ellsworth. Ellsworth has vast unencroached airspace, it is sparsely populated, and has diverse terrain, all key attributes for military value.

In reviewing DoD comparative military value rankings

CERTIFIED

of the three bases in North and South Dakota, Ellsworth, Grand Forks, and Minot, the staff found that Ellsworth ranked first in six of the eight mission categories, bomber, airlift, tanker, fighter, C-2, ISR, and space. When we compared Dyess and Ellsworth in military value for criteria for bombers we found both are outstanding installations. This is indicative of the fact that Ellsworth scored higher in three of the four categories but Dyess scored highest in the most weighted category, current and future missions. With the end result being that Dyess scored 5.9 points more than Ellsworth overall. We looked further into the categories that make up this critical current and future mission criteria and we find that the greatest weight had to do with the installation's proximity to airspace supporting missions, proximity to installation to low level routes supporting missions. Dyess has over 2.3 times the volume of airspace as Ellsworth, more training ranges, and instrument routes the staff found.

But what the scoring methodology did not indicate, however, to the staff is the utilization of ranges and the training value of each range has for its specific weapons system. When we looked at utilization we find there are two principal bomber training ranges, the Lancer MOA used by Dyess and the Powder MOA used by Ellsworth. Both ranges are close to installations and offer outstanding

CERTIFIED

capabilities. The estimated utilization in fiscal year at the Lancer MOA is 58 percent of the time, and Powder about 50 percent of the time. All of the other ranges available to both bases within the 300 nautical mile circle used in the criteria were not utilized nearly as much. Utilization range from .05 percent to no more than 10 percent.

The staff assessment is that while the methodology for station range scoring was evenly and fairly applied, it was narrowly focused by placing so much emphasis on the proximity of airspace and ranges to an installation and not factoring capability of a range to support a specific MDS or weapons system as measured by its utilization. The idea here is that the capability of an airspace and training range as measured by utilization should have been factored into the overall scoring.

[Next slide]

Also -- could you go back one, please? Also, under criteria one, the community expressed concern that consolidating the B-1 bomber fleet at one location increases risk to the fleet from the singular attack, that putting all the eggs in one basket argument. The staff addressed this concern with DoD. The Department responded that the consolidation can occur with no more risk than was accepted for other aircraft at locations like Whiteman, Missouri, with the B-2s at Beale Air Force Base,

CERTIFIED

California, with the U-2s. The consolidation of the B-1's has no more risk than any of these other legacy aircraft consolidations. The staff assessed that there is additional risk in consolidating the B-1 fleet. The recommendation reduces the number of bomber bases from five to four. The concern is that this reduction is occurring in a period of time when according to the defense intelligence agency capability of current and emerging strategic threats is growing.

The staff also concluded that the consolidation is inconsistent with the national defense strategy goal developing greater flexibility to contend with uncertainty by emphasizing agility, and by not overly concentrating those heavy forces in few locations.

Lastly, the consolidation the staff assesses is inconsistent with the Air Force BRAC principle number 7 to ensure long range strike bases, provide flexible strategic response and strategic force protection.

Under criteria one the community voiced concern that under B-1 consolidation operational and logistics readiness suffers. All 67 B-1s at one base spells inefficiency and degrades operational readiness according to the community. The staff assessed that increasing the number of B-1s at one location should increase operational ability of aircraft for training and missions and improve crew

CERTIFIED

availability as well. It should also increase the availability of support equipment, particularly test equipment for the B-1. The consolidation of parts inventories from Dyess and Ellsworth should improve the key readiness indicator of the mission capable rate but it improves it only in the short term.

The short term we estimated an increase of one to two percent increase in the MC rate. That translates to approximately one more available aircraft on the flight line. But we also assess no long term improvement is expected with the MC rate due to spares availability because the Air Force's MC rate is 95 percent and that is a rate they buy spares to. A key measure of the cost of operations is the cost per flying hour. The staff wanted to measure the cost savings in this area. We found that the Department did not complete the analysis on the cost to fly the B-1.

In fairness, there's no requirement to do so under the BRAC rules but as a business case we thought it would provide us valuable insight. The staff assessed that by consolidating the fleet it would not decrease the cost, the operational cost, of the B-1 since the number of B-1s would remain constant, as well as the training requirements.

Under criteria two, the community voiced concerns that the Dyess primary training range called Lancer MOA and IR-

CERTIFIED

178's as being impacted by protracted litigation. The staff researched the issue and found that training in the Lancer MOA IR-178 is impacted due to litigation. Because of the litigation the Air Force changed its minimum operating altitude to 500 feet. The Air Force volunteered to do this as the procedure went through the courts. The court order restricts the Air Force to fly no lower than 500 feet due to concerns that plaintiffs have of wake turbulence.

In April, '05, however, the Air Force changed its requirement from 300 to 500 feet as part of its normal review process and that is the requirement now, 500 feet. The litigation is pending, the outcome of environmental impact statement, the concern the staff has with this litigation is that the MOA IR-178 has unique training capability and needs to be unfettered to provide realistic training. Could you go back one, please?

[Next slide]

Under C-3, the cost to accommodate the C-130s after gaining installations is underestimated. Under criteria three, the staff assessed that the MILCON cost to accommodate the C-1s at Little Rock was significantly underestimated. The latest COBRA run provided by the Department with data based on recent site surveys at Little Rock shows MILCON requirements about $253 million dollars,

CERTIFIED

63 percent more than the original estimate. And additionally, the COBRA shows that there's a net increase in personnel supporting the C-130s when they disperse to the three locations. As Mr. Small mentioned earlier the increase is approximately 225 people. Next slide, please.

[Next slide]

Under C-5 the staff found that the $1.8 billion dollar savings in terms of true dollar savings identified in the COBRA is more cost avoidance than actual savings. This assessment is supported by GAO's assessment in the July, 2005, report which notes that claiming such personnel savings without reducing end strength does not provide dollar savings that can be reapplied outside the personnel accounts. When we pulled out the personnel savings from this recommendation, it results in a 20 year net present value of a cost of about $19 million dollars.

If the Department were to take the manpower efficiencies gained and there are manpower efficiencies gained because when you consolidate the two bases you are now actually managing and operating the B-1 fleet with less people, but overall since those positions are not being taken off the book so to speak but converted into other skill sets, the Air Force does not realize actual cost savings. Next slide, please. Could you go back one, please?

CERTIFIED

[Next slide]

Under C-8, under C-6, economic impact on surrounding communities is very significant. The community's position asserts that DoD significantly underestimated the job loss impact. The community estimated the closure would result in over 11,000 jobs lost for an impact of 20 percent of adjacent communities. Using the conservative job estimate loss provided by DoD of 8.5 percent, the staff found that this is substantially high relative to other DoD job loss impacts which range from plus to minus 1.5 percent. The job loss at Ellsworth is compounded by low population growth and net out-migration. Next slide, please.

[Next slide]

Mr. Small: Thank you, Mr. Beauchamp. Staff stands by for your questions, sir.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. This is certainly one of the most significant recommendations to come before the Commission and it will have a profound impact on our national security and on the community. So let me begin the questioning and I'm sure there will be lots of discussion before we vote.

I would like to focus my initial questions on the selection criteria that we are charged to review and to determine whether the Secretary substantially deviated from those criteria, both military value and the others.

CERTIFIED

Could you tell me how in your opinion, how this recommendation will impact on our current and future mission capabilities and what the impact will be on our readiness if we approve this recommendation?

Mr. Beauchamp: Sir, in terms of the impact on operational readiness, we assessed that essentially it will remain unchanged. As stated earlier the number of aircraft are not decreasing, the mission capable rate will probably -- the target of mission capable rate is 95 percent, so from a spares perspective the Air Force to that level so we don't anticipate an overall increase from what is going on now.

However, there are some efficiencies that are gained because you now have more aircraft at one location. If you have to can from one aircraft to another to make that aircraft serviceable, you improve that. You also have some improvements in terms of expertise because you now have more personnel that you can draw from to support you. In terms of a net gain our assessment is that it will stay at its current level.

Chairman Principi: Even by consolidating all your B-1 bombers at a single base with a single runway you don't see any degradation in readiness?

Mr. Beauchamp: We do not see any degradation in terms of readiness from that perspective, just the operational

CERTIFIED

risks posed by merging and strategic threats.

Chairman Principi: I have never been to Dyess. Can you tell me a little bit about the availability and the conditions of the facilities at Dyess and whether the training range -- ranges, the associated airspace is adequate to meet the operational and training needs of our B-1 force?

Mr. Beauchamp: Sir, it is more than adequate. In discussing doing a comparison of the two ranges that I mentioned earlier, the Powder MOA provides significant capability to the B-1 pilot training. In fact, if we were to provide an assessment, we would probably nudge to the Powder MOA the training space because within that range you could actually do low level training and you do not have to punch out of that range into an IR route to do that training. So we would assess that that capability is slightly better than the capability at Dyess. In addition, there is unfettered airspace in the Dyess region for future training ranges if the Department decides to do that.

Chairman Principi: One final question, if we -- if the Commission decides to retain Ellsworth Air Force Base, am I correct in assuming that the C-130's at Dyess would remain at Dyess?

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir. That is all tied up in that recommendation.

CERTIFIED

Chairman Principi: Would that have any adverse impact on our operational readiness by not moving the C-130s as the Air Force has planned to other locations?

Mr. Beauchamp: No, sir. In fact, and this is a point, the Little Rock recommendation there's not a separate recommendation for Little Rock, but there's significant actions going on at Little Rock and while the focus has been on the B-1, our assessment does not support moving the 130s from Dyess to Little Rock for a number of reasons. Aircraft saturation on the runway and in airspace. As I mentioned the MILCON was admittedly underestimated so if that recommendation were by itself we would not support that.

Chairman Principi: But some of those C-130s were to go to Air National Units. I believe that we all know what's going with Air National Guard.

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir. We have eight of those C-130s that are going to Guard units, two separate Guard units.

Chairman Principi: Obviously, they would not get the recommendation if we voted against the recommendation.

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir, they would not.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Secretary Skinner.

Mr. Skinner: Yes, sir. It's my understanding that looking at the staff report that we did receive some

CERTIFIED

information from the Air Force, at least it's in a earlier staff report, concerning operating cost per hour at the two facilities and reading from the staff report I understand an operating cost is the total cost to operate an aircraft at each of the two facilities. Are you familiar?

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir.

Mr. Skinner: The numbers I got out of the staff report are that at Ellsworth the operating cost is $3,754 an hour and at Dyess it's $31,519 an hour.

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir, those numbers were provided by the Department but they were a snapshot for what the fiscal year the cost as of June 30, '05. However, the point the staff is trying to convey is that as a minimum they don't have any decrease in the cost to operate. We project a slight if not moderate increase in cost to operate B-1s because now what will happen is there is, as we're all familiar with the training range in Utah, there's some requirement to fly from Dyess and Ellsworth, to do live training there. Given the distance between the two it's going to be farther but, sir, that will increase the operating cost.

Mr. Skinner: The best comparison now we have in operating cost are the numbers that were provided by the Air Force as they stand today at the two bases?

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir.

CERTIFIED

Mr. Skinner: And that's $23,754 at Ellsworth, and $31,519 at Dyess. And those could be a combination of factors but those are the best operating cost we have so far, is that fair?

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir. There are a number of factors that contribute to that.

Mr. Skinner: In fact, depending upon the use of their range out of North, even out of Dyess it might even change more than that. Also I would like to talk about wages. Basically stated it but it's my understanding that Air Force policy on strategic positioning of assets on that you found there was a deviation from that. Did I understand you correctly?

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir. We did. We found there was a deviation from the perspective that we're increasing our bomber force from five to four while at the same time emerging strategic threats are increasing their capability.

Mr. Skinner: And one final question here, it kind of reminds us of our Oceana discussion a couple of days ago and that's to be able to train in the environment you fight in. It's my understanding that ideal…and I don't want to put words in your mouth, correct me if I'm wrong…it's my understanding that the normal profile that would be flown that the B-1s would like to fly is at 300 feet or like to be able to go as low and fly on the deck at 300 feet and

CERTIFIED

the Dyess restrictions and the litigation that's pending on encroachment and noise, they voluntarily raised that at Dyess to 500 feet, is that correct?

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir. It's a bit of a complicated issue but the requirements right now as of April, '05, the Air Force changed the operational requirement to 500 feet so that is the requirement right now. However, there are special cases where 300 feet is required of that training mission. The Air Force can achieve that in the Dyess airspace by accessing unrestricted airspace, but the point we were trying to make is that you have at the range at outside of Ellsworth within that range you can do that without any restrictions if you had to so that would give that airspace the nudge so there is degradation in the sense if you compare the two ranges.

Mr. Skinner: And are you aware what drove the height training from 300 to 500?

Mr. Beauchamp: There was a wake turbulence. Plaintiffs filed a motion in the courts saying that basically the wake turbulence impacted them, the communities.

Mr. Skinner: So, therefore, the standard may be 500 but that's because that's all they can fly at least at one of the two bases. So absent the litigation, environmental litigation, we're not sure what the Air Force would do. Is

CERTIFIED

that a fair statement?

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir. That's one of the key points as well. The litigation, there's uncertainty on the range at Dyess.

Mr. Skinner: All right. Thank you.

Chairman Principi: General Newton.

General Newton: Go ahead.

Chairman Principi: Admiral Gehman.

Admiral Gehman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Gingrich. Let's go over some COBRA numbers here. The original COBRA numbers were presented in the secretary's report that indicated the 20 year net present value savings of $1.8 billion dollars and change. I understand those numbers have changed and could you review the present numbers?

Mr. Beauchamp: We can bring up a slide. Could you go to the slide and the backup supporting -- it is the slide that has the COBRA columns.

Admiral Gehman: Why don't you go ahead and tell me what the numbers are.

Mr. Beauchamp: When we run the numbers, when we strip out military personnel from the department's numbers as you can see here, the DoD baseline is that $299 million, the column there with the $1.8 billion dollar savings, when we strip out the military personnel savings as you can see

CERTIFIED

down on the bottom line it becomes a cost of $19.4 million.

Admiral Gehman: So there's no money saved there.

Mr. Gingrich: Admiral Gehman, you confused me when you ask me about the new numbers. I thought you meant new DoD numbers. These are the existing DoD numbers and that is the R & A, the review and analysis stats numbers with the work of removing the military personnel which about 1,520 military personnel were eliminated in the original DoD recommendation. We have realigned them. We ran the COBRA and there are the numbers in the final column.

Admiral Gehman: Right. Now the question is so under that excursion, there are no savings. As a matter of fact, there's a cost here.

Mr. Gingrich: Yes, sir.

Admiral Gehman: Now the question is whether it's reasonable then to back all that military manpower out and once again I'm looking at the COBRA numbers here and it shows under Ellsworth Air Force Base closure minus 3,300 military. Are you with me?

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir.

Admiral Gehman: And it says move 24 B-1s to Dyess and then under Dyess, Texas, gain 310 military. And so I've got to defer to my Air Force General down here about whether or not a 24 plane B-1 wing is 300 whether or not you can operate these planes. What happened to the other

CERTIFIED

2,700 people? That's what I want to know.

Mr. Gingrich: Sir, I can talk right off the top, 1,520-the number I stated previously-were the number that were eliminated. The Air Force those are the military personnel that operate the base. They are associated with base operating support sustainment, et cetera. There is also a certain percentage of each flying unit. That also accounts towards base operating costs. Those most likely in this scenario realigned to Dyess, to Little Rock, to Peterson Air Force Base, and to Elmendorf. If you give me few minutes I can pull up the numbers of the personnel and tell you specifically who goes where.

Admiral Gehman: I've got them. I'm with you. I've got them so when you say when you backed out the claimed military manpower savings you did not back out the 310 people that are going to Dyess and the 482 that are going to Peterson, you just backed out the claimed savings, is that correct?

Mr. Gingrich: Yes, sir. Everyone who is scheduled to realign stayed realigned. The people, the military personnel that were slated for elimination, we simply realigned them to Dyess and to the other gaining installations.

Admiral Gehman: I just want to make sure we aren't double counting and that we are consistent. All right.

CERTIFIED

Thank you very much. One other question. Mr. Beauchamp, you indicated in your briefing which I thank you for a very complete briefing that according the Department of Defense, military value calculations were in the Air Force terms the MCI is what they used, that in the overall MCI's that Dyess ranked higher than Ellsworth by 5.9 whatever MCI's were, whatever the units are?

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir.

Admiral Gehman: To me, and I'm asking you this question, I consider that to be statistically insignificant. That is what you think about standard deviations and all the alleged errors and all that good stuff that that is statistically a wash. Do you have an opinion on that?

Mr. Beauchamp: Sir, we agree with that. We did a run, an analysis on that and we found the same thing that statistically it is a wash.

Admiral Gehman: All right. Thank you. So we have no savings. We're essentially moving the airplanes from one very, very good base to another very, very good base which are essentially equal. The airspace is about the same in both, each one has advantages, each one has disadvantages, and then my last questions before I get off the stage, Mr. Chairman is, if I do the arithmetic, 67 total B-1s, 24, it does appear that we are concentrating, we are moving 24 B-

CERTIFIED

1s to a place where there's 43 B-1s. I mean, we're not doing it backwards, we're moving a base that operates a few B-1s to a base that operates a lot of B-1s.

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir, all the B-1s except for the two test B-1s will be located at Dyess if this recommendation is approved.

Admiral Gehman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Gingrich: Admiral Gehman, I would like to correct a personnel number. The number you have in front of you, gentlemen and ma'am, is the delta or is the net effect on Dyess, the net effect is 341. What you're looking at behind the scenes are multiple moves. The B-1s moved to Dyess in order to make space and an accompanying move, personnel move, from Dyess to Little Rock, from Dyess to Little Rock 1,138 personnel are being transferred or realigned, from Ellsworth to Dyess 2,054. So what you are seeing is the net effect.

Admiral Gehman: Thank you very much. That makes a big difference and now I understand.

Chairman Principi: Could you explain that again? I'm not sure I followed you.

Mr. Gingrich: Sir, typical of most of the Air Force recommendations, it involves multiple moves. What the number in front of you that Admiral Gehman quoted, 341, is simply the net effect at Dyess Air Force Base. What

CERTIFIED

happens at Dyess, Ellsworth Air Force Base transfers the B-1 and the associated military personnel and civilians to Dyess.

Chairman Principi: And how many people?

Mr. Gingrich: That is 2,054 military and civilian.

Chairman Principi: Go to Dyess from Ellsworth. The secondary move to this recommendation is the movement of, I believe, C-130 aircraft from Dyess to Little Rock, 1,138 military and civilian personnel transfer from Dyess to Little Rock. It's also, and I'll just complete the thought, 206 personnel go from Dyess to Peterson Air Force Base and 206 personnel go from Dyess to Elmendorf Air Force Base so there's multiple moves. You just see the net effect in front on you.

Admiral Gehman: That was very helpful for me, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your indulgence because a lot hinges upon to me - this Commissioner - a lot hinges on this rubric of backing out the claimed military personnel savings because it changes the equation enormously and I just wanted to make sure that the puts and takes in that that I understood them and that they pass the common sense test, and as usual with Mr. Gingrich, he's infallible.

Chairman Principi: I thank you for that clarification because I was reading the numbers wrong. I thought a very small percentage, less than 10 percent, were going to Dyess

CERTIFIED

from Ellsworth, and then one could argue that there's really a lot of cost avoidance here, but if the vast majority are going down to Dyess then you really don't even have cost avoidance.

Mr. Cirillo: Commissioner Gehman, if I could, I'm compelled to want to mention the fact that the military personnel savings issue as we discussed on the first day, there is a military value, add to that relocation because it does allow the Department of Air Force to use those resources at other locations and there is a difference, of course, between the Commission and between the Department of Defense but I think all three parties represent the fact that there's a military value in addition to it by the actual relocation and whatever savings are achieved. It's a cost avoidance but it's not a savings.

Admiral Gehman: Well, I suggest we not get into that but unless the Chairman wants to, but in my mind I agree that when you save military manpower you could use that military manpower some other place and so when you do an action like this you save some dollars, you save some people, but the people cannot be turned into dollars.

Mr. Cirillo: That's absolutely correct.

Admiral Gehman: Therefore, we have to keep the two separate at least in my mind. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. General Newton.

CERTIFIED

General Newton: Yes, Mr. Chairman, let me join this part of the personnel discussion, and I think Mr. Gingrich got us closer to it. However, let me say unless we know all of the details which get to be extremely, extremely complicated about what it actually takes when you're moving a group of aircraft from one location to the next. All of those people that may have moved or not moved depending upon what was available at Dyess with reference to the overhead and the BOS costs, what was going to Peterson and so on, so I think we're in the ballpark but I don't want anybody for a moment to think that we can pull out of that unless you have all of the detail data, specifically, what is going one place and what's going the other in the way of personnel. Okay?

I also align myself with the fact that this is helpful for the Air Force in that there are other requirements that they will use those personnel that are left over. When you put this all together those personnel that are not needed there that are left over, they can use them other places. I think we all agree on that point. The discussion has been as to whether we call this a savings or whether we call it something else. I call it the something else which is a cost avoidance. I think we're all there.

Let me go back to a couple of points that came out in the briefing because I just want all of us to be well

CERTIFIED

grounded in understanding some of the things that were said, and the Chairman asked you a question about airspace down at Dyess. I got the impression you were talking about the airspace at Ellsworth.

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes.

Mr. Small: Excuse me, Mr. Beauchamp. We have with us our FAA delegate who can speak briefly to the airspace issue in a comprehensive manner if that's what you wish, sir.

General Newton: No, I just need him to tell me what when the Chairman asked a question and says do we have the airspace capability to conduct a mission at Dyess. Again, I got the impression that you were talking about the airspace at Ellsworth.

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes sir, and that was my oversight. I thought that he was referring to Ellsworth, but Dyess is equally capable, has an outstanding training range, called the RBTI which is under litigation as I mentioned earlier, but I was referring to in terms of the capability if you had to compare both ranges that are used by the B-1, they're both equally capable. The one has litigation right now at Dyess but they're both equally capable and we would give the nudge in terms staff's assessment to the range that is used primarily by the B-1 at Ellsworth, the Powder MOA.

CERTIFIED

General Newton: Let me speak to one other point and that is the consolidation of all of in this case the B-1 assets in one location. Clearly there's a risk when you do that but I agree with the Department when it says it measures that risk and in this case it's probably acceptable. You have to remember how we employ these airplanes. We normally do not employ these airplanes from the United States directly to the target. That would be very unusual. Normally we employ these airplanes by taking them to another location then loading them and employing them from there to the target area. So I just didn't want anyone to be confused about that. Once again I was talking about the acceptable risk and clearly, as we've discussed earlier, if the pilots are not training where we need them to train whether there's 300 feet, 500 feet, or pick an altitude, if they're not there then we're not giving them ideal training, we're giving them something less. And it doesn't make any difference how you want to measure that, it's still not 100 percent as desired, therefore, we're giving them something less than the ideal training. That gives you a little bit of a risk.

Mr. Skinner: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to make a motion in a minute but I don't know if we got into it. It's my understanding that in order to accommodate the B-1s at Dyess we would have to move all the C-130s out and you've

CERTIFIED

assessed the cost of doing that and the MILCON that is doing that and you've put those in those numbers, is that correct?

Mr. Beauchamp: Sir, as part of the original COBRA recommendation those numbers are there in terms of after gaining Little Rock but we found that those MILCON costs are significantly underestimated at Little Rock.

Mr. Skinner: And if we were to -- I'm going to make a motion in a minute to reject the secretary's recommendation but that if we were to do that as I look at the recommendation as it's written then the C-130s which were moved as a part of this recommendation would stay at Dyess along with the remaining B-1 fleet, is that correct?

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir.

Mr. Skinner: And that we would avoid the MILCON or at least that portion of the MILCON that's related to the C-130s at Little Rock.

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir. When we did the latest estimate the piece of the Little Rock that is applicable to the Dyess transfer of the 24 C-130s is approximately $77 million dollars and that is our rough estimate so you would save that portion.

Mr. Skinner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a motion.

CERTIFIED

Chairman Principi: In just a moment. We'll continue discussion. Commissioner Coyle.

Mr. Coyle: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to follow up to make an observation related to the question that Admiral Gehman asked. A characteristic of the DoD recommendations that relate to Air Force bases is that they have much higher, a much higher fraction of the projected cost savings are due to these military personnel savings and I'm looking at the calculations that you did, Mr. Gingrich, and, for example, here's an Air Force base with 92 percent of the cost savings are due to military personnel and here's another one where 97.8 percent of the cost savings are due to military personnel and here's another one where it's 94 and a half percent are due to military personnel, but I think the Ellsworth case is remarkable because it's 101 percent of the cost savings are due to military personnel which you would think wasn't possible, but that comes about because as you showed in the slide that's before us now the savings swung over to a net cost. Do I have that correct?

Mr. Gingrich: Yes, sir, you do have that correct. That is why it is 101 percent. That percentage was based on initial work, primarily spreadsheet work. The numbers that are presented right now in the far right-hand column are the rerun of the COBRA that shows you I would say a

CERTIFIED

true impact of those numbers.

Mr. Coyle: Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Could you just again, you have covered most of the criteria, I would just like to just take a little time and talk about the economic impact on the community. Mr. Beauchamp, can you please expound a little bit on what you said about how this move would impact on the community of Ellsworth, Rapid City?

Mr. Beauchamp: Yes, sir. DoD has estimated that the closure of Ellsworth, it will result in a 8.5, it could potentially result in a 8.5 percent job loss in the metropolitan statistical area, the MSA area. When we ran the numbers the average economic shock so to speak to a community based on the DoD recommendations is 1.5 plus a negative percent. So that is the baseline, so to speak. This impacts at 8.5 percent so you can see the delta there is what we talk about in terms of the significance and that is a conservative estimate. The community estimates the job loss in MSA area is approximately 10 percent so in either case there's a significant impact to the community. And additionally, as you know, it is in a rural area so it is not as if industry will come in like they will with some other areas that are under consideration in the BRAC.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Secretary Skinner.

Mr. Skinner: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a motion. Let

CERTIFIED

me make sure I get the right one here. I move that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force recommendation 43, Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota, and Dyess Air Force Base, Texas, he substantially deviated from final selection criteria one, two, three, four, and six and the Force Structure Plan and that the Commission strike the recommendation and that the Commission find this change is consistent with the final selection criteria and Force Structure Plan. I so move.

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

Mr. Coyle: Second.

Chairman Principi: Is there any discussion on the amendment?

Mr. Skinner: It's not an amendment, it's actually a motion to strike.

Chairman Principi: A motion to strike, excuse me. Is there any discussion on the motion to strike?

[No response]

All in favor of the motion to strike. Excuse me, before I do so, are there any recusals?

[No response]

Chairman Principi: No recusals. All in favor of the motion to strike?

[A show of eight hands]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

CERTIFIED

[A show of one hand]

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The vote is eight in favor, one opposed, none abstaining. The motion is adopted.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. The Commission will stand in recess for 10 minutes.

[Recess]

Chairman Principi: Mr. Cirillo.

Mr. Cirillo: Thank you Mr. Chairman. We will proceed to the Pope add only, which is chapter 11, section 194. And the after that we well do chapter 3, section 100, Cannon Air Force Base. Mr. Small?

Mr. Small: Good morning again Chairman Principi and Commissioners. Okay, we are at Statute, section 194, close or further realign Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina. This recommendations modifies - next slide please.

[Next slide].

This recommendation modifies the original Air Force recommendation to realign Pope Air Force Base by severing consideration of the relocation of C-130s from Yeager Air Guard Station, West Virginia and Pittsburgh International Airport. And it also provided for no residual assigned Air Force C-130s to be at Pope. The slide you're looking at, which is a graphic depiction show the dotted line, would show what would be remaining to the right and above the

CERTIFIED

dotted line.

In brief summary from Pope 36 A-10s would realign to Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, which is the original proposal from OSD. Twenty-five C-130Es would realign to Little Rock. Real property accountability would transfer from the Air Force to the Army. At Little Rock, 27 of the C-130Es of - it would probably be a composite of what's going to Little Rock, and what's at Little Rock. But, 27 of the C130Es would go to retirement, and eight more would go to the backup inventory for the E model. Little Rock's active duty C-130Js would be realigned to three different Air National Guard units.

At this point I'm going to turn over the mike to Mr. Flinn for discussion of the justification and issues.

Mr. Flinn: Thank you, Mr. Small. Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, BRAC staff justified this add to further realign Pope Air Force Base because our assessment indicated that 16 C-130s would be insufficient to satisfy the training and joint currency requirements at Fort Bragg.

Additionally, Strategic Airlift demands also are not satisfied by permanently stationed C-130s at Pope. Additionally, the Government Accountability Office identified differences between the Air Force's projected savings and the Army's projected costs for realigning Pope.

The COBRA analysis for further realigning Pope Air

CERTIFIED

Force Base projects a one time cost of $162 million dollars. And a total net present value savings of $1.2 billion dollars over 20 years. This recommendation will eliminate almost 1300 military and civilian positions.

However, these should be partially offset by substantial gains associated with the relocation of Forces Command Headquarters, and Army Reserve Command Headquarters to Fort Bragg. Finally, the estimated cost to complete for environmental remediation at Pope Air Force Base is $9.7 million dollars. We identified three issues during the assessment of the DoD recommendation to realign Pope Air Force Base.

This add would mitigate one of those issues. The first issue is associated with criteria 1, concerning the impact on operational readiness. The formation of an active duty reserve associate unit, which was specified by the BRAC recommendation to offset the transfer of Pope's C-130Es to Little Rock Air Force Base. But the recommendation did not specify the command and control structure necessary to maintain the operational readiness for Fort Bragg's mission.

The second criteria or the second issue pertains to criteria two, as it relates to the availability and condition of facility existing locations. The justification for closing Pittsburgh and realigning Yeager

CERTIFIED

appears to have been based on outdated or incorrect information. That issue is mitigated through this add.

Finally, the third issue under criteria three regarding the ability of receiving location to accommodate future TURTLE force requirements. BRAC staff verified that a comprehensive capacity analysis was not completed at the receiving facilities at Little Rock Air Force Base. The most significant of these issues identified above, which is that of command and control. I'm sorry, the most significant are the issues identified above remains that of command and control. That issue can be addressed during consideration of the original OSD recommendation.

Mr. Small: Thank you, Mr. Flinn. The staff stands by to answer any questions.

Chairman Principi: Are there any questions or discussions?

Mr. Coyle: Thank you again. Would you say again what you said a few minutes ago about what would happen to Pittsburgh and Yeager. First under this add and second under - when we come to deal with the OSD recommendation - the DoD recommendation.

Mr. Flinn: Yes, sir. This add would sever the unit at Yeager Air Guard Station, West Virginia from further consideration, and would also sever the 911th Airlift Wing at Pittsburgh International Airport, Air Reserve Station

CERTIFIED

from further consideration. So, they would basically be left alone.

Mr. Small: And I have a footnote there, it would sever from this discussion, not from the consequences of the basic OSD recommendation.

Mr. Coyle: Of course. And what happens to Pittsburgh and Yeager under the proposed DoD action?

Mr. Flinn: Under the original proposed DoD action, Yeager Air Guard Station, Charleston, West Virginia would be realigned. Their C-130Es - I'm sorry, C-130Hs - C-130H2s would be transferred to Pope Air Force Base. The C-130Hs at Pittsburgh International Airport, eight of those would also be transferred to Pope Air Force Base. And the aircraft would be combined into a 16 PAA primary assigned aircraft reserve/active duty associated squadron.

Mr. Coyle: And of that will be dealt with when we come to the guard question - the guard and reserve question, I should say.

Mr. Small: Yes, sir. I understand that the Pope item is now in the guard and reserve discussion, sir.

Mr. Coyle: Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Admiral Gehman?

Admiral Gehman: Yes, I want to be sure the Commission is clear on that. The movement of the C-130s is not being decided by this vote. The movement of the C-130s will be

CERTIFIED

decided - that is, I mean if we decide that way. The movement of C-130s will come up in item 103, which is still on the table. The other item that was briefed and that is the residual command and control. The appropriate residual Air Force command and control management which ought to remain at Pope will also come up in item 103. Because I'm going to offer an amendment to fix that. So, I suggest there is not business that we aren't going to take care of left in this motion. Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Is there any further discussion? Do I hear a motion to close or further realign Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina? Hearing none. We'll take it off the table.

Mr. Small: The next item of business, sir is Cannon Air Force Base. It's at section 100. Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico. This recommendation is to close Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico. The home of the 27th Fighter Wing. This slide shows the distribution of the F-16s from Cannon. Six will be distributed to the 388th Wing at Hill Air Force Base, Utah. Seven of the 57th Fighter Wing at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada. Nine to the 113th Wing at Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland. Three to the 150th Fighter Wing at Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico. Three to the 114th Fighter Wing at Joe Foss Field, South Dakota. Three to the 115th Fighter Wing at Gain County Regional

CERTIFIED

Airport - I think I just misspoke. Joe Foss Field is the 114th Fighter Wing. This recommendation also distributes 29 F-16s to the backup inventory for the F-16 fleet. Next slide.

[Slide]

Thank you. DoD's justification to close Cannon is part of the Air Force overriding strategy to more effectively employ the shrinking Air Force structure by organizing its weapons systems into fewer, larger squadrons. And by eliminating excess physical capacity. This recommendation, if approved, would allow the Air Force to reduce some of excess physical capacity. It would allow the Air Force to relocate its Block 50 F-16s as backup inventory. Its Block 40 F-16's to installations with higher military value. And its Block 30s to the Air National Guard units. These moves would sustain the active, the Air National Guard, and the reserve force mix by replacing F-16 aircraft that will be retired in the 2025 Force Structure Plan.

The Department of Defense anticipates that for a one time cost of about $90 million, it will save $816 million during the six year implementation period. Annual returning savings to the Department of Defense after 2011 are projected to be $200, with an immediate payback anticipated. As at present value of the cost and savings

CERTIFIED

to the DoD over 20 years is a savings of roughly $2.7 billion. This action will eliminate 2824 direct jobs. And will relocate 765 jobs to the gaining installations. DoD estimated environmental remediation costs is $1.2 million dollars. Next slide please.

[Slide]

Issues raised. The community is concerned for their good reason. The first issue addresses a community concern that Cannon was incorrectly scored with regard to multiple military value. The community questioned the weighting process used in some of the MCI analysis and whether the data accurately reflected the true situation at Cannon. The staff found that the methodology used by the Air Force was consistently applied to all bases. And the scoring at Cannon was consistent.

The second issue addresses a community concern that the New Mexico Training Range Initiative should have been considered. Which would have significantly increased Cannon's MCI score. The staff found that DoD was consistent in not accepting data after the established cut off date. The Commission staff learned through discussions with FAA and Air Force, Air and Space and Range Division, that the NMTRI proposal as mitigated would not have significantly increased Cannon's score.

The last issue addresses the community position that

CERTIFIED

Cannon is unencroached and did not receive full credit for its air, space and range and for its expandable growth potential. The community is correct in that Cannon has no ground encroachment issues. In fact the Clovis community in concert with the Governor of New Mexico, are working on a land acquisition of about 3000 acres which would allow USAF to expand the Base. However, the staff found that Cannon does have air space conflicts at higher altitudes. The heavily traveled air corridor that is controlled by the FAA and runs between Dallas, Texas and Los Angeles crosses directly over part of Cannon Air Force Base. This air corridor restricts the altitude of available air space around Cannon. Next slide.

[Slide]

I think I just discussed this in my previous comments. Next slide please.

[Slide]

This issue addresses the air space Melrose Range - and made sure I'm in the right script here. Range complex are an integral package supporting national security. The staff found that the Melrose Range and the Cannon controlled air space are a valuable that will be maintained and operated by another unit if Cannon Air Force Base closed. DoD statistics show that during the past five years, 35 other Active Guard and Reserve Units, to include

CERTIFIED

the Army and the Navy have used the Melrose Electronic Range. The last issue addresses the economic impact of closing Cannon. The Commission staff found that prior to BRAC the Air Force approved the programmatic out year projection to reduce 1,150 personnel. This action, when combined with the BRAC would result in an economic impact of 28.71 percent. This programmatic action was part of an Air Force plan to retire some F-16s, and is not included in the original COBRA runs. Next slide please.

[Slide]

Cannon Air Force Base is a good fighter Air Force Base. Its closure would remove from the pool of exceptional fighter Air Force bases the surge capability and the flexibility of the Air Force for future weapons systems and future implementation and uses.

Also, and as you note in item six the staff, as I commented earlier that the combination of the previously programmed action and the BRAC action is a significant 29 percent impact on the economy in the area. Next slide.

[Slide]

Gentlemen that concludes my comments. I'm available for your questions.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. This too, is probably the most difficult decision we'll have to make today. Can we talk about the cost savings associated with this

CERTIFIED

recommendation? Admiral Gehman raised that, with regard to Ellsworth I would like to just see. If you can that chart, if you have a similar chart to the one that you had for the previous discussion - I mean similar to the previous discussion.

Mr. Gingrich: Yes, Mr. Chairman. While he brings the slide up again, similar methodology was employed taking the DoD existing recommendation. And rather than eliminate the approximately 1,850 military personnel from Cannon Air Force Base, we realigned them to other Air Force bases. And you can see on this slide in the far right column the impact on the 20 year net present value. It is reduced down to $216 million dollars. When you take into account no military personnel eliminations.

Chairman Principi: So we've effectively - we've gone from $2.7 billion to $216 million in savings.

Mr. Gingrich: Yes, sir.

Chairman Principi: If we don't count them as cost savings?

Mr. Gingrich: Yes, sir. That is correct. In the COBRA model, if we don't account for them as cost savings, when you eliminate the military personnel in the COBRA model you incur the savings of the salaries of those military personnel that are eliminated. And therefore it has a fairly dramatic impact on the overall net present

CERTIFIED

value.

Chairman Principi: All right I would like to go back to military value criteria, as I did in the previous discussion. Tell me what impact this closing will have on our current and future mission capabilities, and the impact on operational readiness.

Mr. Small: I believe the biggest impact, sir is the Air Force - the F-16 fleet in the Air Force is one. Some of the systems are getting old and the weapon system has been used hard for many, many years. The Air Force desires the availability of the airplanes at Cannon in order to keep the remaining F-16 fleet fresh, safe, and operable. The Air Force otherwise has two active F-16 Wings. Cannon has been, for many years the third active F-16 Wing in the regular Air Force. With a attrition of the aircraft through age and cracks the fleet is shrinking. And they need to have availability of the very modern aircraft that are at Cannon. They're very serviceable aircraft. They've been well taken care of for many, many years. But, they need to get into the fleet at other locations. That's the OSD position as I understand it, sir.

Chairman Principi: One concern I've heard expressed and certainly was highlighted with the Oceana situation where you have - there's growing encroachment around a number of our installations. There are few, if any Cecil

CERTIFIED

Fields left. Nellis, Luke, and I'm sure there are many others. The availability and condition of the associated air space here for training, can you comment on that - the encroachment issues?

Mr. Small: The air space issue, I will give it a first cut here. And if we have much follow up I'm going to defer to the FAA expert on air space. But, let me take a first cut. The air space in New Mexico is, as a general statement, very good for the military. The state and the citizens have not only been tolerant, but participated many times in making sure that the government had adequate air space available. As my opening comment stated the probably the single biggest detractor on this discussion at Cannon is that it happens to be on a straight line between Dallas and the West Coast.

So, to allow the Air Force to operate high into the high air space environment, where the airliners work, there needs to be constant dialog and trading between where the military's going to be and commercial aviation is going to be. If you'd like a follow up on that I'd be more than to happy to defer to Mr. Aarnio, who's our FAA expert.

Chairman Principi: If he could give a very, very brief follow up. And have you been sworn?

Mr. Aarnio: Yes, I have.

Mr. Cirillo: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Aarnio did swear in

CERTIFIED

yesterday prior to testimony. But if he needs to swear in today again, this is the time to do so.

Mr. Aarnio: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners thank you. I'm open to any questions. The high altitude structure that has been referred to is jet route 74. It's a very heavily trafficked jet route. Primarily in and out of the Dallas, Fort Worth area to Los Angeles. Both east and westbound for arrivals and departures. The original NMTRI proposal started out as informal discussion between the 27th Fighter Wing and the Albuquerque En Route Air Traffic Control Center, which would be the controlling agency for that air space. For a number of years, it's my understanding that numerous proponents within the 27th Fighter Wing have tried to get the FAA to move that particular airway. That is a rule making action, and very difficult thing to do. And it's also not popular with the domestic air traffic or domestic airline fleet. So, all that being said, the NMTRI, which is a very complex and multi-componented or compacted proposal, in that particular requested airspace up to 50,000 feet. Under the current structure Albuquerque Center, as the controlling agency, is allowing up to 26,000 feet because of the ingress and egress traffic to not only Dallas-Fort Worth, but other major airports in the area. So, in the last round of mitigation of informal talks there was an agreement in

CERTIFIED

principle between the Albuquerque Center which is the, once again, the controlling agency - and the 27th Fighter Wing, as the using agency. That the altitude usable on J-74 to the 27th Fighter Wing would be flight level 320 and below, or 32,000 feet and below. The initial proposal was lower, but due to enabling and emerging technologies and our domestic reduced vertical separation criteria above 29,000 feet we were - or the FAA at Albuquerque Center - was able to go up to 32. But, because of the inbound and outbound flow of traffic, and the compression and miles and trail restrictions that would be required of aircraft going through that area, that was the highest altitude that Albuquerque was allowed to be mitigated in that case.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Are there any further questions?

General Newton: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I have a motion at the appropriate time. However, I would like to make some comments at this time.

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, I know that the mission analysis didn't find deviations or serious deviations from criteria one in the Force Structure Plan. However, this Commissioner disagrees with that assessment and I would like to take a couple moments and demonstrate why I think that the review and the analysis which took place may have missed a very important point.

CERTIFIED

And therefore I think that the Secretary deviated particularly from criteria one, and as well as the economic impact criteria, which was shown in an earlier chart. In my opinion, I clearly know in my mind why Cannon Air Force Base was selected to be on the closure list. And it was pointed out earlier. It's because the Air Force needs the aircraft. There's no question about that. Cannon Air Force Base, however also have some of the best ramp and airfield facilities of any of our Air Force bases in the United States Air Force. Its range complex is second to none. And it's air space has been extremely, extremely valuable to the training capabilities of our F-16 fleet. Even though we spoke to this restriction, which we have now at 24 and lifting to 32,000 feet. I can assure you that once, Mr. Chairman we loose air space it's going to be very, very difficult to regain that air space again.

The Department claimed that Cannon is a single mission Base. And they're right, it is. It's an F-16 Base. However, it has the capability to go to multi mission functions at that Base. It has lots of ramp space, lots of opportunity for expanding the Base, if need to. I might also add that the single mission statement might be misleading since there are other functions on that Base, namely an international function that was on that Base with the Singaporean F-16s which just left a few months ago.

CERTIFIED

They have the capability and the capacity to expand if an additional mission came their way.

At Cannon Air Force Base is also, is also absolutely out in the middle of no where. That's not to slam Cannon Air Force Base, but if you're a flyer, like I am, that's exactly what you're looking for. And that is just the right place and the right thing that we need. It's a great Air Force Base, and as a matter of fact, as was said in testimony by other Air Force officials we have no bad Air Force bases these days. They're all good. We're just at that tough spot of how we reduce this infrastructure. I should also mention that Cannon has a wonderful community that has surrounded this Base for many, many years. Known as Clovis, New Mexico and the surrounding areas. The Secretary and the Department deviated from criteria one, because in my mind they failed to take a look at what I would call strategic depth. This BRAC has been focused on what will happen to your force in the next 20 years. We have just given a large part of our time to Oceania and the encroachment problems, which we've discovered there.

This Commission certainly feels that Cannon plays a role in our force structure as we look to the future. By that I mean many of the primary Air Force Bases today are encroached. Not to the degree that it causes serious problems, but encroachment is not one that goes away with

CERTIFIED

time or gets better with time. It is one that gets worse with time. Let me give you a couple of examples of places in the Air Force where encroachment is taking place. However, it's being mitigated. Nellis Air Force Base out in Nevada. Luke Air Force Base in Arizona. Davis Monthan Air Force Base in Arizona, and Langley Air Force Base are just a few that I could mention. Once again, not serious problems, but it's growing. So, as we look out into the future at least, as I look out into the future, Mr. Chairman, I expect that this problem will get worse. Now, as the Air Force moves to its future systems, mainly the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, this will be an important discussion of encroachment. The engine on this magnificent aircraft, the Joint Strike Fighter, will produce 40,000 pounds of thrust. And it will grow. With that capability, I can assure you noise and encroachment problems will continue to grow. However, as was mentioned earlier, Cannon Air Force Base is not encroached. And therefore Cannon Air Force Base could be an ideal place to locate F-35s, the Joint Strike Fighter, as we look to the future.

So, in my mind it's clear that they've deviated from the criteria because they failed to look at the strategic depth of the future of our force. I've had more calls, Mr. Chairman about this fine Base from senior Air Force officers than any other installation that is on this BRAC

CERTIFIED

list. As I mentioned earlier, Cannon Air Force Base is a fine Air Force Base. It has the capability of hosting coalition forces and it has hosted coalition forces in the past. Cannon is an ideal location for joint and coalition training. And therefore I would invite the Department of Defense to seriously look for other coalition partners who may want to come to the United States and train with us, as the Germans do over at Holloman Air Force Base, also located in New Mexico. Today, as we build the Joint Strike Fighter we have eight partners plus a number of other countries that are helping us to develop that system. They will need someplace to initially train their pilots. And I think Cannon could play a role here. This would add significantly to criteria one, our military value and our strategic depth. We spoke to economic impact earlier, and the Department numbers for economic impact was 20 percent. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that closing Cannon Air Force Base would devastate the town of Clovis, New Mexico and the surrounding area. And I would estimate that the economic impact would be a minimum of 30 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I recommend that we realign Cannon Air Force Base, and I have an amendment to that effect when we get there. And that we move the F-16s from the Base and realign it to host a program which the Air Force has done at Moody Air Force Base now, known as the initial fighter

CERTIFIED

Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals, which is trained on T-38 aircraft. I recommend that we move that unit to Cannon Air Force Base and have the Air Force and the Department to look for other missions as appropriate to join with this mission at Cannon Air Force Base. Once again, Cannon is a fine Base and it is a great Base as we look to the future of the United States Air Force. Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, General Newton. General Hill?

General Hill: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Part of the privilege of being a BRAC Commissioner has been the opportunity to travel around America meeting the people affected by BRAC. That travel was part of the Commission's statutory, and I believe moral, obligations to fairness. Because it is after all not merely a look at military value, it is about lives and real people. Those visits have invigorated my already great esteem, indeed love for the American people. And it is the people issue that is caused me the great anguish over two decisions more than others. Ingleside Air Force Base and Cannon Air Force Base. I made the very difficult decision to vote to close Ingleside because I was persuaded that the military value factor overwhelmingly trumped the economic factor, criteria one over criteria six. The mine sweepers belonged with the

CERTIFIED

fleet, the area with the courageous leadership of Congressman Solomon Ortiz will overcome the temporary economic set backs, as have so may other communities around the country with recent BRAC visits.

I am not so persuaded in the case of Cannon, and will vote to keep it open. As General Newton more eloquently described than I possibility could, the Air Force has not made the case in my mind to persuade me that the military value overcomes the economic factor. In these uncertain times and the uncertainty of the future, I cannot see us closing Cannon. Luke will be the next Cecil Field, and we need to continue to find ways to maintain strategic flexibility and depth. And just as importantly, Clovis, New Mexico, does not have the economic resiliency of Corpus Christi, Texas. One only needs to look south from Clovis and still see the economic devastation caused a mid '60s decision to close Roswell, New Mexico air Base. Yes, however you figure the numbers, and I do not believe the DoD numbers are accurate, the Department saved some money. But the American taxpayer and treasury will bear the brunt of that decision from the economic downfall and devastation of Clovis for many years to come.

So, in fairness to the people of Clovis and the American taxpayer I will vote today to keep Cannon open. To accept whatever amendment General Newton comes forward

CERTIFIED

with. I know we will hand the Air Force a problem if we adopt this recommendation. But, they're better equipped to deal with it than Clovis. It is in my mind the right thing to do. And I urge my other Commissioners to follow that. Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, General Hill. Admiral Gehman?

Admiral Gehman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Small, unlike the last Air Force Base that we just dealt with, this is not a movement of units and airplanes from one Base to another, as I understand it.

Mr. Small: That is correct.

Admiral Gehman: There's a…I counted here, perhaps six different receiving sites for these F-16s. Four of which are Air Guards. And then there are 29, which are listed to go to back up inventory. Can you tell me what back up inventory means?

Mr. Small: Yes, sir. The back up inventory - there's a couple of classes of planes that are not primary assigned aircraft. When they talk about a unit being 24 airplanes, that is a general reference to the - or the technical reference being primary assigned aircraft. The other side of the coin is the back up aircraft inventory. And these are planes that are serviceable. They could very well be parked on an Air Base where they could be used. But, the

CERTIFIED

Air Force does not have funding and appropriations to actually operate those aircraft. So, they are basically uninservice, spare, available for distribution where ever they might be needed to keep the units that are flying at full strength or as close as they can get them to.

Admiral Gehman: Thank you. In our very careful analysis of the Air Guard issue we found cases where we thought maybe Air Guard stations were being compared to active duty bases, and things like that. But this is active F-16 flying bases we're talking about here. And, I'm I correct that the Air Force currently operates four major active F-16 bases: Luke, Nellis, Hill, and Cannon? Have I got them right?

Mr. Small: Well I'm going to take a cut at it, and General Newton may reeducate right here. On the microphone however. Of the active line Air Force, Cannon was one of three. Hill and Shaw. The fourth Base, as you accurately state, Luke, has a large number or reasonably number of F-16s. Luke is primarily a training establishment, sir.

Admiral Gehman: And then if the inventory of F-16s is going down, and the Air Force is assigning 29 to back up inventory. And four of these distributions, which total 18 airplanes are going to the Air Guard. Did the Air Force choose to take the F-16s out of the Base with the lowest MCI of those four?

CERTIFIED

Mr. Small: Well, Luke is because of the different mission, I haven't done that comparison, sir. I can't without looking at the charts. But, of the three, Hill, Shaw, and Cannon, Cannon is number three, sir.

Admiral Gehman: So, the Air Force inventory is going down. They're out of F-16s and the Secretary did chose to depopulate the Base with the lowest military value.

Mr. Small: Yes, sir.

Admiral Gehman: Now I agree with my colleagues here completely about the agony of trying to make this decision and I want everyone to know that the question before this Commission is not, is Cannon a good Air Force Base? I think if the Chairman put that to us, the vote would be nine to zero. We would say yes, Cannon is a great Air Force Base. Unfortunately, that's not the question. We're working on the question - we're working on is when you run out of F-16s did the Air Force, did the Secretary of Defense deviate from the policy, deviate from the criteria when he selected which Base as not to have any F-16s? And that's really what our mission is here. This is a very troublesome - I have as much trouble with this one as do my colleagues. Not so much because of the Air Force - of the military value part of it, but of the impact on the local community. That is the part of this equation I'm going to have to wrestle with. I have no other questions, Mr.

CERTIFIED

Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Commissioner Coyle?

Mr. Coyle: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thought the comments made by General Newton and General Hill were quite eloquent and I've not heard either one of them say those things before because of the limitations we have on meeting in a quorum. And we don't talk and have opportunities to have these kinds of exchanges. And I'm not a pilot, I'm not a military pilot and so I don't have the background and expertise that General Newton does. But, I found his comments regarding criteria one quite powerful.

On this Commission we're regularly reminded that we're supposed to think out to 2025. And a lot of things can happen in 20 years. And I think families have to make these kinds of decisions too. A lot of military families - I'm talking about the military families of modest means now - own or rent two houses. It's difficult for them. But, they get located all around country and they need a place to live where they go. But, they don't sell their house back home. If they can afford it they don't sell their house back home because it’s too valuable. They know they're going to want to return home someday and maybe they like the weather and the clear skies better there better, also.

For me Cannon Air Force Base is sort of like that.

CERTIFIED

Mr. Chairman there has to be a limit to my analogy. But, every military family knows exactly where that limit is. An accountant could show them how much money they could save next month or next year if they didn't have that mortgage. But, those military families aren't thinking how much they could save in the future.

I expect that every member of this Commission has been in a situation such as those military families, and it hasn't been easy. I know I have when I first came to Washington 27 years ago. I needed a place to live and I didn't sell my house back in California. And I'm very glad that I didn't. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Secretary Skinner?

Mr. Skinner: When I began this job everybody told me thank you for doing it and how hard it was going to be. And then for the next two months I got visit military installations all over this country and see the fine people that serve, and the fine installations. And I fell in love with everyone of them. And I never really - maybe I kicked the can down the road, so to speak. I never focused on what they meant when it was hard.

Well 4:00 o'clock this morning I found out that when I woke up and the alarm was set for 6:30 and I pulled out the papers, and I thought about the families, and then I thought about the installations. I ran some numbers. And

CERTIFIED

I thought of those families and communities, not only in Clovis, but in - and I added it up. 29 units of the Air National Guard and the Army Reserve are impacted and would be closed or would no longer have a flying mission if the Secretary's recommendations went through. And then I estimated, and no one knows till the votes are made, how many will be - how many of those will hold, and it's somewhere between 20 and 30 is my best guess. But, we won't know until the votes come in. Every one of those is a community. Every one of those is a family. I saw them at Mitchell Field in Milwaukee. I saw them at Springfield, Illinois. I saw them all over the mid-west. And each one of them has invested their families and their lives to this country. In the defense of this country.

In some cases for over 50 years. So, this is truly - my friends are right, it is a hard decision. This one as far as what to do with the airplanes and the recommendation of the Secretary, I think is quite easy. If we don't approve the movement of those 50 F-15s, that list of guard families and communities will go north of 30 that will be impacted. And it's the right thing to do. Because each of these families, the pain there it is not as broad, but it's as deep, I can assure you. That leads us to what do we do now? And the question is, has the Secretary made a mistake in not finding another mission for Clovis and Cannon Air

CERTIFIED

Force Base? And finally if the Secretary couldn't find a mission, can we find one? And I can assure you I know everybody has searched vitally for a mission. And, obviously, General Newton has a suggestion which we'll consider shortly.

I think as we make our decision here we've got to take into consideration all of these factors and all of these families that are waiting for our decisions this afternoon. As well as the people in New Mexico, who by the way are just - I didn't visit there, but everything I've heard it - is a spectacular Base, spectacular people, spectacular leadership. And they've supported our mission for many, many years. Unfortunately, the BRAC process doesn't allow us to be everything to everybody. I remember when we did Transportation Bill when I was Secretary of Transportation. As we solved these problems by giving them more projects and more money.

But, unfortunately the BRAC process doesn't allow us to do that. There's an easy solution, but we don't have an easy one here. So, I believe that the aircraft that are currently at Cannon should to out. And I think that I would like to listen to the rest of the Commissioners and listen to General Newton's proposal on what he would put in there and why. And also wrestle another little while as to whether - if that isn't the right mission, and General

CERTIFIED

Newton is a very knowledgeable and highly respected Air Force aviator and leader.

But, we would really - if we were to take a mission and put it in there that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force thought we shouldn't do - I wonder if we don't run the risk of micro-managing or superimposing our judgment as we may think it is on the Secretary of the Air Force and the Secretary of Defense. And in many of these cases we've resumed regularity with the Secretary. On the other hand, I want to make sure that the people of New Mexico have every opportunity to make sure they prove their case and try and find a mission, and we've done that mightily. And so I don't know how it's all going to come out, but those are kind of the issues I struggle with. But I understand the economic impact.

I understand the great work they've done, but I also understand the impact on all these other units that have performed equally well, our citizen soldiers. And so it is clearly the toughest decision this Commission will have, in my opinion. It is tougher, as tough as the Guard is. Or it's at least as tough as the Guard mission. And I think we have to take into consideration that the airplanes are needed, number 2, and the Secretary thought the Base was excess, and this would be the only military facility in the active we would close of any significance.

CERTIFIED

Now, that doesn't mean you do it just because it's one. It's got to be the right thing. And I think as we listen to everybody deliberate this one, we'll really go right down to the wire. Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Congressman Bilbray?

Mr. Bilbray: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is one of the nine items that our planes are being transferred to Nellis Air Force Base or align the State of Nevada. It's the one that causes me the most problems. I wish I could vote on this issue because I think Cannon is a great Base. But, the fact is I have to recuse myself, and hopefully my vote will not be needed.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. General Turner?

General Turner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, woke up early this morning and began collecting my thoughts for what I would say today. Prior to June 22nd of this year I had never been to Cannon or Clovis. I've never particularly wanted to go there.

In fact I had successfully avoided going there in my 30 years in the Air Force. And there was really no particular reason for that, except that I knew, as my colleague mentioned that it was in the middle of nowhere. And I'm kind of a big city girl, growing up in Chicago. So, it simply wasn't on my radar screen, but then along came the BRAC process. And I realized that this was kind

CERTIFIED

of a classic case of I didn't know what I didn't know. And so of course I drew the site visit and the regional hearing for Cannon.

So, it came to the point where the big city girl would meet Clovis, New Mexico. And what was immediately obvious to me was the relationship between the local communities and this Air Force Base. These people are genuine supporters and partners of Cannon Air Force Base and the Air Force members and their families who are stationed there. And I want the citizens of the local communities to know that we all recognize that. And we appreciate that, and we applaud them for their efforts over these many years. Cannon Air Force Base, well, it's true it's in the middle of nowhere. But, this is actually a part of its charm, and, in my opinion part of its current and future military value. It's a great climate, wide open spaces, buildable acres, virtually no encroachment, excellent access to the range. I mean the list could go on and on. And you've already heard other folks talk about it. But, I'll tell you what my take away was from Cannon Air Force Base and that was when you’re on the top of the brand new, state of the art control tower it's very obvious to you that on a clear day you can see forever in any direction. And that includes up. So, my bottom line today is that I believe that there's a future military mission for Cannon

CERTIFIED

Air Force Base beyond their current F-16 mission. And it is incredibility short sighted of us to close the Base at this time. Therefore I intend to support the motion when offered because, quite simply, it's the right thing to do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, General. Are there any further comments?

[No response]

I would like to proceed in the following fashion, and I'll ask your indulgence. I don't want to prolong this agony that everyone is going through waiting for this to be decided. I would like to ask General Newton to offer his amendment. And I'll call for a second. After the second, I will ask that the amendment be tabled so that the Commission can stand in recess for 15 minutes. There's an important procedural matter I want to discuss with my follow Commissioners. Upon completion we'll return. I have comments I want to offer on this issue. And my fellow Commissioners may also have comments. And then we will vote on the amendment, and we'll vote on the final solution. So, General Newton if you will offer your amendment at this time.

Mr. Skinner: I just have a procedural question. I wonder if before we take our recess, once General Newton introduces his motion he can explain it so we understand

CERTIFIED

it. And then we'll take that recess.

Chairman Principi: That will certainly be fine. General Newton?

General Newton: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense, when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force recommendation 32, Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico he substantially deviated from the final selection criteria one, two, six, and seven and the Force Structure Plan. That the Commission strike the entire recommendation and insert in it's place, realign Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico to disestablish the 27th Fighter Wing, and to strip it of aircraft to meet the requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendation. Of the Secretary of Defense as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Relocate from Moody Air Force Base all Introduction to Fighter Fundamental (IFF) training for pilots, Introduction to Fighter Fundamental training for weapons systems officers, Introduction to Fighter Fundamental training for instructor pilots, and all associated training asset and aircraft including all AT-38s and T-38Cs aircraft to Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico. And that the Secretary of Defense shall seek other missions as appropriate and assign the missions to Cannon Air Force Base. And that the Commission find this change in the recommendation, as

CERTIFIED

amended are consistent with the final selection criteria and Force Structure Plan.

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

General Hill: I second.

Chairman Principi: General Newton?

General Newton: There is this unit, as I mentioned earlier of Introduction to Fighter training at Moody Air Force Base. Those aircraft are moving and they will be going to other training locations, distributed around the command. Under this recommendation all of those aircraft would go to Cannon Air Force Base. And we would consolidate all Introduction to Fighter training at that location, getting that synergy of all of them being together.

The cost of doing this would certainly be much less than an F-16 unit, in that traditionally this type of aircraft is contracted maintenance and support. Clearly this is not a mission that requires all of the assets at Cannon Air Force Base since it was sized for an F-16 Wing. And this would not be a Wing. So, that's the proposal, and I'll be happy to try to answer any questions, reference what has been included in this proposal if there are any. Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Are there any questions at this time?

CERTIFIED

Admiral Gehman: I do. But do we want to discuss now or go recess?

Chairman Principi: Let's take a recess and we'll come back. The Commission will stand in recess for 15 minutes.

[Recess]

Chairman Principi: The Commission hearing will be in order. Currently pending is the motion to amend by General Newton. I would like to offer some comments and then I believe there may be another amendment at some point. The Secretary's recommendation to close Cannon Air Force Base is certainly the most difficult decision that I will face, and have faced. I know the recommendation was difficult for the Air Force to make. Cannon has a long history of exemplary service to our Nation. Many of the uniform leaders of the Air Force have touched down on it's runways, and perfected their skills in the New Mexico skies.

As General Hill and General Newton have indicated, a decision to close Cannon will be absolutely devastating to the people living in Clovis and Eastern New Mexico. These are people whose lives and livelihoods are intertwined with the Base. This is a community whose history is defined by a legacy of faithful support, not just for the Base but for our Nation.

I would add that I learned first hand the strong character, and bedrock values of the people of New Mexico

CERTIFIED

as a young man attending the New Mexico Military Academy prior to my enrollment in the Naval Academy. I know how hard the people of New Mexico work to secure the base's continuing role in America's defense and that their hard work is reflected in the advocacy of their very capable representatives in Congress, and certainly their Governor. I know that decision before us could be very painful for everyone involved. But I also know that the BRAC process was created because the institutional adjustments necessary to meet the changing needs of a dynamic environment, while painful, are also absolutely necessary.

An institution unable to make changes necessary to meet the changing need of a changing environment is an institution that will be ineffective and that will not serve the men and women we send in harm's way. Painful basing decisions cannot be, and should not be avoided or deferred simply because they are difficult. Postponing, necessary decisions simply makes the later pain even worse. We know that F-16s are old and will be replaced. But we also know there will be far fewer replacement airplanes than the number of F-16s we now support.

We also know that the Secretary of the Air Force has designated the F-16s at Cannon for other important missions including the Air National Guard. And we have heard from Air National Guard and I think just about every Governor in

CERTIFIED

our Nation. I don't believe it's appropriate for the Commission to dictate to the Secretary of the Air Force, or the Secretary of Defense that all pilot training, or component of pilot training should be done at Cannon Air Force Base. I believe that's a decision for the Secretary and not this Commission.

I will support the Secretary's recommendation, not because it is easy, but because I understand the need for the Air Force to support only the installations it believes it needs to support for the equipment it will have. And because I cannot find a substantial deviation from the statutory BRAC selection criteria, and the Force Structure Plan. Admiral.

Admiral Gehman: Thank you Mr. Chairman, this decision is indeed a very agonizing decision. It is my understanding that the Air Force structure of the future which will consist of F-22s, will have significantly fewer F-22s than they currently have F-15s. I don't know what it is but it’s significant. It will consist of F-35 JSFs, which will be fewer number than the F-16s we have right now. It will be a new tanker version - there will be fewer air frames than we have right now. And so there is no question that when you measure aircraft, count aircraft in the future and use the Force Structure Plan which we are by law required to do, that the requirement for basing goes

CERTIFIED

down in the future.

Now one way to get around that of course is to have small squadrons at lots of Bases. But we have already found out that that is not the Air Force plan. The only alternative we have is a very painful one of selecting a very, very good Air Base to close. It reminds me very much of the long and agonizing discussions over the Federal Navy Shipyards. They're all good and the Department of Defense made the recommendation that one of them had to be closed, to make the argument that the Base should be kept open because there are new airplanes that are coming on the line someday, does not seem to ring true when you start counting airplanes. The number of platforms in the future is going to be smaller than they are right now. And therefore it's reasonable for the Secretary of Defense to decide that he needs one less Air Force Base. I will remind my colleagues that in a previous vote, we proposed, the staff proposed, we add to our list of Bases to be closed or realigned the Grand Forks Air Force Base which was in the Secretary's recommendation, essentially to be a warm Base. My colleagues elected to not do that. We voted against that proposal. We had previously a vote on Ellsworth Air Force Base, which the Department recommended to close. My colleagues elected not to close Ellsworth Base. We are essentially down to the last hard one, and to me I cannot

CERTIFIED

find that the Secretary has deviated in any substantial way from the criteria, with one exception. And that exception is the impact on the local community. And so I look at what the impact is on the local community, and in my mind is what is necessary to be done, is to weight the overall good of the country, and weigh the overall good of the Department as we have shredded this thing every possible way, against the good of a local community. And I'll just have to sort that out.

I applaud General Newton for making an extraordinary effort to find some mission to create a mission for Cannon Air Force Base, I applaud him for that. He has done a marvelous job. This mission, of course, has not been analyzed by the Department of Defense to my knowledge. We have no idea what it actually entails, but I don't think that it is our job to tell the Secretary of Defense how to move these forces around in order to kind of create something for Cannon Air Force Base.

So based on the fact that not only does the Department stipulate that it has no future use for this Base, but my knowledge of acquisition and force structure in the future confirms that there is no requirement for this Base, it simply comes down to determining whether or not the military value criteria in my mind are more significant than the other criteria. And to make that determination, I

CERTIFIED

go back to the statute. And the statute tells us that we are to value the military value criteria over the others. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Thank you. Is there any further discussion. Secretary Skinner?

Mr. Skinner: Yes, thank you. One of my concerns is the fact that the Secretary of the Air Force may not have anticipated, or may not have reflected enough on what the future needs of Air Force are going to be. We've seen that earlier, it seems like last week. But two days ago when we have a very active discussion of the Oceana Naval Air Station and the fact that the Navy a few years ago decommissioned Cecil Field, and now if it was active, it might very well be the master jet Base of the United States. Air fields are not easily duplicated. Having said that it is clear to me that we can inflict no more pain on the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve, and the Squadron, the Flight Wing that is scheduled. The 27th Fighter Wing that is schedule to deploy its aircraft otherwise, should go forward. Number 2, it does not to me seem appropriate for us, and I say this as a former Cabinet Secretary to dictate a move of this magnitude unilaterally, without consultation with the Secretary. And I will be voting against General Newton's motion, which I think - whose judgment I value, and have taken into consideration.

CERTIFIED

And if that fails I will be introducing a new motion that will disestablish the fighter wing, will create an enclave at the Cannon Air Force Base. An enclave is something new to us, but we learned a lot about it, during our Guard discussions. I'm sure some in this room are now going to the dictionary and trying to determine what an enclave is. But an enclave is not closure. It allows the facility to remain open, in a diminished state, and then I will also ask in this motion, direct the Secretary to reexamine his decision to close Cannon Air Force Base, and to seek a new mission if possible. And that if the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of the Air Force, find a new mission before the date of closure of the enclave - which I would suggest should be December 31st, 2010 - he can designate that again as an active Air Force Base. If he does find a mission and does not decide to keep it open and after reflecting in the cool of the night, that it still is appropriate to close that facility by not designating a mission for that facility he will have the ability, it will close by order of the BRAC within the BRAC period. Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Is there any further discussion?

[No response].

Chairman Principi: Hearing none, we'll vote on the amendment. Are there any recusals.

CERTIFIED

[A show of two hands].

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of four hands]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[A show of three hands].

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the votes are, four in favor, three against, two abstentions. The motion is disapproved.

Chairman Principi: I understand we have another motion which has to be inviting, this amendment was disapproved? She said disapproved.

Mr. Skinner: I will be making a motion. I - no one else could read my writing this was done momentarily, just a few minutes ago. I suggest that we defer this, my motion and the consideration on this, until we can get this motion in writing and I'll make it, if it gets a second we will debate it and then decide whether it makes sense or not. That is my suggestion. If you want, however, Mr. Chairman, I will make my motion now? What do you want to do?

Chairman Principi: I suggest, let's reduce it to writing, let's get it around to all Commissioners, we will stand at recess until 1:30 at which time we'll take up your amendment. And we'll proceed to the other issues this afternoon. Thank you.

[Lunch Recess 11:20 a.m.]

CERTIFIED

AFTERNOON SESSION

Chairman Principi: The Commission hearing will come to order.

Mr. Cirillo?

Mr. Cirillo: Yes, we have a -- before we start this afternoon's proceedings, I recommend we all get sworn in again, since we have a lot of new witnesses.

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

All members of the BRAC staff who are presenting

CERTIFIED

evidence before the Commission today, please raise your right hand for me.

[Whereupon, the staff witnesses were sworn in.]

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Cirillo: Mr. Chairman, if I could give you a brief rundown of where I believe we're going this afternoon, we'll first start off completing section 100, which is Cannon Air Force Base. From that, we will complete section 128, the Undergraduate Pilot Training at Moody Air Force Base, which was tabled from yesterday. At that point in time, we'll go into the Air National Guard-related activities that we'll be discussing, and Reserve activities that we're discussing this afternoon -- be an introduction to that. Within that Air National Guard discussion, we'll also address three other actions that were held back from this afternoon, and that would be the Kulis, Elmendorf, section 180 -- I'm sorry -- repeat -- section 80 from this morning, Kulis, Alaska, and Elmendorf, Alaska. We'll also the section 103, Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina -- also includes Pittsburgh and Yeager, and will also include section 104, which is Grand Forks Air Force Base, and then the many recommendations that are Guard- and Reserve-related will be discussed all in this one dialogue.

At this point in time, Mr. Chairman, I'm going to turn

CERTIFIED

it over to Mr. Small, and Mr. Small will be available for further discussion regarding Cannon Air Force Base.

Mr. Small: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners.

Oh. Okay, I guess we're back to Cannon Air Force Base and the discussion. Are there any questions of the staff that have arisen, sir?

Mr. Skinner: No. I have a motion. And --

Chairman Principi: Yes.

Mr. Skinner: -- I have a motion, Mr. Chairman, and I just sent it out for a quick typo change. So --

Chairman Principi: Okay.

Mr. Skinner: -- maybe --

Chairman Principi: Well, why don't we just table that, and we'll go to the next item, and then we'll come right back to Cannon, so we don't --

Mr. Skinner: That would be perfect.

Chairman Principi: -- we don't lose any time.

Mr. Skinner: Thank you.

Chairman Principi: We've got a lot of work to cover, and time is running short.

Mr. Cirillo: We could go to section 128, which is the Undergraduate Pilot Training. At this point in time, then, I'm sure you saw plenty of Mr. Dave Van Saun yesterday, but you'll get another opportunity, Mr. Chairman. And, also,

CERTIFIED

Mr. Syd Carroll will address section 128, which is the Moody Air Force Base realignment.

Mr. Van Saun: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a -- one slide shows the rest of the Education and Training items. We are going to be addressing section 128. It is Joint Cross-Service Education and Training, number 14, section 128 of the bill, relocates primary phase of fixed-wing pilot training, Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals training, and undergraduate navigator training within the Air Force.

Specifically, this recommendation provides for the realignment of Moody Air Force Base by relocating the primary phase of fixed-wing pilot training to Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, Laughlin Air Force Base, Texas, and Vance Air Force Base, Oklahoma; the Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals training for pilots to Columbus to Columbus Air Force Base, Mississippi, Laughlin Air Force Base, Randolph Air Force Base, Sheppard Air Force Base, and Vance Air Force Base; the Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals training for weapons systems officers to Columbus Air Force Base, Laughlin Air Force Base, Sheppard Air Force Base, and Vance Air Force Base; and the Introduction to Fighter Fundamentals training for instructor pilots to Randolph Air Force Base. It also provides for the realignment of Randolph Air Force Base by

CERTIFIED

relocating undergraduate navigator training to Naval Air Station Pensacola.

I'd like to introduce Syd Carroll to further explain the move.

Mr. Carroll: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, thank you for having me back again this afternoon.

The DOD justified this recommendation on the basis that it aligns and consolidates the Air Force's primary phase of undergraduate flight training, reduces excess and unused basing capacity, enhances jointness for undergraduate navigator training, and improves military value. The one-time cost to implement this recommendation is $71.7 million, which will be repaid from savings in four years. The net present value of the savings for this recommendation through the year 2025 is $174.2 million. A total of 1,054 people are affected by this recommendation.

Staff determined that the Secretary of Defense did not deviate from BRAC criteria in making this recommendation.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my presentation. I'll gladly answer any --

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Mr. Van Saun: -- questions you may have.

Chairman Principi: Are there any questions?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: Any further discussion? Any

CERTIFIED

amendments?

Admiral Gehman?

Admiral Gehman: The provisions of this -- and I'm for it; I'm not questioning it -- the provisions of this recommendation sound eerily familiar. I think they were contained in an amendment which we just voted down. And if we had voted that amendment up, the law of unintended consequences would have applied. I did not realize that that amendment was related to the -- was related to this. These are the same functions that we were trying to stick into Cannon.

I'd suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we are on the very edge of the competency of this Commission and that we are on the very edge of what we know, if we know what we're doing. And I recommend we stick strictly to what we're supposed to be doing here.

Thank you very much, sir.

Chairman Principi: General Newton?

General Newton: I'm at a loss for what the Commissioner was implying there. I --

[Laughter.]

General Newton: -- I don't mean to further this discussion, but, you know, I -- are you indicating that we're on the edge of being illegal? I don't -- I'm not aware of anything that we've done that has not had the

CERTIFIED

advice of counsel that what we were doing were strictly within the rules and the guidance of the law at which we're working under.

Chairman Principi: If there's no further discussion, I'll move the motion to approve Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group recommendation 14, Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training, appearing at chapter 4, section 128 of the bill. I move that the Commission find that the Education and Training Joint Cross-Service Group recommendation 14, Undergraduate Pilot and Navigator Training, is consistent with the final selection criteria and force-structure plan.

Is there a second?

Admiral Gehman: Second.

Chairman Principi: Any recusals?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous. The motion is approved.

Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Next item?

CERTIFIED

Mr. Van Saun: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That completes the Joint Cross-Service Team's initial presentations. Sorry it took so long.

Chairman Principi: Thank you very much.

Mr. Van Saun: And we have some technical corrections that we'll need to discuss at the end of the session.

Chairman Principi: So, we have the -- there may be another amendment on one of the issues --

Mr. Van Saun: Yes, sir. We --

Chairman Principi: -- the integrated armaments?

Mr. Van Saun: Yes, sir. That additional amendment and correction of the amendment, and technical corrections, we'll bring to the table at the end of the deliberations.

Chairman Principi: We'll do at the very end. Okay.

Mr. Van Saun: Yes, sir.

Chairman Principi: Thank you very much.

Mr. Cirillo: Mr. Chairman, if we're ready for section 100 -- to complete 100, we're prepared to -- as usual --

Mr. Skinner: We can do Cannon now, if you want.

Mr. Cirillo: Cannon Air Force Base.

Chairman Principi: Okay. We'll proceed to Cannon. Secretary Skinner, would you offer your amendment?

Mr. Skinner: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I make a motion to amend Air Force recommendation 32, Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico. I move that the

CERTIFIED

Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force recommendation 32, Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, he substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1, 6, and 7, and the force-structure plan, that the Commission strike the entire recommendation and insert in its place, quote, "Realign Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, by disestablishing the 27th Fighter Wing and distributing its aircraft to meet the primary aircraft authorization requirements established by the Base Closure and Realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission; two, after de-establishing the 27th Fighter Wing, the Air Force shall establish an enclave at Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, which enclave shall remain open until December 31, 2009, during which time the Secretary of Defense shall seek other missions for possible assignment to Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico. If the Secretary designates a mission for Cannon Air Force Base during this period, the enclave status would revert to the status appropriate for the designated mission. If the Air Force does not find a mission for Cannon Air Force Base by December 31st, 2008, Cannon Air Force Base and the enclave shall be closed. Nothing in this directive shall prohibit the State of New Mexico and the Department of Defense from entering into an agreement to close the enclave at Cannon Air Force Base

CERTIFIED

earlier than December 31st, 2009. Finally, that the Commission finds this change is consistent with the final selection criteria and force-structure plan."

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

Mr. Coyle: Second.

Chairman Principi: Is there any discussion?

Mr. Bilbray: Mr. Chairman, are all those numbers supposed to be 2009?

Mr. Skinner: Yes --

Mr. Bilbray: I noticed the second --

Mr. Skinner: -- they're all 2009.

Mr. Bilbray: Okay.

Mr. Skinner: Thank you.

Admiral Gehman: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Principi: Yes, Admiral Gehman?

Admiral Gehman: Just so I understand, this moves all the airplanes out. Is that -- that's correct?

Mr. Skinner: That's correct.

Admiral Gehman: All right. So, we have an empty base until 2009, and we are asking the Secretary -- the law says that the -- the statute -- BRAC statute says that the Secretary of Defense is to study all this stuff, make recommendations to us, and then we decide what bases stay open. And this goes back to the Secretary and said, "You get one more chance to decide." And so, we're really

CERTIFIED

throwing this back to the Secretary. Is that correct?

Mr. Skinner: I don't know if I'd have used the word "throwing back." We're asking him to reconsider his recommendation and ensure that -- before he closes a vital asset of the United States Air Force, that he assures himself, again, that there is no mission for this. And if he finds there's no such mission, by not recommending a mission, the base will close. If, on the other hand, during this period of time, as the disestablishment of the wing occurs, they find a mission, they can reestablish the mission, as appropriate. This means that, going to your point earlier, Admiral Gehman, we are not superimposing our judgment on the Secretary of the Air Force or the Secretary of Defense, as you and I were concerned about; we're basically letting him make that decision and asking him reassess as to whether or not there is a mission and whether or not it's appropriate to close. And it still sends the aircraft to the Active Air Force. It obviously creates an enclave, which is -- the Air Force is now fully familiar with, a much smaller force than would, of course, be if they had a mission of the Fighter Wing. And it still gives the Department of Defense, to make sure that -- as we go down the road, that the concerns that were expressed by some of the Commissioners today, that we were closing a base that we would later regret that we closed, that we are

CERTIFIED

double-checking this most -- the Secretary of Defense is double-checking this decision. And that's what the motion does.

Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Is there any further discussion?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: Hearing none, we'll vote on the motion to amend.

All in favor?

[A show of six hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[A show of one hand.]

Chairman Principi: Recusals?

[A show of two hands.]

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The vote are six in favor, one opposed, two abstentions. Therefore, the motion is approved.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Hearing no further motion to amend, we'll vote on whether to approve the Secretary's recommendation, as amended, and find that it is consistent with the final selection criteria and the force-structure plan.

Do I have a second?

General Hill: Second.

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

CERTIFIED

[A show of six hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[A show of one hand.]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, once again the vote is six in favor, one opposed, two abstentions. The motion carries.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Mr. Cirillo?

Mr. Cirillo: Mr. Chairman, before I turn it over back to Mr. Small, just want to point out that all the actions that you will see in the Air National Guard will be discussed in order of weapons systems, such as starting off with the KC-135, and there are -- each reference that will be discussed at the end of the presentation will refer to the specific sections when motions are read that are within the bill that everybody has.

Chairman Principi: And Kulis will be discussed in -- during the course of the Air National Guard --

Mr. Cirillo: That's correct. Grand Forks is within the KC-135s, and that's section 104; Pope Air Force Base, section 103, is within the C-130s --

Chairman Principi: That's fine.

Mr. Cirillo: -- as is Kulis and Elmendorf, also with the 130s, which is section 80.

Chairman Principi: Good, thank you.

CERTIFIED

Mr. Cirillo: I'll turn it over to Mr. Small.

Chairman Principi: You may proceed, Mr. Small.

Mr. Small: Yes. Good afternoon, again, Mr. Chairman.

Very briefly, sir, a digression. Here around us are several individuals that need to be recognized. Our associate analysts have kept us moving for several days. I would like to recognize Nat Sillin, Ethan Saxon, Ryan Dean, Ashley Buzzell, Michael Kessler, Aaron Butler, and, on the computer -- not on the computer, is Justin Breitschopf. We owe these gentlemen and lady a great deal of compliment.

Now --

Chairman Principi: Greatly appreciate your efforts. Thank you.

Mr. Small: I would like to briefly describe the approach to presenting the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve bed-down. The staff has a recommended distribution of the aircraft. We considered military value and homeland security in the preparation of our recommendation to the Commission. We had available to us the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, comments from hearings, and materials provided by the public.

We have prepared a series of charts that list installations by weapons system. The distribution will be presented in charts. It includes aircraft that are involved in your discussions on Grand Forks, Kulis,

CERTIFIED

Elmendorf, and Pope. We are available to proceed as you wish.

Mr. Cirillo: Mr. Chairman, we are ready to proceed, unless any -- you have any comments.

General Newton: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Principi: I apologize. General Newton?

General Newton: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make -- before we proceed with the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard, I'd like to make a few comments, and then I'll, kind of, explain how we will continue as we do the layout here.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to have the opportunity to say that, unlike the rest of the process which we've gone through, clearly this part of the recommendations from the Secretary of Defense on the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve have been the most difficult for this Commission to understand and to execute.

I want to call to everyone's attention that we must all remember that the Secretary of Defense must have the full authority and the flexibility to shape the force and to employ the force when directed by the President. This exercise is about helping the nation and helping the Secretary of Defense to shape that force. That's why the law was created.

The Air Force, as we all know, has an aging fleet,

CERTIFIED

which is costly to maintain and to sustain. They are in the process of taking out a large number of aircraft from the aircraft inventory of the Air Force, and we spoke to this some on yesterday. And, as a matter of fact, as we pull those aircraft out of the inventory, we can expect that there will be fewer and fewer units that will have aircraft. The driving reason for that is that the replacement aircraft that come along, like the F-22 and the Joint Strike Fighter and so on, are advanced weapons systems with great capability, and, therefore, they will not be a one-for-one exchange of the legacy systems.

The recommendations from the Air Force that we received -- from the Secretary that we received -- and, as you look at the entire lay-down, there are some who would say that they did it about right. It is unfortunate that it appeared that they did not share it with anyone. It is very clear to us, as we went around the nation and visiting the various installations, that the states the Air Force -- I mean, the Air Guard TAGs did not feel that they were full players in the process, nor were they advised, in a degree that they were satisfied with, that -- of what was going on.

However, if they had been a part of the process, it is my estimation that the layout would have come almost exactly as the Secretary of Defense presented it. The key

CERTIFIED

here was participation and buy-in and ensuring that we paid close attention to national security -- I'm sorry, to homeland security and homeland defense, as we have asked many questions about that. The Guard and the Air Force were -- are and were divided on this subject, and probably are still divided, to some degree.

I strongly recommend, Mr. Chairman, that -- once we present our recommendations to the President, that both entities come back together as quickly as they possibly can and recreate and rekindle that close total-force relationship that we have always enjoyed in the United States Air Force.

As we -- what we will bring up next, Mr. Chairman, is a set of recommendations or proposals that the staff have analyzed, and they will make these proposal to us, and we will roll them out by weapons system. And we will walk our way all the way through, and we will have an opportunity to discuss those, at that time. Once we've completed that rollout, then we will go back to each one of the recommendations from the Secretary, and we will vote on those, either as the Secretary presented it or as amended, for those who may offer amendments.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

You may proceed.

CERTIFIED

Mr. Small: May we have the first chart, please? Are we working one screen, or two? One. Okay, one screen.

What you see on this chart is the military-capability index, the name of the base, the current aircraft assigned, DOD's recommendation as it came to us on May 13th, and the staff's recommendation. These are all KC-135 moves on this chart.

Next chart?

This is the remaining -- whoops, we went to F's. Okay. Let's stop at something. That's good.

Okay, the A-10s, these are AFRES A-10s. Whiteman, Missouri, Barksdale, Louisiana, Naval Air Station New Orleans. I may remark, at the moment, that -- we've got to stop somewhere, gang -- that the -- one of the points of interest on these charts is, What did the Secretary of Defense and what did the staff recommend, if they're identical or similar, or if we go in a different direction.

Next slide?

Okay, we've changed to Air Force Reserve, the C-130s.

Next slide, please?

Okay, now, these -- this next series of slides -- and it's a slightly different format -- contents, the same -- these will be Air National Guard aircraft weapons systems. These are the KC-135 Stratotankers.

Next slide, please?

CERTIFIED

This table contains the C-130 bed-down for the Air National Guard.

I wish to comment that, in a couple of cases, you may recognize a name that you believe to be an Active Air Force site. That is probably a true observation; your knowledge is good. The aircraft count here represent only Air National Guard aircraft.

Next slide, please?

You will note here, possibly, that the staff has suggested enlarging several of the squadrons by a few airplanes or remaining at the levels established by DOD to strengthen the forces -- or the availability of the squadrons.

Next slide, please?

I believe that's all. Is there another slide? Okay. I think we've seen this before, but this may be the last slide.

Mr. Cirillo: We do have a couple of graphical representations, maps that they're going to show that'll show us the DOD laydown and the BRAC staff-recommended laydown. Just bear with us just a moment while we bring those up.

For those who might not be able to see, in the corner, we're swapping thumb drives on the side of a laptop. So, please bear with us for just a moment.

CERTIFIED

Yeah, bring them up now, if you could, if they're available.

And when you see this map, Commissioners, this map reflects only those actions that are under review under the Commission. There are other -- you will see states don't appear to have aircraft within them. This only reflects those states where we have actions actually going on. And you also see a delineation between Guard and Reserve.

Mr. Small: I fear it may be a minute or so, sir. I don't know if you wish --

General Newton: Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Small: -- to proceed, or we can stay in a hold pattern.

Mr. Cirillo: Bingo. Here we go.

Mr. Small: Here we go.

No, this is good. Let me explain, very briefly. You have two different charts. I believe everything is there. You note the legend is on the bottom of the screen.

Mr. Bilbray: Unfortunately, we can't see the outline of the country on our sheets, so --

Mr. Small: Yeah, the contrast on one side of ours, sir, is very, very faint.

Chairman Principi: Well, that's okay. Proceed and --

Mr. Small: Yes, sir.

Chairman Principi: -- do the best you can.

CERTIFIED

Mr. Cirillo: One of the charts that you'll see is the DOD-recommended Air National Guard AFRES basing plan. That one appears to -- that one is in the bluer of the two. And the other one is the BRAC staff-recommended basing plan.

Chairman Principi: Excuse me. General Newton suggested a 15-minute break to --

General Newton, do you --

General Newton: Yes, sir. Let's take a break, and then we'll come back and start through each one of the bases and approve or disapprove or amend the Secretary's recommendation.

Chairman Principi: Okay. We'll take a 15-minute break.

Mr. Small: Yes, sir.

[Recess.]

Chairman Principi: We'll go back on the record, please.

We've, hopefully, resolved the technical issues here, but we'll try to work our way through.

General Newton, or staff, however you want to proceed.

General Newton: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Cirillo, if I can ask you to proceed with the first ones that we wanted to get done, and I think it's Grand Forks, and then we'll go from there.

Mr. Small: Okay, very good, sir.

CERTIFIED

Okay. These slides, the Guard and Reserve slides, come down. Let's go to Grand Forks and the title slide of Grand Forks. It will take about 30 seconds here to get our thought process organized.

Sorry for the delay here, Mr. Chairman.

Okay, we are now at section 104, Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota.

Grand Forks is currently the host of the 319th Air Refueling Wing. This recommendation results in the realignment of all the base's KC-135 air-refueling aircraft, though leaves personnel in place to support DOD's stated future mission to operate a family of unmanned aerial vehicles. The UAVs will be flown in association with the Air National Guard personnel and functions at Hector Airport, Fargo, North Dakota.

Next slide, please.

This bubble chart denotes the flow. In summary, 24 aircraft are distributed to Air National Guard and Reserve Forces at Scott, Illinois, Hickam, Hawaii, and Seymour-Johnson, North Carolina; 12 aircraft are being distributed to Active Duty units at McConnell, Kansas, and MacDill, Florida. The aircraft transferred to MacDill will be flown, in part, by Air Force Reserve personnel being realigned from Selfridge, Michigan.

The recommendation also directs realignment of

CERTIFIED

McConnell Air National Guard Base, Kansas. Please note that McConnell currently hosts Active, Reserve, and Guard components at the same base. While the Grand Forks portion of this recommendation directs aircraft to the Active Duty component on McConnell, the second realignment action directs that the Air National Guard flying components relocates with its nine aircraft to Forbes Field Air National Guard Station, Kansas. Air Guard expeditionary combat-support elements are retained at McConnell.

Mr. Tim MacGregor, the Air Force analyst for Grand Forks, will further discuss his analysis and assessment of the recommendation.

Mr. MacGregor: Thank you, Mr. Small.

Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, the Department of Defense justified realigning Grand Forks because of its low tanker military value relative to all other Active Duty KC-135 bases. DOD also states that realigning, vice closing the base, allows the Department a continued presence in the North Central United States, as well as a site for emerging missions. Recall that DOD is on record stating that Grand Forks Air Force Base will bed down UAVs. Though one of the receiving locations has a lower mission compatibility index score, or MCI, than Grand Forks, 32 of 36 aircraft will be distributed to bases with MCIs higher than Grand Forks.

As noted, DOD estimates this recommendation will have

CERTIFIED

a one-time cost of $131 million, with a $1.98 billion 20-year net present value savings. The recommendation will result in the net loss of approximately 1,500 jobs. Grand Forks itself, though, will lose over 2,600 jobs.

Next slide.

I have listed the significant issues by relevant BRAC selection criteria. First, the community argues that Grand Forks' military value was underestimated. Specifically, they contend that the tanker MCI failed to properly account for attributes such as un-encroached airspace, room for expansion, infrastructure, global operations, and proximity to polar routes for intercontinental missions. They find particular fault with the measurement and valuation for proximity to airspace supporting mission.

The staff assesses that, while the tanker MCI may not have fully captured all aspects of a base's military value, it appears to have been administered consistently amongst bases. With specific regard to scores for proximity to airspace supporting mission, the staff agrees that some elements of the attributes measured had a relatively narrow focus and may not have fully captured geolocational military value, vis-a-vis mission airspace. But despite alternative measurement submissions from several communities, the staff could not conclusively validate a comprehensive, fair, and impartial substitute formulation.

CERTIFIED

Second, the community additionally argues that Grand Forks' aircraft will be distributed to Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve bases with lower overall utilization rates. Fiscal year 2004 flying-hour data reveals that the Guard and Reserve bases receiving Grand Forks aircraft flew their currently assigned aircraft an average of 49 percent fewer hours per aircraft per year. The Active Duty receiver bases flew their KC-135s an average of 8 percent more. This recommendation results in 67 percent of Grand Forks' aircraft realigning to Guard and Reserve bases, though the staff assesses that this is consistent with the Air Force's proportionality goal, noting that Guard and Reserve Forces currently operate 62 percent of the worldwide KC-135 fleet.

Third, the community cites that Grand Forks is programmed to host the first complete KC-767 squadron, as detailed in the Air Force's 2003 tanker roadmap. While the staff has not determined why Grand Forks may have lost favor with DOD in regard to hosting a new tanker, staff noted that the KC-767 program discussed in the 2003 roadmap was canceled.

Fourth, closely tied to the first issue discussed, it can be argued that growth-potential measurements were not weighted heavily enough. Grand Forks attained 93 percent of points available for that attribute. And, though

CERTIFIED

overall weighting of the attribute may not have been as high as some may prefer, it appeared to have been assessed consistently across the force.

Lastly, this recommendation will result in an estimated job loss of 7.5 percent of the jobs in the metropolitan statistical area. DOD acknowledged the loss, but did not base its decision on the issue.

Mr. Small: That completes the comments. We're standing by, sir, for any questions.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Are there any questions?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: Are there any comments or discussion?

General Newton?

General Newton: I was wondering if Mr. Coyle had an amendment.

Chairman Principi: Excuse me. Commissioner Coyle?

Mr. Coyle: Yes, at the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer an amendment which modifies the DOD recommendation.

I think all the Commissioners will recall that we've heard testimony from the Department of Defense that they intend to put tankers at Grand Forks. We've heard testimony from important elected officials that these

CERTIFIED

tankers will be going to Grand Forks. Probably no military program is as well supported in the U.S. Congress as our new tankers and the need for them, with U.S. forces deployed all over the world. And we also heard, from high-level Air Force officials, that they intended to put tankers at Grand Forks. However, the 767 fracas, which really has nothing to do with Grand Forks, ended up having the program canceled. My own view is that, from a BRAC point of view, the Air Force overreacted to the tanker problem, not that it wasn't a serious problem and didn't need to be dealt with strongly by the Air Force, but, given the BRAC horizon, that the Air Force did not need to act towards Grand Forks as they did.

So, at the right time, I'd have an amendment in that regard.

Chairman Principi: Yes, you may proceed.

Mr. Coyle: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I move that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force recommendation 37, Grand Forks Air Force Base, North Dakota, he substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1 and 3, and the force-structure plan, that the Commission strike the language, quote, "distribute the 319th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R aircraft to the 126th Air Refueling Wing, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, 12 aircraft, which retires its eight

CERTIFIED

KC-135E aircraft, the 916th Air Refueling Wing, Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina, eight aircraft, which will host an Active Duty associate unit, the 6th Air Mobility Wing, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, four aircraft, which will host a Reserve association with 927th Air Refueling Wing manpower realigned from Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Michigan, the 154th Wing Air National Guard, Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, four aircraft, which will host an Active Duty associate union -- unit, and the 22nd Air Refueling Wing, McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, eight aircraft, which currently associates with the 931st Air Refueling group," close quotes, and insert in its place the language, quote, "distribute the 319th Air Refueling Wing's KC-135R, slash, T [KC-135R/T] aircraft to meet the primary aircraft authorization requirements established by the base closure and realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, establish the following: KC-135R, slash, T PAA, the 126th Air Refueling Wing, Air National Guard, Scott Air Force Base, Illinois, APAA, KC-135R, slash, T, the 126th Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Center at Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft, the 916th Air

CERTIFIED

Refueling Wing, Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, North Carolina, 16 PAA KC-135R, slash, T, which will host an Active Duty associate unit, the 6th Air Mobility Wing, MacDill Air Force Base, Florida, 16 PAA -- 16 PAA" -- excuse me --" KC-135R, slash, T, which will host a Reserve association with 927th Air Refueling Wing manpower realigned from Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Michigan, the 154th Wing, Air National Guard, Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii, 12 PAA KC-135R, slash, T, which will host an Active Duty associate unit, and the 22nd Air Refueling Wing, McConnell Air Force Base, Kansas, 48 PAA KC-135R, slash, T, which currently associates with the 931st Air Refueling group, modify infrastructure at Grand Forks Air Force Base to accommodate the emerging unmanned aerial vehicle, UAV, mission, the Secretary of Defense will maintain eight KC-135 aircraft at Grand Forks Air Force Base to facilitate an efficient and cost-effective bed-down of UAVs, the Secretary will keep the tankers in place until the UAVs are operational at Grand Forks, but no later than 31 December 2010, unless otherwise required by the Department of Defense for national emergencies," that the Commission strike the language, quote, "realign McConnell Air National Guard Base by relocating the 184th Air Refueling Wing, Air National Guard, nine KC-135R aircraft, to the 190th Air Refueling Wing at Forbes Field Air Guard Station, Kansas,

CERTIFIED

which will require its -- which will retire" -- excuse me -- "it's eight assigned KC-135E aircraft," close quote, and insert in its place, quote, "realign McConnell Air National Guard Base by distributing the 184th Air Refueling Wing's, Air National Guard, nine KC-135R, slash, T aircraft to meet the PAA requirements established by the base closure and realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission, establish 12 primary aircraft authorization KC-135R, slash, T aircraft at the 190th Air Refueling Wing, Forbes Field, Air Guard Station, Kansas, the 184th Air Refueling Wing KC-135E aircraft will be transferred to the AMARK at Davis Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona, for appropriate disposal as economically unserviceable aircraft," close quote, and that the Commission find this change and the recommendation, as amended, are consistent with the final selection criteria and force-structure plan.

Thank you.

Mr. Bilbray: Second.

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

Mr. Bilbray: Second.

Chairman Principi: Is there any discussion on the amendment?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

CERTIFIED

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: The amendment carries. I thank my fellow Commissioner Coyle for his amendment. And we'll proceed.

Mr. Cirillo: Mr. Chairman, at this time we can either proceed with the other two large aircraft we're talking about, which is the Pope and the Kulis, or we could reflect the KC-135 overlay.

Chairman Principi: We'll go to Kulis.

Mr. Small: One moment while we play musical chairs here, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Cirillo: And Kulis will be section 80.

Mr. Small: Mr. Chairman, we are now at section 80, Kulis Air Guard Station, Alaska, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska.

The closure of Kulis Air National Guard Station and the relocation of the Air National Guard to Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, and the realignment of Elmendorf by relocating some of its aircraft to Langley Air Force Base, Virginia.

Next slide, please.

CERTIFIED

This recommendation would close the existing Kulis Air Guard Station on Anchorage International Airport and relocate it and its aircraft on an Active Air Force installation, Elmendorf Air Force Base, also in Anchorage. The wing at Kulis operates C-130 aircraft and HH-60 helicopters.

Under a separate recommendation, Elmendorf would receive four additional C-130 aircraft from Dyess, which would allow the formation of a Guard Active Associate Wing. The realignment of Elmendorf calls for removing 24 of its 42 F-15 aircraft and relocating them to Langley Air Force, Virginia.

Mr. Craig Hall will discuss the recommendation justifications.

Mr. Hall: Thank you, Ken.

This chart shows the Department's justification for this recommendation.

First, it distributes aircraft to a base with a higher military value. Further, it consolidates two installations in the same city, reducing infrastructure, creates an Active Guard Association and retains the skilled Guard personnel from Kulis. Finally, this recommendation distributes F-15s to base with a higher military value, Langley Air Force Base, but retains a squadron of F-15s at Elmendorf to conduct the air sovereignty mission.

CERTIFIED

This chart also shows the cost and savings related to this recommendation. These figures reflect a site survey conducted at Elmendorf after DOD made the recommendation, in May. This effort revealed that the costs of relocating the Guard Station was found to be considerably more expensive than originally thought, in the range of $70- to $110 million. Accordingly, the one-time cost increased to about 30 percent, to $121 million, and the payback period doubled to eight years. Further, when we separated the cost of savings of these two actions, the Kulis relocation and the realignment of the F-15s to Langley, we found that the Kulis move, alone, has a payback of 25 years and a net present value that is a cost. This recommendation also relocates about 1300 personnel.

Next slide, please?

Here, I've listed the key issues, grouped by the appropriate selection criteria. With respect to the increased costs of the proposed Kulis relocation, the community, including the Governor, TAG, and Guard Wing commander, are concerned that not properly funding it could have a negative operational impact on the Guard unit. The Governor, who believes that his consent to the proposed relocation of Kulis is legally necessary, will not provide it until adequate funding is provided.

As I noted earlier, if you isolate the costs and

CERTIFIED

savings of the Kulis move, it has a 25-year payback and a net present value cost. Further, these figures are probably a little bit low, as they reflect only an additional $30 million in military construction over the original estimate, as opposed to the additional $70- to $110 million revealed by the site survey. So, the actual payback may actually be greater than 25 years.

We found no issues with the proposed move of F-15s from Elmendorf, as FA-22s will be fielded at Elmendorf in the next few years to offset the loss of the F-15s.

Chairman, that concludes my prepared remarks.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, Mr. Hall.

I'll begin by saying I -- to quote my good friend, this is a no-brainer. It's strongly supported by the Governor of the state of Alaska, by the adjutant general of Alaska, by the Air National Guard of Alaska. It's an excellent move. It frees up much-needed airspace -- space at Anchorage International Airport. It consolidates the Air Guard at Elmendorf. I think this is an excellent proposal, and I fully support it.

Are there any questions or --

Mr. Bilbray: Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Principi: Yes, Congressman Bilbray?

Mr. Bilbray: I just want to ask about the comments by the Governor that we've underestimated the cost and that --

CERTIFIED

until the costs are made up, that he will not consent to this being done. Where is the status of that, at this point, or --

Mr. Hall: That is still a true statement. The site survey revealed quite a disconnect. The -- Governor, TAG, and wing commander a bit concerned about the -- that disconnect. Whether the proper amount of funding will ever be provided is uncertain at this point.

Chairman Principi: Is there any further discussion? Any questions?

General Newton: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, because of the way, as you noted in the amendment which Commissioner Coyle presented a few minutes ago -- because of the way they were presented to us in the recommendation, we will present this back to the Secretary, not dictating where airplanes are going to be coming from or going to be going. And so, I'm going to read through this one for Kulis. But, after that, as we get to the others, we feel it's not necessary for us to go through all of that. We'll just go to the recommendation, look at those. The Commissioners can discuss them. And then we can offer the motion and --

Chairman Principi: The language will be similar.

General Newton: I move that the Commission find -- because, on each one of these, we have to strike the entire

CERTIFIED

language that the Air Force gives to us, and we reinsert the Commission's language, is why that's being done -- I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense when made Air Force recommendation 7, Kulis Air Guard Station, Alaska, and Elmendorf Air Force Base, Alaska, he substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1 and 5 and the force-structure plan, that the Commission strike the language, "close," and replace it with the language "contingent on the availability of adequate military construction fund to provide the necessary facilities at Elmendorf Air Force Base close," that the Commission strike the language "the 3rd Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 24 of the 42 assigned F-15C, slash, D [F-15C/D] aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing, Langley Air Force Base, Virginia," and replace it with the language, "the Commission recommend the 3rd Wing at Elmendorf Air Force Base will distribute 18 of the 42 assigned F-15 aircraft to the 1st Fighter Wing at Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, and six to the Air National Guard unit," that the Commission find this change and the recommendation, as amended, are consistent with the final selection criteria and the force-structure plan.

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

General Hill: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

CERTIFIED

[A show of one hand.]

Chairman Principi: One recusal.

All in favor of the motion?

[A show of eight hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the results are eight in favor, none opposed, one recusal. Therefore, the motion is approved.

And, with the Chairman's indulgence, I would like to report the vote on our last vote, motion 104, dash, 4(a), on Grand Forks, North Dakota, offered by Commissioner Coyle. The vote was unanimous, and that motion was approved.

Thank you.

Chairman Principi: I apologize.

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, I just read back to you the results from our last vote, on motion 104, dash 4(a), on Grand Forks, North Dakota. The vote was unanimous, and the motion was adopted.

Chairman Principi: All right, great. There was one recusal.

Ms. Sarkar: Sir, I was reporting on the last vote.

This vote -- let me read it to you again -- this vote, on Kulis, passed by a vote of eight in favor, none opposed,

CERTIFIED

and one recusal.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Mr. Small: We will now proceed with section 103, Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, the DOD recommendation on the chart.

This recommendation, the primary action associated with this recommendation is the realignment of Pope Air Force Base. However, all other actions include realigning Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas, and Yeager Guard Station, West Virginia. Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station is recommended for closure.

Next chart.

The actions to close Pittsburgh and realign Yeager are on this bubble chart. C-130H's relocate to Pope to form an Active Duty Reserve associate unit. The expeditionary compact support elements from Pittsburgh and Yeager would relocate to other facilities in Ohio, Nebraska, and West Virginia. From Pope, 36 A-10s go to Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, and 25 C-130E's go to Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas. The real-property accountability would transfer from the Air Force to the Army.

At Little Rock, 27 C-130E's are retired, and eight go to backup inventory. Little Rock's Active Duty C-130J's

CERTIFIED

will be realigned to three different Air National Guard units located in California, Rhode Island, and also remaining at Little Rock Air Force Base.

At this point, I will turn the remainder of the discussion for this recommendation to Dr. Mike Flinn, one my senior analysts.

Mike?

Mr. Flinn: Thank you, Mr. Small. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners.

The justification for realigning Pope is part of a larger effort to restructure the C-130 fleet by consolidating aircraft at Little Rock, Arkansas, to create the single major active duty C-130 unit. Removing aircraft from Pope also reduces the Air Force presence to facilitate transfer of that property to the Army.

Our COBRA estimates project that, for a one-time cost of $290 million, the Air Force will realize savings of $694 million during the six-year implementation period. This recommendation will result in a total net present value savings of $2.7 billion over 20 years. This recommendation will affect 6,704 military and civilian positions. However, this impact will be partially offset by substantial gains from the relocation of Forces Command Headquarters and Army Reserve Command Headquarters to Fort Bragg. Finally, the estimated cost to complete

CERTIFIED

environmental remediation at Pope Air Force Base is $9.7 million.

Of the issues associated with the eight BRAC selection criteria, the primary concern pertains to criteria 1 and the potential impact on operational readiness. The 43rd Airlift Wing at Pope Air Force Base currently supports Fort Bragg by providing tactical airlift and coordinating strategic airlift. The recommendation to create an Air Force Reserve/Active Duty Associate Squadron did not adequately address the command and control structure that would be needed to satisfy Fort Bragg's airlift requirements.

The issue associated with criteria 2 concerns the availability and condition of facilities at existing locations. The justification for closing Pittsburgh and realigning Yeager Air Guard Station was based on outdated or incorrect information. Yeager can host the optimal 12 C-130s, while Pittsburgh can accommodate 20 C-130s with no additional military construction. Additionally, Pittsburgh's non-payroll base operating support is the lowest of all Air Force Reserve command bases. They also have one of the lowest costs for flying C-130H's.

Finally, the Air Force lease at Pittsburgh stipulates that, upon termination of the lease, the property will be

CERTIFIED

returned to its original condition. An engineering firm hired by the -- by Pittsburgh estimated that restoration of the facility would cost approximately $45 million.

The third issue pertains to criteria 3 and the ability of the receiving location to accommodate the future total force. BRAC staff verified that a comprehensive capacity analysis was not done for Little Rock Air Force Base. Consequently, the total military construction cost to accommodate all the C-130 BRAC-related moves to Little Rock was originally underestimated by approximately 63 percent. We estimate the actual construction costs would cost $246.7 million.

This concludes my presentation on the recommendation to realign Pope Air Force Base. At this point, I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have prior to any motions being made.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

I have a motion to make on Pope Air Force Base. Is there any discussion before I read the --

Admiral Gehman?

Admiral Gehman: Yes, sir. I'll certainly defer to you to read the motion. I thought I was. But I'd defer to you. But, for my colleagues, when you -- this'll probably be the last motion that requires verbatim reading, but, in the copy in front of you, there is a typographical error,

CERTIFIED

which I will point to when we get to it. And when we get to it, if it's all right with my colleagues, then the motion that I'm going to read, I would like to be the one that we vote on, because it's a simple line-out. There's no changes. It's just a an error. And if --

Chairman Principi: Very well.

Admiral Gehman: General Counsel, is that all -- I mean, is that all right?

Chairman Principi: Please.

Admiral Gehman: All right.

The motion will execute the staff-proposed C-130 laydown, as General Newton briefed it. And the purpose -- and -- it will do that all that, but it will also do one other thing -- it will fix the problem that we discovered at Pope Air Force Base of having sufficient Air Force residual command and control assets there to do the liaison between the 18th Airborne Corps and the remaining Air Force units. And when I get to that, I'll point that out.

So, if you're ready, sir, I'll read it. All right, thank you very much.

I move that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force recommendation number 35, Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, Pittsburgh International Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania, and Yeager Air Guard Station, West Virginia, he substantially deviated

CERTIFIED

from the final selection criteria 1, 2, and 3, and the force-structure plan, that the Commission strike the text of the paragraph (a) of chapter 3, section 103 of the bill, and insert in its place, quote, "Realign Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, distribute the 25 C-130E aircraft assigned to the 43rd Airlift Wing and the 36 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 23rd Fighter Group to meet the primary aircraft authorizations PAA requirements established by the base closure and realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Base Closure and Realignment Commission, establish 16 PAA C-130H aircraft at Pope Army Airfield, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, establish 48 PAA A-10 aircraft at Moody Air Force Base, Georgia, transfer real-property accountability to the Army, disestablish the 43rd Medical Group and establish a Medical Squadron. The Air Force will establish an Air Operations Group to provide unity of command of Air Force units on Pope Army Airfield, mission execution planning, and management of efficient load-out of Fort Bragg assets."

The next two sentences are to be struck. That's the change. They just line 'em out.

And that the Commission strike the text of paragraph (b) of chapter 3, section 103 of the bill and insert in its place, "Realign Little Rock Air Force Base, Arkansas, distribute 39 of the C-130 aircraft assigned to Little

CERTIFIED

Rock, Arkansas, to meet the primary aircraft authorization requirements established by the base closure/realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission, establish an eight PAA C-130J aircraft at the 143rd Airlift Wing, Quonset State Airport Air Guard Station, Rhode Island, establish eight C-130J aircraft at the 146th Airlift Wing, Air National Guard, Channel Islands Air Guard Station, California, establish nine PAA C-130 aircraft at the 189th Airlift Wing, Air National Guard, Little Rock Air Force Base," and that the Commission strike the text of paragraph (c) of chapter 3 of the section 103 of the bill, and insert in its place, "Realign Yeager Airport Air Guard Station, West Virginia, and establish an eight PAA C-130 aircraft at Yeager Air Guard Station, West Virginia," that the Commission strike the text of paragraph (d) of chapter 3, section 103 of the bill, and insert in its place, "Realign Pittsburgh International Airport Air Reserve Station, Pennsylvania, establish a contiguous enclave at the Pittsburgh International Air Station, Pennsylvania, sufficient to support continued operations of the Reserve Station units, including flight operations, and compatible with combined use of the civilian airport by the Air Reserve, Air National Guard, and civilian users. Within that enclave establish a Regional Joint Readiness Center at

CERTIFIED

Pittsburgh International Air Station, with the mission of providing civil/military operations, homeland security, community-based medical support to the Department of Defense and the Department of Homeland Security National Incident Management Plan, and the National Response Plan. The enclave and the RJRC will be staffed at current manning levels of the ARS. The PAA and personal allocations of the Air Guard Station units of the Air Guard units at Pittsburgh are unaffected by this recommendation," quote, and that the Commission find that this change and the recommendations, as amended, are consistent with the final selection criteria and the force-structure plan.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, Admiral.

Is there a second?

General Newton: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous. The motion has been adopted.

Chairman Principi: Very, very well. Thank you very

CERTIFIED

much.

Mr. Cirillo: Mr. Chairman, at this point in time, I would like to bring back section 68, which is Navy 21, which is Willow Grove, which was tabled from the -- during the Navy recommendations, as there is involvement in that recommendation in the Air National Guard.

We'll have to swear in the two analysts -- Mr. Hanna, who was earlier, and Mr. Michael Delaney.

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, please raise your right hand for me.

[Whereupon, the staff witnesses were sworn in.]

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Cirillo: Mr. Hanna?

Mr. Hanna: Mr. Chairman, we now bring to the floor chapter 2, section 68 of the bill, Navy recommendation 21, close Naval Air Station Willow Grove, Pennsylvania.

This motion -- this portion of the bill closes the Naval Air Station, moves the Naval and Marine Corps air capability assigned there to McGuire Air Force Base, moves the Marine Corps Light-Attack Helicopter Unit from Johnstown, Pennsylvania, to McGuire, disestablishes the Air Guard Unit and the Air Force Reserve Unit stationed there.

Mr. Michael Delaney is the analyst for this motion.

Mr. Delaney: Thank you, Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, the DOD justified this

CERTIFIED

closure and realignment by stating it creates new joint opportunities at McGuire Air Force Base and Fort Dix and leverages maintenance and operational efficiencies.

The COBRA data reflects a $126.3 million one-time cost, $60.6 million annual savings, and a net present value in 20 years of $710.5 million savings. The recommendation results in a reduction of 1,232 direct and 698 indirect jobs, for a total of 1,930, and relocates 618 military and 65 civilians. The Department estimated a remediation cost $12.8 million.

This slide summarizes the key issues that were developed during analysis in this recommendation, and are grouped by their associated selection criteria.

First, while the community raised several issues with this recommendation, none was more strenuously voiced than the deactivation of the Air National Guard 111th Fighter Wing, which was done without consultation with the Governor and adjutant general, as required by law.

Secondly, the realignment of the Air Force Reserve 913th Airlift Wing was not considered in the Air Force evaluation.

Mr. Hanna: Mr. Chairman, we're standing by to answer the Commission's questions on Willow Grove.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Admiral Gehman?

CERTIFIED

Admiral Gehman: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Colleagues, this closure of the Joint Reserve Base at Willow Grove is -- anytime we deal with a closure, it gives us great pause -- this closure is part of the total Air Guard laydown. It frees up units, frees up airplanes, moves them around in accordance with our master plan. And, therefore, I -- it's probably the right thing to do.

This has been a Naval Air Station and then a Joint Reserve Base for decades and decades and decades. The people of this community and the functions at Willow Grove have been performed over the years have been remarkable. They've been important to the national defense of the country. The community has been enormously supportive of Willow Grove for decades. It's a fabulous base. And our vote here today in no way should be taken that -- as a signal that there's -- they're doing something wrong or that something's not right. This is a very, very good installation, a very successful experiment in joint basing, and it's -- the only reason why it's on the table is because it's swept up in the larger plan of other bases. I, myself, know what a great contribution the citizens have made, what a great contribution that this base has made over the years, and it -- I regret that it's come to this, but the greater good of the Department and the country requires that we take this action.

CERTIFIED

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, Admiral Gehman. And I certainly associate myself with your comments. This is a painful decision. But I believe that it's the right decision. You know, we did not find substantial deviation from the military-value criteria. However, indeed, as Admiral Gehman said, the people of Willow Grove have served this nation very, very well.

General Newton?

General Newton: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have an amendment.

Chairman Principi: Please offer your amendment.

General Newton: I move that the Commission find that the Secretary of Defense made recommendation 21, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, Pennsylvania, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, Pennsylvania, he substantially deviated from the final selection criteria 1, 3, 4, and 5, and the force structure plan, that the Commission strike the language "deactivate the 111th Fighter Wing Air National Guard and relocate assigned A-10 aircraft to the 124th Wing Air National Guard, Boise, Air Terminal -- Air Guard Station, Boise, Idaho, three primary aircraft authorized, the 175th Wing Air National Guard, Martin State Airport, Air Guard Station, Baltimore, Maryland, three primary aircraft authorized, the 127th Wing

CERTIFIED

Air National Guard, Selfridge, Air National Guard Base, Mount Clement, Minnesota -- I'm sorry -- Michigan, three primary aircraft, and retire six primary aircraft authorized," and that the Commission find this language, as amended, consistent with the final selection criteria and the force-structure plan.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Is there a second?

Mr. Coyle: Second.

Chairman Principi: Is there any further discussion?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: All in favor of the amendment?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous. The motion is adopted.

Thank you.

Mr. Cirillo: Thank you.

Mr. Small, you can come back up.

If I suggest, we could put up the 135s?

Chairman Principi: No, we have to have another --

Mr. Cirillo: I'm sorry.

CERTIFIED

Chairman Principi: Excuse me. We have to have another vote.

I move that the Commission find that the Navy recommendation 21, Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base Willow Grove, Pennsylvania, and Cambria Regional Airport, Johnstown, Pennsylvania, as amended, is consistent with the final selection criteria and the force-structure plan.

Is there a second?

General Newton: Second.

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous. The motion is adopted.

Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Mr. Small, you may proceed.

Mr. Cirillo: At this point in time, I think we're going to have to go to the A-10s.

General Newton: Yeah, go to the A-10s.

Mr. Cirillo: What you'll see in the A-10s is both the Reserve and the Air National Guard laydown. And there's a -- on both the right and the left-hand side, for the audience.

CERTIFIED

General Newton: Mr. Chairman, if I can offer a comment here. As we go through these, I suggest to my colleagues here that we not read all of the language, which will go into the report, it will be into the record, particularly in those places where we have not changed from the Secretary of Defense's recommendation. In those places where we have made a change, we will point that out, we'll have an opportunity to discuss this, and then, sir, you may ask for the vote for the motion at that time.

So, the first one here is Whiteman Air Force Base, which was recommended by DOD to have 24 aircraft. And we did not change that, so it's no change to that recommendation. And then Barksdale Air Force Base, which had 24 aircraft in the Air Force Reserve, we made no changes there, as well. In New Orleans, the Secretary of Defense recommend that their A-10s go to zero, and we -- the recommendation was for us to agree with that.

Admiral Gehman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question? Down here.

Chairman Principi: I'm sorry. Admiral Gehman?

Admiral Gehman: May I ask a -- just a procedural question, to be sure?

General Newton, when you say "there is no change," did the -- is there a Secretary of Defense recommendation on the subject of Whiteman or Barksdale? What I'm getting at

CERTIFIED

is, even if we are agreeing with his recommendation, don't we have to approve it?

General Newton: Yes, that's correct. This is a --

Mr. Cirillo: That would be in section --

General Newton: The Chairman --

Mr. Cirillo: -- that would be in section 91, when you get to it later on.

General Newton: That's correct.

Admiral Gehman: Thank you.

Mr. Cirillo: Within the A-10s, by the way, just for reference in the future, sections 81, sections 85, sections 88, sections 91, and we just --

General Newton: Well, let's just take --

Mr. Cirillo: -- discussed section 68.

General Newton: -- the first one. Give me the section for Missouri -- Whiteman Air Force Base, Missouri.

Mr. Cirillo: That's section 91.

General Newton: It's section 91.

Mr. Cirillo: That's correct.

General Newton: Yes.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to offer a motion that we accept the Secretary's recommendation, as was presented, for section 81 -- 91, I'm sorry.

Chairman Principi: Section 91.

General Newton: Section 91.

CERTIFIED

Mr. Bilbray: Second.

Chairman Principi: Is there any discussion?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous. The motion is adopted.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Mr. Small: Shall we proceed to the next panel, sir?

General Newton: No, just stay right there. We will go -- give me the section for Barksdale.

Mr. Small: It's also section 91, sir.

General Newton: Okay.

Mr. Small: Those three are all in the same section.

General Newton: Okay.

Mr. Small: If we were to --

General Newton: I just want to be sure that we didn't have any discussion on Barksdale, before we move on, just in case we -- if someone misunderstood that.

Okay, fine. Shall -- now we would like -- I'd like to move over to the --

Mr. Cirillo: Air National Guard?

General Newton: -- Air National Guard side.

CERTIFIED

Mr. Cirillo: And in section 81 is Fort Smith.

General Newton: Okay. That -- now this makes --

Let me give some explanation here, Mr. Chairman. As you will see in -- let's take the first one, Selfridge -- and if you look at these, the numbers on the left side are the military-value scores. DOD recommended 18 aircraft, and we recommended 24 aircraft. The reason we recommended 24 aircraft was because Kellogg, right down the road, will be -- their aircraft will go away. And we think we need it -- more aircraft, then, over at Selfridge. And Selfridge will be losing their F-16s. So, the recommendation from the Secretary was that Selfridge --

Mr. Cirillo: That's actually -- if I --

General Newton: I'm sorry.

Mr. Cirillo: Section 80 -- we can address either one -- this section 81 is Fort Smith. If I can read the recommendation, Selfridge is in section 85.

General Newton: Okay. So, Selfridge went from F-16s to 24 A-10s.

Admiral Gehman: And our action is to increase the number, from the Secretary's recommendation, from 18 to 24.

General Newton: That's correct. And that will help us, then, to offset the number of pilots that are down, and the crews down, at Kellogg, who will be losing aircraft. And you'll see that down at the bottom.

CERTIFIED

Admiral Gehman: And we are doing that at the highest-rank A-10 base in the Air Guard.

General Newton: That's correct. Just as is indicated there.

Mr. Cirillo: We also -- in that are, incidentally, we did already cover section 68. We already covered that, which was Willow Grove. There's two other sections within the A-10 --

General Newton: So, tell me all of the sections that we have --

Mr. Cirillo: Yes, sir.

General Newton: -- in the Air National Guard with the A-10s.

Mr. Cirillo: Section 81, which is Fort Smith; section 85, we just spoke about, which is Selfridge, Barnes, Martin; section 88, which is Boise --

Mr. Skinner: And 95, too, I think. 95 is Kellogg.

General Newton: Mr. Chairman, Fort Smith was recommended by DOD to lose their aircraft. The staff recommended providing them with 18 A-10s. They're presently flying F-16s. If anyone has any question as I go down this, please let me know.

As you can see, in Idaho there were no changes. In Martin State, in Baltimore, Maryland, no changes. And Willow Grove, we just covered, was closed. Barnes, in

CERTIFIED

Massachusetts, DOD recommend 24. We took them down to zero, but we put other aircraft in, that you will see later. Bradley was recommended as zero, and we did not change that; as well as Kellogg.

And, Mr. Chairman, if we have no further discussion or amendments, I would like to offer a motion that we accept the Secretary's recommendation, as amended, for these locations.

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

Admiral Gehman: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

[No response.]

Mr. Skinner: I've got an amendment, I think, that we're going to accept 'em -- I thought we were going to do 'em one by one. Are we going to accept 'em as a group or --

Chairman Principi: Yeah.

Mr. Skinner: I've got two amendments that I'd like to offer that I've discussed with General Newton.

One is an amendment. It's 82, dash, 3(a). One is a language cleanup. And it's a motion to amend Air Force recommendation 10, Beale Air Force Base, California, and Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Michigan. And it deletes some language. It moves -- I move that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air

CERTIFIED

Force recommendation 10, Beale Air Force Base, California, and Selfridge Air National Base, Michigan, he substantially deviated from final selection criteria 1 and 3, and the force-structure plan, that the Commission strike the language "F-16 aircraft" and the language "A-10" where it appears in paragraph (b) of chapter 3, section 82 of the bill, and that the Commission find the changes in the recommendation, as amended, are consistent with the force-structure criteria and force-structure plan. When they wrote this language, they put language in here that we don't believe is operative. By striking it in the recommendation, it clears up what might be a -- and this is the only place they've done that. In other recommendations, they haven't.

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

General Newton: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: All in favor of the amendment?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Before you go on, Commissioner Skinner. The vote was unanimous, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

CERTIFIED

Ms. Sarkar: The vote is adopted.

Mr. Cirillo: And that was section 82? Is that correct?

Mr. Skinner: No -- yes, that was in section 82.

Now I have a motion in section 95, which is also part of General Newton's motion. It's a motion to amend the Air Force recommendation 27, W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, Michigan. It amends the distribution in -- basically, changes the position of the field. It takes -- and I'll read the motion.

I move that the Commission find that when the Secretary of Defense made Air Force recommendation 27, W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, Michigan, he substantially deviated from final selection criterion 1 and the force-structure plan, that the Commission strike the language "Close W.K. Kellogg Air Guard Station, Michigan, distribute the 10th Fighter Wing's A-10s, 15 aircraft, to the 127th Wing Air National Guard, to Selfridge Air National Guard Base, Michigan," and insert in its place "Realign W.K. Kellogg Airport Air Guard Station, Michigan, distribute the 15 A-10 aircraft assigned to the 110th Fighter Wing Air National Guard to the primary aircraft authorization requirements established by the base closure and realignment recommendations of the Secretary of Defense, as amended by the Defense Base Closure and

CERTIFIED

Realignment Commission, establish a contiguous enclave for the 110th Fighter Wing Air National Guard sufficient to support operations of that unit, including flight operations, and compatible with the joint use of an Air Guard Station as a civilian airport. If the State of Michigan decides to change the organization, composition, and location of the 110th Fighter Wing to integrate the unit into the future total force, all other personnel allocated to the 110th Fighter Wing will remain in place and assume a mission relevant to the security interests of the State of Michigan and consistent with the integration of the unit into the future total force, including, but not limited to, air mobility C-41SR information operations, engineering flight training, and unmanned aerial vehicles. Where appropriate, unit personnel will be retained in skills relevant to the emerging mission." This recommendation does not effect a change in the authorized end strength of the Michigan Air National Guard. The distribution of aircraft currently assigned to the 110th Fighter Wing is based on a resource constraint determination by the Department of Defense that the aircraft concerned will better support national requirements in another location, is not conditioned upon the agreement of the state.

I move.

CERTIFIED

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

General Newton: Second.

Admiral Gehman: Can I ask a question?

Chairman Principi: Yes.

Admiral Gehman: What is the effect of this amendment?

Mr. Skinner: The effect of this amendment -- this is an anomaly. This is a situation we've talked about. As you know, the W.K. Kellogg Air National Guard Station is a A-10 base. It has 15 of the 18 aircraft. It is a fully equipped station in Kellogg, Michigan. It is the major primary operator of the A-10s in Michigan. And this will keep a enclave open so that that facility can be used, and so that the State of Michigan can assess, as their own perspective, as to working with the National Guard Bureau. They'll have the flexibility to decide which of these two bases they deem as appropriate to operate out of. And it -- because of the way the recommendation was originally made by the Secretary, we were unable to accommodate that change and allow that decision. And, as I said, we have a fully trained group 120 miles away, and the State of Michigan ought to have the opportunity to figure out what's in their best interest with that one Guard unit.

Chairman Principi: Is there anything further?

Admiral Gehman: I hate to belabor this, and I will not, but the Secretary recommended closing -- this was --

CERTIFIED

the recommendation is, "close" -- because there's no flying unit there -- the recommendation was not "enclave," it was "close." And I gather that my -- Mr. Skinner wants to change that from "close" to "enclave." And -- even though there's no change in the airplanes. Is that -- that's the effect?

Mr. Skinner: Yes, that's correct.

Admiral Gehman: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Is there anything further?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous. The motion is adopted.

Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Okay, we go to a motion on Air Force recommendation 27 --

Mr. Cirillo: That would be section 95?

Chairman Principi: We are now voting on all the A-10s.

CERTIFIED

Hearing no further motion to amend, we will vote on whether to approve the Secretary's recommendation, as amended.

Is there a second?

General Newton: Second.

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous. The motion is adopted.

Thank you.

Mr. Small: May we have the slides for the F-15s, please? The slides are coming. We are working split screens with split operators. They're about 25 feet apart. So, the logistics on this one is amazing today.

Mr. Cirillo: Within the F-15s, for your future reference, are three areas -- section 94, section 98, and section 108.

General Newton: I'm sorry, give me those sections again?

Mr. Cirillo: Yes, sir. Section 94 -- and I can read the title of it, if you wish -- which is --

General Newton: No -- go ahead.

Mr. Cirillo: -- which is Otis Air National Guard

CERTIFIED

Base, Lambert, St. Louis International Airport Guard Station, Missouri, and Atlantic City. There's also section 98, which is Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, and section 108, which is Portland International Airport --

Chairman Principi: Could you please --

Mr. Cirillo: -- Air Guard Station.

Chairman Principi: -- could you speak up just a little bit, Mr. --

Mr. Cirillo: Sorry. Section 98, which is Great Falls International Airport Air Guard Station, and section 108, which is Portland International Airport Air Guard Station. That's Air Force 41.

General Newton: Mr. Chairman, the staff has recommended, here, the aircraft lineup that you see before you. And let me give a little explanation.

For Jacksonville, DOD recommended 24; the staff has recommended 18. Hawaii had no change. Atlantic City, New Jersey, DOD recommended 24 F-15s; we disapproved -- we have -- the recommendation is to disapprove that, and they come up with another slide, with aircraft. Portland, Oregon -- no, I'm sorry, Klamath Falls is recommended at 24; they are at 18. Portland, Oregon, was recommended for zero; the staff recommends 15. New Orleans is recommended to 24; the staff recommends 18. Otis was recommended to close; the

CERTIFIED

staff recommends agreeing with that. Barnes, in Massachusetts, if you looked on the slide before, they flew A-10s, but DOD recommended zero; we recommended 18. Great Falls, Montana, was recommended for zero; we recommended 15. And Lambert Field was recommended to close.

A bit more of an explanation. We looked at a number of criteria to ensure that we could fit into criteria 1 and not violate criteria 1. So, if you'll look to the left-hand side, once again, you'll see the military-value numbers. We also considered homeland security and homeland defense, and that drove the change for Portland, Oregon. The staff worked diligently on analyzing that. And if you look in Great Falls, Montana, we moved F-15s there, as well. This is a better suit for Montana. They were in F-16s, and we think that F-15 are a better weapons systems for that location. Barnes, in Massachusetts, right up the road from Connecticut, and you see that they would be going from -- if approved by the President and the Congress, they'll be going from A-10s to F-15s.

The staff and I will be standing by for your questions.

Chairman Principi: Is there a motion to approve?

Admiral Gehman: I'll make the motion, General Newton, if you're happy with that.

General Newton: Please.

CERTIFIED

Admiral Gehman: We'll take them in three sections.

I move that we approve chapter 3, section 94, which has the effect of closing Otis Air Force Base, of -- at the case of Jackson Air Guard Station, of moving it from 15 to 18 F-15s; in the case of Atlantic City International Air Guard Station, of reversing the Secretary of Defense decision to convert to F-16s, and -- I mean, to convert to F-15s and have 'em keep their F-16s at a number -- and at the case of Barnes Municipal Airport, to convert to F-15s, 18 F-15s, from A-10s, and for -- in the case of Lambert, St. Louis International Airport, to support the Secretary to go to zero and have an enclave.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Is there a second?

General Newton: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

Mr. Skinner: I have a question on this, if I might. This is the -- I think this is the motion that closes the Otis Air National Guard Base in Massachusetts.

Admiral Gehman: It is.

Mr. Skinner: As you will -- as the members will recall, you know, on that base, it's -- is a United States Coast Guard Air Station, I believe. And if -- is that

CERTIFIED

correct?

Mr. Small: That is correct, sir.

Mr. Skinner: Okay. We talked earlier about having some report language in there that -- and it didn't get into the motion. So, we, you know, will put some report language in, which is the -- I think, the sense of the Commission is that the Secretary of Defense, as he discusses disposition of this property, will consult with the Director -- the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Commandant of the Coast Guard to work and facilitate to the Coast Guard those facilities, if they so desire, that exist on Otis Air National Guard Base and are actively involved as the senior -- as the northernmost station of the United States Coast Guard as it performs its homeland defense and search-and-rescue missions.

Chairman Principi: I conferred with Admiral Gehman on this matter. I think it's a very, very important issue. This motion will not close the Coast Guard Station. So, that's a separate item, that's a separate matter. And I'm sure that can be worked out between the Department of Defense, Department of Transportation -- or, I should say, the Department of Homeland Security -- with regard to the ongoing presence of the Coast Guard.

Mr. Skinner: And so, if we can -- I think, Mr. Chairman, if we have report language along those lines

CERTIFIED

that'll will communicate it.

Thank you very much. Thank you, Admiral Gehman.

Chairman Principi: I think it certainly should be part of the report.

Admiral Gehman: And I agree with that.

Mr. Skinner: Now, we could move them back to the Department of Transportation, but I don't think that'll happen.

[Laughter.]

Chairman Principi: When you go back and become Secretary.

All in favor?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous. The motion is adopted.

Thank you.

Admiral Gehman: Mr. Chairman, we've got to finish up our F-15s, with your permission.

Chairman Principi: Yes, sir.

Admiral Gehman: I move that the -- we approve chapter 3, section 98, which has the effect, in the case of Great Falls, Montana, of changing the Secretary's recommendation to take all the airplanes out and enclave it, instead would

CERTIFIED

convert it to a 15 PAA F-15 squadron.

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

General Newton: Second.

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous. The motion is passed.

Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Admiral Gehman: Last F- -- Air Guard F-15 motion, chapter 3, section 108, in the case of Portland International Airport Air Guard Station, Oregon, the effect of this motion is to keep the same number of F-15s that are currently there, 15, and essentially to disapprove the Secretary's recommendation to enclave it.

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

Mr. Bilbray: Second.

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of nine hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Once again, Mr. Chairman, the vote is unanimous. The motion is adopted.

CERTIFIED

Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

General Newton: I think that covered 'em all. That covers it for F-15s. Let's go to the F-16s next.

Mr. Small: F-16s, please?

Mr. Cirillo: If you'd like, I would like to -- I could read the sections that are involved in this one. There are many of them, as you know. I think you have a -- items in front of you.

General Newton: Let's to the Air Reserves first.

While you're looking at that, I'll give some explanation. This is another one where we agreed with the recommendation by the Secretary of Defense. I might comment on a couple of these.

At Luke Air Force Base, where the Reserves flew F-16s, Luke Air Force Base is a very large F-16 base for the Active Force. They've trained all of the Air Force's F-16 pilots there -- the Active Air Force F-16 pilots there. So, this unit can associate themselves with the Active units there at Luke Air Force Base.

And, at Hill Air Force Base, where we have a wing of F-16s, and we also had Air Reserve Forces who flew F-16s, they are in the process right now of creating an associate unit, and they were doing that when we visited them, during regional hearings. And so, again, we agreed with the

CERTIFIED

recommendation of the Secretary.

We also agreed with Homestead, at 24, and Carswell, slash, Fort Worth, Texas, at 24.

Mr. Cirillo: We might want to go to section 113.

General Newton: I'm sorry?

Mr. Cirillo: We might want to go to section 113 -- 113, which is Hill Air Force Base, Utah. And it includes Reserve action.

General Newton: Louder for me, please.

Mr. Cirillo: Section 113, which is Air Force 47, which is entitled Hill Air Force Base, Utah, Edwards Air Force Base, California, Mountain Home Air Force Base, and Luke Air Force Base. And that includes Homestead Air Reserve Base. It's Air Force 47 in your bill, which is in the front of the motion book.

Admiral Gehman: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Chairman Principi: Yes.

Admiral Gehman: Mr. Cirillo --

Mr. Cirillo: Yes?

Admiral Gehman: -- Air Force 113, entitled Hill Air Force Base, but it also includes Luke, Homestead, Carswell, Fort Worth. As I understand it is -- section 113 does what is on the left-hand slide here. Is that correct? Which, in a sense -- which essentially supports the Department of Defense recommendation.

CERTIFIED

Mr. Cirillo: Mr. Small?

Mr. Small: Sorry, I was -- I apologize.

Admiral Gehman: Well, section 113 --

Mr. Small: That's correct. I'm told the answer is correct, sir.

Admiral Gehman: -- 113 is one recommendation, but it does all four of those things on the left-hand side, and the result of our action is to support the Secretary of Defense's recommendation.

Mr. Small: Yes.

Admiral Gehman: Just wanted to help my colleagues to know what they're voting on.

Mr. Cirillo: It also does some maintenance activities for the CIRF, for the LANTIRN pod, for the --

General Newton: Yeah, but we're fine. We did not change -- we did not change any of that. It's all as the Secretary recommended it.

Chairman Principi: So, is there a motion to --

Mr. Bilbray: Mr. Chairman, I have to recuse myself on this one for Nellis Air Force Base.

General Newton: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion that the Commission accept the Air Force -- I mean, I'm sorry, the Secretary's recommendation for section 113 of the bill, Air Force 47 for Luke Air Force Base, Hill Air Force Base, Homestead Air Force Base.

CERTIFIED

Is Carswell and Fort Worth in that one, as well?

Mr. Small: Yes, sir, all are in this one.

General Newton: As well as Carswell and Fort Worth, Texas.

Chairman Principi: Is there a second?

Admiral Gehman: Second.

Chairman Principi: Are there any recusals?

Mr. Bilbray: Mr. Chairman, I have Homestead. I -- but I understand, under our procedures we're talking about, I will vote affirmative, but I will be taken out of the Homestead vote, total vote. Is that correct, or should I just not vote on this?

Chairman Principi: You should not vote.

Mr. Bilbray: All right.

Chairman Principi: All right. Are there --

Mr. Skinner: I have a --

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

Mr. Skinner: -- question.

Chairman Principi: I'm sorry.

Mr. Skinner: No, I just have a question I want to make sure that I understand, as well. We're not voting on the entire group. We're just voting on portions of 'em. Is that right?

Chairman Principi: We're voting on --

General Newton: This particular one, we're voting on

CERTIFIED

the Air Reserve over on this side, sir.

Mr. Skinner: Okay.

General Newton: And they were all in one section.

Mr. Skinner: Good. Okay, thank you.

Chairman Principi: All in favor?

[A show of five hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Chairman Principi: We have one recusal, I believe. Four recusals? Four recusals.

Ms. Sarkar: Could you hold up your hands if you've been recused from this vote, please?

Mr. Coyle: Mr. Chairman, I had understood, going into this situation, that -- let me take a particular example. There are two people, two jobs, affected at Edwards Air Force Base in this recommendation. I had understood that Counsel was going to treat those locations -- in this case, those two jobs at Edwards Air Force Base -- as individual recusals on that part of the motion, but not on the entire motion.

Mr. Bilbray: That's what I understood, too. That's why I asked you, Mr. Chairman, whether or not -- otherwise, you don't have enough votes to pass it.

Chairman Principi: Commissioner Coyle, you can vote.

Does that answer all the questions?

CERTIFIED

Ms. Sarkar: Well, Mr. Chairman, could you show me again who is being recused, other than Commissioner Bilbray, whom I've noted?

Chairman Principi: Congressman Hansen.

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We're ready for the vote, sir, thank you for your indulgence.

Mr. Skinner: I think we only need --

Chairman Principi: Let's vote again.

All in favor of the motion?

[A show of six hands.]

Chairman Principi: All opposed?

[No response.]

Ms. Sarkar: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your indulgence. The vote is six in favor, none against, and three abstentions. Therefore, the motion is passed.

Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

General Newton: Mr. Chairman, I think that completes the Air Reserve F-16s.

I'd like to go to the Air National Guard F-16s, which are on the -- which are on the screen. And I'd like to take these -- can you tell me --

Chairman Principi: Excuse me. Excuse me, General Newton. Counsel asked for a ten-minute recess.

CERTIFIED

General Newton: Yes, sir.

[Recess.]

Chairman Principi: The hearing will come to order.

As you can imagine, this is a very, very complex subject, very detailed. It involves the movement of a significant number of aircraft. And a number of technical issues have arisen during the course of our deliberations this afternoon on the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve. And to ensure that we have all of these technical issues correct and complete, we are going to stand in recess until 7:00 p.m. this evening.

In the interest of transparency and openness, we are conducting these deliberations in the public view, and we want to make sure it's clear and correct and that the motions are in order. And, accordingly, we will spend the next three hours working through these details so that when we reconvene at 7:00 p.m., we will be able to go through the list of weapons systems and get through this process this evening.

So, the Commission will be in recess until 7:00 p.m.

[Whereupon, at 4:10 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

CERTIFIED