



Steven C. LaTourette
Congress of the United States
14th District, Ohio

June 29, 2005



Mr. Anthony J. Principi
Chairman
Base Realignment and Closure Commission
2521 South Clark Street, Suite 600
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Commissioner Principi:

As you know, the Base Closure and Realignment Report contains numerous recommendations regarding the Defense Finance and Accounting Service (DFAS), including a massive realignment of DFAS in Cleveland that will result in at least 1,028 direct job losses (1,013 civilian, 15 military) and another 847 indirect job losses.¹

I sent a lengthy letter to you and the BRAC Commissioners earlier this month that documented many reasons why the consolidation of DFAS should be reconsidered, and urged that Cleveland DFAS be taken off the BRAC list. A regional hearing was held on June 27, 2005, in Buffalo, NY. I testified on behalf of Cleveland DFAS, as did my colleagues Congressman Dennis Kucinich and Congresswoman Stephanie Tubbs Jones. In addition, Mr. Fred Nance of the Cleveland Defense Industry Alliance laid out a detailed and compelling case that highlighted errors in calculations that harmed Cleveland DFAS, several inconsistencies in examining and applying data, and some simply illogical recommendations.

I must bring to your attention some remarkable evidence that I did not possess at the regional hearing relating to DoD Antiterrorism/Force Protection Standards. This illustrates yet another glaring flaw that unfairly contributed to Cleveland DFAS being slated for a massive realignment.

I have discovered that Cleveland DFAS is being penalized for not meeting DoD anti-terrorism standards even though the standards do not take effect for more than four years. How can DoD possibly conclude that Cleveland DFAS does not meet a standard when the standard does not take effect until October 1, 2009?

As I highlighted in my last letter, the three DFAS sites that will ultimately gain jobs – Denver, Indianapolis and Columbus – now meet DoD Antiterrorism/Force Protection (AT/FP) standards according to the BRAC Report.² DFAS Indianapolis, which stands to gain 3,500 jobs

and take over military payroll functions, is located on the grounds of the former Fort Benjamin Harrison, which closed in 1995.

Both DFAS Indianapolis and DFAS Cleveland are housed in buildings owned by the General Services Administration (GSA). The BRAC Report made clear that Indianapolis meets anti-terrorism standards, and internal documents I obtained from DoD show that the Celebrezze Federal Building, home to DFAS Cleveland, does not meet those standards.³

As I mentioned in my last letter, it is very ironic that DoD raised no terrorism or security concerns when payroll work from Denver and Indianapolis was transferred to Cleveland DFAS in July 2004 due to extended deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan and a need for efficient manpower.⁴ There was certainly no fortress around Cleveland DFAS less than a year ago when DoD decided to locate its Reserve Pay Center of Excellence in Cleveland and consolidate virtually all Reserve pay functions there.

Also, as I pointed out in my last letter, DoD intends to keep about 435 privatized workers and 19 civilian positions at the Celebrezze Building in Cleveland – the same building that allegedly doesn't meet terrorism standards. These workers will handle pay issues for military retirees. Common sense dictates that if the Celebrezze building isn't safe enough for 1,028 government DFAS workers in Cleveland, how could it be safe enough for some 435 privatized employees responsible for DFAS work?

At the time of my last letter, I took DoD at its word that Cleveland DFAS didn't meet anti-terrorism standards. I posed the question to the BRAC Clearinghouse staff in writing and they responded to my exact questions in writing and stated that Cleveland DFAS does not meet the standard. DoD never mentioned that the standards do not even take effect until October 1, 2009.

The "Unified Facilities Criteria (UFC) – DoD Minimum Anti-Terrorism Standards for Buildings" is the manual that outlines what standards need to be met in buildings housing DoD employees. The document is labeled as UFC 4-010-01. The anti-terrorism standards contained in this UFC are intended to "minimize the possibility of mass casualties in buildings owned or portions of buildings owned, leased, privatized, or otherwise occupied, managed, or controlled by or for DoD."⁵

As one might expect, the document covers new construction, existing buildings, building additions and leased buildings, among other things. As I mentioned, Cleveland DFAS is in a leased GSA building, and Cleveland DFAS just renewed a lease for 5 years with GSA in February 2005.

The UFC contains the following, critically important language about leased buildings:

1-6.4 Leased Buildings. DoD personnel occupying leased buildings deserve the same

level of protection as those in DoD-owned buildings. Implementation of these standards is therefore mandatory for all facilities leased for DoD use and for those buildings in which DoD receives a space assignment from another government agency except as established below. This requirement is intended to cover all situations, including General Services Administration space, privatized buildings, and host-nation and other foreign government buildings. This requirement is applicable for all new leases executed on or after 1 October 2005 and to renewal or extension of any existing lease on or after 1 October 2009. Leases executed prior to the above fiscal years will comply with these standards where possible.⁶

Clearly, Cleveland DFAS falls under the renewal or extension of an existing lease, which means that the building does not have to comply with DoD anti-terrorism standards until October 1, 2009. I would also like to remind the BRAC Commission that Congress appropriated \$22,986,000 in Fiscal Year 2002 for repairs and alterations to the Anthony J. Celebrezze Federal Building in Cleveland (Public Law 107-67).⁷ The renovations have not taken place yet, and I would argue that this \$23 million could certainly go a long way toward ensuring that the building meets the DoD anti-terrorism standards prior to the 2009 effective date.

It seems clear to me that DoD massaged and manipulated data to help DFAS sites that stand to gain jobs and did the same to harm sites that stand to lose jobs, like DFAS Cleveland. The evidence is crystal clear in a document DoD provided to me in response to an earlier inquiry: "During the analysis process used to define potential gaining locations the following locations were identified as meeting DoD Antiterrorist and Force Protection Standards..."⁸ DoD then listed 14 DFAS locations that meet the standards, including DFAS Indianapolis, DFAS Columbus and DFAS Denver.

The key words are the "analysis process used to define potential gaining locations." Clearly, if a DFAS location failed to meet the anti-terrorism standard it was not going to be evaluated as a "potential gaining" location. Regrettably, Cleveland DFAS didn't even get a fair shot to gain jobs because it was improperly labeled as failing to meet anti-terrorism standards even though DoD knew full well that the standards would not apply to DFAS Cleveland for several more years.

Make no mistake, Cleveland DFAS did not miss a deadline to meet DoD anti-terrorism standards. Instead, in this horribly flawed and unfair process, a phoney deadline was imposed on Cleveland DFAS to its great detriment. Meanwhile, the DFAS site in Indianapolis, also a GSA facility, could be unfairly rewarded for meeting anti-terrorism standards years before they actually take effect. Of course, it's probably no surprise that the Indianapolis DFAS building meets those anti-terrorism standards since taxpayers just footed the bill for a \$123 million top-to-bottom renovation.

The inclusion of Cleveland DFAS in the master consolidation of DFAS is unfair and a disaster waiting to happen. I again urge you to remove Cleveland DFAS from the list and

proceed with a fair, sensible and cost-effective consolidation plan.

Sincerely,



Steven C. LaTourette
Member of Congress

1. DoD Base Closure and Realignment Report, Volume I, Part 2 of 2: Detailed Recommendations, May 2005
2. DoD Base Closure and Realignment Report, Volume I, Part 2 of 2: Detailed Recommendations, May 2005
3. Memorandum for OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0202 – Additional Questions from Congressman LaTourette; June 3, 2005
4. www.forrelease.com/D20040712/clm047.P2.07122004122709.01180.html
5. UFC 4-010-1, 8 October 2003; DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings
6. UFC 4-010-1, 8 October 2003; DoD Minimum Antiterrorism Standards for Buildings
7. http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=107_cong_public_laws&docid=f:publ067.107
8. Memorandum for OSD BRAC Clearinghouse Tasker 0202 – Additional Questions from Congressman LaTourette; June 3, 2005