

2005 BRAC COMMISSION REGIONAL HEARINGS

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 10, 2005

8:31 A.M.

216 HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING,
WASHINGTON D.C.

STATES TESTIFYING:

INDIANA, OHIO, MAINE, NORTH CAROLINA, VIRGINIA, DISTRICT
OF
COLUMBIA

COMMISSIONERS:

ANTHONY PRINCIPI, CHAIRMAN;

JAMES BILBRAY;

PHILIP COYLE;

ADMIRIAL HAROLD GEHMAN, U.S. NAVY (RET.);

JAMES HANSEN;

GENERAL JAMES HILL, U.S. AIR FORCE (RET.);

GENERAL LLOYD NEWTON, U.S. AIR FORCE (RET.);

BRIGADIER GENERAL SUE TURNER, U.S. AIR FORCE (RET.);

SAMUEL SKINNER

PRESIDING COMMISSIONER:

ANTHONY PRINCIPI

WITNESSES:

SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR (R-IN);

GOVERNOR MITCH DANIELS (R-IN);

REPRESENTATIVE DAN BURTON (R-IN);

REPRESENTATIVE JULIA CARSON (D-IN);

INDIANAPOLIS MAYOR BART PETERSON (D);

GREG BITZ, FORMER SITE DIRECTOR, DFAS-INDY;

MATT HOPPER, DEPUTY MAYOR, CITY OF LAWRENCE;

RUMU SARKAR, ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL, DEFENSE BASE

CLOSURE AND

REALIGNMENT COMMISSION;

SENATOR MIKE DEWINE (R-OH);

REPRESENTATIVE DAVID HOBSON (R-OH);

TY MARSH, COLUMBUS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE;

HARLEY ROUDA, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, REAL LIVING;

COLUMBUS MAYOR MICHAEL COLEMAN (D);

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL TURNER (R-OH);

LT. GENERAL JOHN NOWAK, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR

LOGISTICS,

U.S. AIR FORCE;

DAN CURRAN, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON;

SENATOR OLYMPIA SNOWE (R-ME);

REAR ADMIRAL HARRY RICH, U.S. NAVY (RET.);

CAPTAIN RALPH DEAN, U.S. NAVY (RET.);

REPRESENTATIVE THOMAS ALLEN (D-ME);

GOVERNOR JOHN BALDACCI (D-ME);

SENATOR SUSAN COLLINS (R-ME);

REPRESENTATIVE MIKE MCINTYRE (D-NC);

REPRESENTATIVE BOB ETHERIDGE (D-NC);

BRIGADIER GENERAL PAUL DORDAL, U.S. AIR FORCE (RET.);

COLONEL TERRY PECK, U.S. ARMY (RET.);

ANTHONY CHAVONNE, CO-CHAIRMAN, GREATER FAYETTEVILLE
FUTURES;

SENATOR JOHN WARNER (R-VA);

REPRESENTATIVE JIM MORAN (D-VA);

REPRESENTATIVE TOM DAVIS (R-VA);

GERALD CONNELLY, FAIRFAX BOARD OF SUPERVISORS;

DELEGATE ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON (D-DC);

DR. GREGG PANE, DIRECTOR, D.C. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH;

ROBERT MALSON, CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, D.C. HOSPITAL
ASSOCIATION

MR. PRINCIPI: (Sounds gavel.) Good morning. I'm Anthony Principi, and I'm pleased to be joined by my fellow commissioners, Commissioners Newton, Skinner, Turner, Hansen, Coyle and Bilbray.

We are indeed honored that Senator Lugar, Governor Daniels, Congressman Burton, Congresswoman Carson, Mayor Peterson and other local officials from Indiana -- Indianapolis -- are here to represent the state of Indiana in today's hearing.

On July 19th, this commission voted to consider closure or realignment of eight installations not included in the Defense Department's recommendations. We took this action not because of any desire to close more bases or realign more bases than the secretary of Defense recommended, but to meet our obligation to the American people and to the uniformed men and women who defend our freedoms. That obligation compels us to examine the BRAC proposals of the Department of Defense from every angle and perspective.

We are committed to thorough, impartial, transparent and non-political process that will shape our military installations for decades to come, but also one that we know will have a rather profound impact on our

communities and on the people who bring our communities and our military installations to life.

The commission's July 19 action was not a vote to close these facilities. Our action merely allowed the commission to compare directly those facilities included in the DOD package of recommendations with facilities that are not. No decision has been reached and no decision will be reached until the commission has time to hear and consider evidence and input from all interested parties. This hearing is an important part of that process. Our site visits and public hearings, combined with citizen input, provide us with information and views on the substance of the proposals, as well as the methodology and assumptions behind them.

I'd like to take this opportunity to thank the thousands of involved citizens who have already contacted the commission and shared with us their thoughts, concerns and suggestions.

Today we will hear testimony from the states of Indiana, Ohio, Maine, North Carolina, Virginia and the District of Columbia. Each state's and the district's elected delegation has been allotted a block of time, determined by the overall impact of the proposed recommendations added by the commission. I am certain

that testimony will provide information and insight that will be a very valuable part of our review.

We would greatly appreciate it if you would adhere to your time limits. Every voice is important.

I now request our witnesses to stand for the administration of the oath that is required by the Base Closure and Realignment Statute. The oath will be administered by the commission's designated federal officer.

(Administration of the oath.)

MR. PRINCIPI: Senator Lugar, the time is yours, sir, and I'll turn it over to you.

SENATOR RICHARD LUGAR (R-IN): Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the state of Indiana, thank you for holding this hearing on the impact of Secretary Rumsfeld's 2005 Base Realignment and Closure Recommendations for the Defense Finance and Accounting Service -- DFAS -- facility located at the Major General Emmett J. Bean Federal Center in Lawrence, Indiana.

I'm pleased to join with our governor, Mitch Daniels, Congressman Dan Burton, Congresswoman Julia Carson, and Indianapolis mayor, Bart Peterson, in sharing our support for the secretary's recommendations. Mr. Chairman, I'm already on record before this commission in support of the BRAC process: to eliminate excess

physical capacity, to be a path for transformation, to rationalize infrastructure with our national defense strategy, and to reconfigure our military infrastructure in a manner that will maximize our war-fighting capability and efficiency for the next 20 years.

It is paramount that we implement prudent cost-cutting measures throughout the Department of Defense, and indeed, in all sectors of our government using practical business models and proven solutions. Consideration of these facts and hard-core analyses should incorporate the unique assets and distinctive qualities of the Bean Federal Center facility, the town of Lawrence, and the larger Indianapolis community that our witnesses will speak about today.

My good friend, Governor Mitch Daniels, who worked to improve the management and efficiency of our federal bureaucracy during his tenure as President Bush's director of the Office of Management and Budget, is here to speak to these issues in greater depth. He has asked our additional distinguished witnesses to provide detailed information regarding the Fort Benjamin Harrison facilities that members of the commission visited last week, and Indiana's unique qualifications to support Secretary Rumsfeld's suggested course of action.

I believe the original plan to consolidate 3,495 DFAS jobs at Fort Benjamin Harrison facility are in direct accord with the overall BRAC objectives. It supports our nation's next generation of military strategy, the Department of Defense's business consolidation efforts, and the DFAS transformation strategy.

Mr. Chairman, for many years, Congress and its investigative arm, the General Accounting Office -- GAO -- have harped on the inefficiencies embodied in the dissimilar pay and accounting systems that each of the services operate. It is appropriate for the commission to review ways to forge a better pay system for all the men and women in uniform and the many others whose compensation flows through the 26th DFAS facilities.

The mobilization of tens of thousands of reservists over the past few years offers a very real glimpse into some of the challenges that DFAS continues to face in modernizing, despite the investment of billions of taxpayer dollars. For example, a mobilizing reservist can expect a latency of several days in order to move from a reserve-duty pay roster to an active-duty pay roster, with an expectation that the same delay will confront on the way home.

These lost days of productivity cost millions of dollars to the taxpayer, and similar pay issues cause significant financial hardships to our servicemen and women and their families. These challenges are not new. Reservists reported identical problems in 1991, and in March of 2003, a GAO report found that DOD was investing more than \$1 billion to modernize and \$8 billion a year to operate 1,731 disparate business systems. I support the secretary's effort to address these problems through the BRAC process.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that Hoosiers are proud of their military heritage. With 590,000 veterans in a state of 6.2 million people, and tens of thousands in uniform today, Hoosier veterans not only speak with pride and patriotism, but serve the cause of freedom with valor. This is equally true of the talented and experienced civilian workforce which populates the military installations in the state of Indiana.

As a former mayor of Indianapolis, I'm proud to advocate the qualities of my home city and to offer any further assistance I can in your weighty endeavors over the next few weeks.

I thank you for this opportunity to testify.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, Senator.

GOV. MITCH DANIELS (D-IN): Mr. Chairman, first a word of thanks to our leader, Senator Lugar, for bringing us together today and for decades of service to the national defense, and to efficiency, and the protection of our freedoms. And secondly, a word of thanks to the commission for taking on one of the most difficult assignments anyone is given by a president.

Indiana has endured a number of reductions through previous rounds of the BRAC process, but we're supporters of the process and have never protested or complained in view of what we know is a very essential duty if dollars spent to defend us all are to be spent well. We know that, as a practical matter, a BRAC round may be the only opportunity to make necessary changes in the DOD infrastructure.

Like any enterprise, the federal government should seek out opportunities for well-planned consolidation as a means to increase efficiencies and generate cost savings, and it's just such efficiencies that prompt DOD's recommendation to consolidate DFAS activities to three sites, including Indianapolis.

In Section 5 of its recommendations, DOD noted that the consolidation of civilian personnel offices within each military department, and the transactional functions among the defense agencies reduces excess capacity,

reduces the use of lease facilities, and achieves manpower savings through consolidation and elimination of duplicate functions. This recommendation supports the administration's urging of federal agencies to consolidate personnel services.

I note that final sentence with some interest. As director of the Office of Management and Budget in 2001, I directed agencies to pursue the consolidation of personnel services, including payroll and accounting. To its credit, DOD took that direction seriously, and DFAS emerged as an early leader in the federal government.

In August of '02, the Office of Personnel Management conducted an internal competition for consolidated payroll providers, and approved a partnership between DFAS and the GSA -- and the General Services Administration to move forward. I wrote the Defense Department and other agencies in 2003 that this effort was designed to enable agencies to operate more efficiently, thereby enabling the federal government to dedicate a greater share of its resources to the ultimate mission of serving the citizen. I view DOD's recommendation for realignment of DFAS into three locations as accomplishing just that end: applying resources to the ultimate mission of serving the citizen through a stronger national defense.

In an August 2005 letter to Senator Lugar, DOD has confirmed that a three-site scenario for DFAS provides the optimal configuration for future DFAS operations. To quote this letter, "changing or adding locations will reduce DFAS's ability to effect necessary operational changes and will, in the long term, continue to burden DFAS with infrastructure not needed, which will divert scarce resources from the war fighter." End of quote.

The whole idea between the proposed consolidation is to eliminate redundant operations at geographically diverse locations. It will allow DFAS to strengthen and standardize business processes, simplify training, delivery and support, and improve oversight and control. The monetary savings resulting from DOD's DFAS consolidation recommendation are very clear: consolidation to the three sites will result in net savings of \$158 million during the five-year implementation period, and annual savings of \$120 million in the following years. As a result, the estimated net present value of the consolidation proposal over 20 years is \$1.3 billion. In fact, DOD believes that the anticipated efficiencies resulting from this operational restructuring will yield cost savings beyond this estimate.

Let me talk for a few minutes about the criteria used to determine the recommendation and address a few

reasons why Indianapolis clearly fits them. The goal of the optimization proposal stated by DOD was to ensure strong military value while reducing the number of DFAS central and field-operating locations by merging and combining business line operations to the greatest extent possible. The model also sought to balance requirements for an environment that meets DOD anti-terrorist and force-protection standards, strategic business-line redundancy, workforce availability, an anchor entity for each business line to retain necessary integrity to support customer needs, and availability facility space or buildable acres.

Our DFAS facility in Indianapolis meets all these goals. As you all know, DFAS Indianapolis is the Pentagon's largest DFAS facility with over 2500 permanent employees as well as an additional 500 temporary contractors. It is located in the Bean Federal Center on the grounds of the former Fort Benjamin Harrison. Although Fort Harrison was closed in a prior BRAC round, the Bean Center's obvious value led the Pentagon to maintain significant operations there, most importantly making it home to one of DFAS's anchor locations.

I know that Secretary Skinner and General Newton came out and toured the center last week, but we'd like to underscore some of its unique benefits for those who

didn't see it in person. Congressman Burton and Mayor Peterson will address many of these benefits in their testimony, and we're submitting a white paper with specific details -- but a few key points.

First and most importantly, let me talk about capacity. The Bean Federal Center is the second largest building in the Pentagon inventory with over 1.6 million square feet of space. DFAS currently operates in 1.1 million square feet, thus there is still significant space for additional expansion of DFAS activities within the Bean Center.

At last week's site visit, DFAS stated that there are currently about 800 vacant work stations in the existing space available for immediate use. In addition, DFAS can accommodate nearly a thousand additional workers by expanding into unused space in the Bean Center and by using space that will soon become available through other BRAC realignments. Beyond this, we could also secure space for additional permanent employees by moving the contractors off site to nearby buildings that share DOD connectivity.

Thus there is immediate space for at least 4700 permanent employees at DFAS Indianapolis. DOD's formal BRAC recommendation proposed putting as many as 6,000 employees in Indianapolis, and should the experts decide

that such a level is the right number for our facility, I am fully confident that we can accommodate it.

I also want to stress that both the state and local governments are fully committed to ensuring the success of this effort and will provide the full cooperation of the state's Departments of Workforce Development, Economic Development or other agencies to that end.

Another key advantage to Indianapolis is our low cost of operations. Due to a number of factors, including the operating agreement we have with GSA and the low locality pay rate in our area, Indianapolis operating costs rank below all other major DFAS facilities; even below those which are located on military bases and pay no rent or security costs.

I also want to touch on an issue raised by Secretary Skinner last week. Indianapolis has a very short hiring time, one of the shortest in all of DFAS. Our local operation is able to fill job openings in an average of just 13 days compared to an average time among all DFAS operations of nearly 30 days. Credit for this certainly goes to a strong local workforce and educational system, as Mayor Peterson will discuss.

In sum, it's just good business and sound public policy to build upon the recent investment of almost \$124 million in the Bean facility. A decision to add

facilities back would diminish the potential savings that this initiative offers to our war fighters, and may push the date for ultimate completion well back into the future.

Again, my deep gratitude to the commissioners and staff for the task you've undertaken and the diligence you've brought to it. I commend to you the balance of our presentation, and we'll be happy to answer any questions.

REP. DAN BURTON (R-IN): Thank you, Governor. I presume it's now my opportunity to talk. The Congress is always down the list a little bit. We have to wait for the senators and the governors, and then they finally get to the congressmen. (Laughter.) I'm teasing of course.

First of all, let me just say, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate all of your hard work. I have a detailed statement that I will submit for the record, and I will try to just cover some of the bases that the governor and the senator have not gone into detail on.

First of all, let me just say that, Governor, that was a very fine presentation. He covered a great many of the things that I'm concerned about, and I think it was very well done. It's good to see my good buddy, Jim Hansen, again. Jim, it's nice seeing you. I hope you

don't miss all the bells we have to hear running to votes and everything. Are you enjoying your retirement?

MR. HANSEN: Absolutely.

REP. BURTON: Good, good.

MR. : Up 'til now? (Laughter.)

REP. BURTON: Let me say that the governor is correct. There has been almost \$124 million spent in renovating this facility, and it is the second largest facility of its type in the entire inventory. The Pentagon is the only other building that's larger than that. And we can accommodate, without any doubt, the additional personnel that they're talking about.

One of the things that has been discussed is the parking. Somebody said not too long ago, well, we won't be able to accommodate all the people who have to park at this facility. I've talked to Mayor Cantwell, mayor of Lawrence, and Mayor Peterson. There is no problem whatsoever with the parking. We have adequate parking already, but if necessary, the parking can be expanded, and I think possibly you can show that on the paper there, on the map.

The -- Senator Lugar and I worked on getting additional funding for a new commissary and post exchange. This year I think there's \$2 million that has been allocated for that purpose. This is going to be

very good for the personnel that will be working there in the reserve units that work there at the base. I think that will be very good from the standpoint of the employees who are going to be working there in Indianapolis.

The security -- there's been some question about security. Mayor Peterson and Mayor Cantwell have assured me they have a very good SWAT team and a good agreement with the facility right now that will take care of security needs. If additional security is required, there is no question in my mind it can be done in an -- a very low cost and equitable manner. This is already a very secure facility. If necessary, it could be made even more secure with a minimal amount of expenditure.

The cost per square foot, after the agreement that was reached in 1997, runs about \$8.17 per usable square foot. This is much lower -- as the governor was alluding to a few moments ago -- than any of the competing facilities around the country, and since we're talking about saving taxpayers' dollars and making sure we streamline the military's expenses, I think this shows that that will be a very beneficial aspect as well.

One of the things that I'd like to talk about that's very, very important is the people that are going to be working there. And I had my staff pass out to you -- I

hope you'll take a look at this, it should be in front of all of you right now, we worked on this last night -- it shows on there the cost-of-living comparisons between all of the sites concerned: Indianapolis, Cleveland, Columbus, Denver and Kansas City. If you look at the GS-5, GS-7, GS-9, GS-11 and GS-13 and then the average per-location savings for each employee, I think you'll find it very interesting, and I'll let you look at that at your leisure. But the overall average for all the centers, including Indianapolis, is that Indianapolis on average is -- will save the employee about -- almost \$3,000 a year -- \$2907.04 a year. Some locations the savings between them and Indianapolis is much greater.

So when you're talking about quality of life, the old Fort Harrison has been completely renovated. It's one of the finest facilities of its kind. We were all very concerned when they closed Fort Harrison. We now have all kinds of restaurants, business facilities there, so the employees who will be working there will find it very, very comfortable to work in that environment.

Mayor Peterson and Mayor Cantwell, I'm sure, will tell you as well the housing facilities and the other things that are needed for the quality of life in and around Fort Harrison and the finance center are very, very good, and that this is one of the areas that I

represent and my colleague from Congress represents, and we're sure that the quality of life will be very, very, very good.

So from the standpoint of cost savings, from the standpoint of environment, from the standpoint of accessibility and security, and from the standpoint of quality of life and the cost of living for these people that will be working there, there is no question in my mind that this would be a great move for your commission to make.

Thank you very much.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, Congressman Burton.
Congresswoman Carson?

REP. JULIA CARSON (D-IN): Thank you very much. I assume I'm next. When you are number three, there really isn't much left to say. I want to associate myself with the remarks of those who preceded me -- Senator Lugar and Governor Mitch Daniels, and certainly my colleague, Dan Burton.

Members of the commission, I'm pleased to be here with such a distinguished cast of Indiana leaders to bring the case for our finance center. Our finance center is an important part of our community, and its work has paid great dividends in terms of the opportunity, the production, the skills, the pride and

the diversity of its workforce. I'd like to emphasize that the Bean Center does in fact provide a centerpiece for diversity. It's right in the middle of America, and it's right in the center of a diverse population. These are qualities and values that would transfer well to new workers joining our DFAS workforce as they join into the community of the facility and its mission.

Mr. Burton has given you especially good evidence as to the measures we have employed over time to see to it that this is a strong and efficient facility, all in anticipation of a time like this, of a decision like the one you must now reach. Mr. Chairman, within Indianapolis, not many, many months ago, we dedicated a homeless shelter for the veterans of Indianapolis, and I want to repeat every chance I get my appreciation for your taking the time to do that. Thank you so much.

You've heard a great deal in great detail and have even more evidence provided in written form to consider, so I'll not belabor and not repeat, but simply associate myself with the record that you have with the remarks of my Indiana colleagues and the evidence offered. May you appreciate the wisdom, the good business, the human sense of Indianapolis as a great workplace for the DFAS workforce.

Thank you very much for your attention to all that we have to offer, and as a member of Congress would say, I will yield back the balance of my time -- (scattered laughter) -- and I'm sure you're glad that I'm yielding back. Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, Congresswoman Carson, and it was a privilege to join you in the dedication of that veterans homeless shelter, and it's appropriately named for the person who really brought it to life: you, yourself, so it was great to be with you then.

Mayor Peterson?

MAYOR BART PETERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. Thank you for your continuing service to our country through this, at times, thankless task, and also thank you for your accessibility. I've been very pleasantly surprised at the ease of communication directly with commissioners themselves, and the way you've made yourselves available, and it's -- we truly appreciate it in Indianapolis.

I also want to say that I am grateful to Governor Daniels for that terrific overview and for his very hard work, not just on this particular facility, but across the state of Indiana; and also to our members of Congress -- Congressman Burton and Congresswoman Carson, and

Senator Lugar, who is leading us and convening us here today -- for their commitment.

I am representing not just the city of Indianapolis, but also the city of Lawrence. It would take more time than you have through the course of the remainder of your service to explain why the Bean Federal Center is actually both in the city of Lawrence, Indiana, and in the city of Indianapolis, Indiana, but it is. And so therefore I'm speaking on behalf of Mayor Deborah Cantwell of the city of Lawrence, and we work together on this process.

I want to talk a little bit initially about what this means to Indianapolis. This is not an economic development project. It's much, much more than that. I know when you talk about jobs and you talk about infrastructure, it sounds like economic development, but to us, this is our last remaining institutional connection to America's fighting men and women, and we are a very patriotic city. We have more war memorials than any other city in America other than Washington, D.C. We are a city that reveres the military. We are a city that grew up proud that we were the army pay center. We always talked about the army pay center at Fort Ben. Well, Fort Ben is no more, but DFAS has taken on that responsibility, and it's something that connects us to

those who serve our country in a very, very important way.

So this is of symbolic importance to us, and I think that you'll see the commitment. I think you see it here today, and I guarantee you'll see it if new jobs are brought to Indianapolis. You will see how committed we are to make this work because it is more than just jobs; it is our chance to serve those who serve us.

The city of Indianapolis is a city with a diverse economy. In addition to DFAS, our major employers include Eli Lilly and Company, the pharmaceutical giant; WellPoint, which is now the nation's health insurer, is headquartered in Indianapolis; Simon Property Group, the largest mall owner, largest publicly traded real estate company in America is located there, and many other businesses. We have a very diverse economy. We're a strong city with a strong economy.

We also have a terrific quality of life, which I think is important when you talk about recruiting people; the types -- the quality of people that DFAS wants to recruit. We have terrific sports amenities, we have professional sports in the Indianapolis Colts and the Indiana Pacers and others. We have -- we are known as the amateur sports capital of America, the headquarters

of the NCAA, and many other amateur sports governing bodies.

But we also have terrific arts and cultural amenities that really exceed anything you would expect in a city our size. So the quality of life we have is terrific, our neighborhoods are terrific, but I think one of the most important points here is affordability. We were recently named by the National Association of Homebuilders as the most affordable city in America over one million people -- the most affordable city in America over one million people, and that contributes to us having, as was previously mentioned, the lowest federal locality pay rate among the cities with major DFAS operations.

I want to spend just a couple of minutes on education because that is not something that has been covered yet, although it has been alluded to. The educational opportunities in central Indiana are extraordinary, and as we know from previous BRAC operations, the number of people who will actually move in these relocations is relatively small historically. Now we hope with Indianapolis that will be a higher percentage, but if it is consistent with historical trends, much of the hiring will have to be done locally.

And with a facility of this size already DFAS's largest operation, there is a consistent need to hire.

Governor Daniels mentioned the fact that we are one of the highest rated DFAS facilities in time to hire. I want to tell you about the quality of hiring through our educational institutions. We have two of the finest universities in the world located within 60 miles of the Bean Federal Center: Purdue University to the northwest and Indiana University straight south. Both of them have nationally ranked top-25 business programs, very strong in finance and accounting.

We have other terrific state universities close by: Ball State University, Indiana State University, and the combined campus and many private universities as well, 29 in total within close proximity to the center. We have the combined campus of Purdue University and Indiana University in Indianapolis, which is called IUPUI, and you may not be familiar with IUPUI, but it has 29,000 students; it is the 15th largest conferrer of professional degrees in the country -- IUPUI, not Indiana University, not Purdue University, but IUPUI confers the 15th largest number of professional degrees in the country. And so we have the opportunity to be able to provide the highest quality of employees that DFAS needs and desires and will hire over the coming years, both to replace those as

there is turnover, and to hire new people necessary in conjunction with this realignment.

The final thing I want to mention is the building itself and the facilities, and I won't go over what has already been said other than to just point out the map here. As Congressman Burton said, we can expand the parking significantly. There is already a lot of parking there, as you can see. That is a huge building and so you can imagine how big the parking lot behind it is. But the white areas are expansion opportunities on the Federal Center's property right now, and then the pink overlay is what the city of Lawrence is already planning to do in terms with a community development project that will add additional parking. So as many as 2,500 additional spaces can be added to the thousands of spaces that are already there in terms of parking. In addition, our bus service, IndiGO, has recently started providing direct-to-the-front-door service, so transportation and parking will actually be, we believe, a strong suit of this facility, in addition to the fact that is an enormous building, in beautiful condition because of its recent renovation, and with a lot of empty space waiting to be filled.

So, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission, I appreciate the opportunity to be here on behalf of Mayor

Cantwell and on behalf of the people of Indianapolis, and thank you for your consideration. And we stand ready, willing and able to do whatever it takes to make this transition successful and to make DFAS successful in Indianapolis for the long term. Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, Mayor. Is there any additional testimony?

Well, let me begin with a question or two. I have not been to the facility. It certainly looks like a beautiful facility. I note that there is not a fence or security around the building, and great concern for the Department of Defense is protection of its facilities. Has there been any cost assessment of what it would take to do the appropriate fencing or security for the people who will occupy that building? Anybody?

MR. GREG BITZ: Mr. Chairman, my name is Greg Bitz. I'm a former director of DFAS-Indianapolis, as well as a lot of other things during 33 years with the Department of Defense. The original estimate on the fencing is approximately \$2 million to throw up a fence and the gates necessary. NORTHCOM and GSA are on schedule to do a full security review. DFAS-Indianapolis asked for the fence in 1999 and it was postponed, but now a team will be coming in, as we understand it, probably right after the first of the year, to do a full security assessment,

and it includes validating the cost of the fence and moving forward with that.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you. Well, perhaps a follow-on question to you. Can this building structure accommodate an increase of almost 3,000 people without any reduction in workplace space standards? Are you going to have to -- I don't know what the standards are for workplace spacing for this type of facility or these types of functions, but can you accommodate it within any diminution in those standards?

MR. BITZ: The way it's currently configured there's enough space to take the first 1,800 people without changing anything, either through empty space or through reutilization of space that has been set aside in anticipation of the BRAC and of transformation. To move up to 2,900 there would have to be some realignment. They have excess classrooms. I did that, so I know they're there. They have excess office space, which regrettably I also approved. So we could tie up the space until the BRAC hearing. So there would be some adjustment on private offices and classrooms but not on the individual cubicles.

In 1994 when we moved out with the Opportunity for Economic Growth to ask cities to as cities to bid on DFAS -- big centers, as we called them then -- the design was

to put 7,500 people in Indianapolis. So with the remodeling we're sure that can be done.

MR. PRINCIPI: Do you foresee any problem in building up to that level, 2,800 or 2,900 in the timeframe -- in the BRAC timeframe, implementation timeframe?

MR. BITZ: Not at all. We changed the mix of the building during the late '90s. I eliminated about 1,700 positions and brought back in 1,700 professional positions in that same timeframe of about three-and-a-half years. In addition, about 3 to 5 percent of the people would be moving with their work, and when the reputation of Indianapolis gets out, maybe even 7 or 8 percent.

So the growth would be very well timed. There is no surge capability of 1,800, 1,200 people, but we were growing about 60 professionals a month for almost three years. And then of course this will include technician workforce, and there is probably plenty of that already available in the Indianapolis area.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you very much.

MR. BITZ: My pleasure, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PRINCIPI: Do the commissioners have any questions?

GEN. NEWTON: Mr. Chairman, I just want to offer to the congressional delegation, as well as to the mayor and to your colleague, Mayor Cantwell, thank you very, very much for the visit last week. It was well done, and I'm certainly very, very proud of the people out at DFAS-Indianapolis.

MR. PRINCIPI: Mr. Skinner?

MR. SKINNER: General Newton and I visited the facility last week and I can -- from our visit I think we were able to assess that the information that has been presented here appears to be accurate, and it is a first-rate facility in first-rate condition, and it appears that with the consolidation that's going on, that fact that there is additional space that's baking now as well as space that could be built out that there is, and the parking plans are underway -- there is adequate room if the consolidation plan goes forward as planned. And I think we did get a commitment from the City of Indianapolis and Lawrence that if there is anything extra that needs to be done to accommodate this, they will work with the agency to do that, and that they're totally committed.

I see the deputy mayor, Mayor Hopper, nodding there. But they are willing to make, and have made in the past,

financial commitments outside the normal process to make sure that happens.

MR. : Mr. Chairman, there is a continuing theme, something about football. I didn't quite understand that part of it, but -- (laughter.)

MR. SKINNER: We refuse to discuss football in this public hearing. (Laughter.)

MR. PRINCIPI: Can we talk about basketball?
(Laughter.) I finally know what those initials stood for. I know they played UNLV last year and I never knew where that school was from. I appreciate that.
(Laughter.)

MR. SKINNER: Now that we've opened the subject, which I refused to do, they do have a great reputation for sports, and it really is a great place to live and work, as I think the statistics here attest to. And I could quiz Governor Daniels on how we compute rents from various agencies in the government process but I'm going to forgive that. I know he could answer it because he's a financial wizard, but we'll let our staff do it that way. (Laughter.)

It does appear -- the one thing I would make on the rent, so the commission understands it, when the building was taken over by GSA and DFAS agreed to go in there, the Defense Department agreed to advance the money for 143 --

I think it is -- million dollars worth of improvements to the facility. In return for that, they get a rebate on their rent. So when we compare costs of various facilities I would only opine that there is information in our books. It's hard -- the occupancy cost is hard to kind of compute because each one of these facilities has a little different arrangement with GSA rather than bothering -- I'm sure our staff can work our way through that, but the low occupancy rate is in sum -- is in part because the Defense Department advanced that money to rebuild this facility out. And it's there, and the point is it's already been spent. If it's not occupied -- you know, this is one of those rare situations where it's legitimate to claim credit for it because it's already been committed, and therefore, if it's not used, the money has already been spent and there is no way of recovering it.

So this truly is vacant space that, if unoccupied by a Defense Department tenant, that money basically -- that space will go unused and there will be no recovery. So this is one of those situations where the creativity of advancing all of the monies to pay for the total rehabilitation and basically paying your rent in advance was probably no way to recover back from GSA, knowing the way they operate over the years. That it is really free

space because it's already been paid for. Is that a fair summary, Governor Daniels?

GOV. DANIELS: That was brilliantly summarized. (Laughter.) I think the shrewdness and far-sightedness of the DOD in taking this step should be commended, and of course it would be tragic not to now to capture the full benefits of that foresight.

MR. SKINNER: Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: Well, thank you. We wish to thank the delegation very, very much for your testimony this morning.

(End of Indiana panel.)

MR. PRINCIPI: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I'll dispense with a second opening statement other than to thank the Ohio delegation: Senator DeWine, Congressman Hobson and the other gentlemen who are here with us today. We appreciate your testimony as we consider additions to the Secretary of Defense base closure list, and we certainly are not looking to add any military bases to the secretary's proposed list but to ensure that we do a fair assessment of those that were included and those that were not.

Senator DeWine, I'll turn this over to you, sir. We look forward to your testimony. However, I must ask you

first all to stand to take the oath required by the base closure and realignment statute.

(Administration of the oath.)

MR. PRINCIPI: Senator?

SEN. DEWINE: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I want to again thank General Newton and Secretary Skinner for taking the time last week to visit DFAS-Columbus and to listen so carefully to our case for expanding operations at this location. I also want to thank the commission for providing us with time today to discuss this recommendation further.

We are pleased, frankly, with the Department of Defense recommended increase in missions for DSCC. The facilities available for support functions on this installation rival any facilities available in the business sector, and together with exceptional military and civilian personnel it has received the Commander in Chief Installation of Excellence Award five separate times.

With me today, my colleague Congressman Dave Hobson, as well as local officials, business men and women from the greater Columbus area. We are here today to outline the main reasons we feel DFAS-Columbus is in a good position to expand.

DFAS-Columbus began as the Defense Logistics Agency Finance Center in 1988 before becoming part of DFAS in 1991. DFAS-Columbus is responsible for dispersing contractor and vendor pay, dispersing travel pay, and performing accounting services for 29 defense agencies, including the Defense Logistics Agency, also at the Defense Supply Center Columbus, among many other functions.

Before discussing the details, I would like to highlight the uniqueness of DFAS-Columbus. This facility is the single DFAS location processing contractor pay. In contract pay, where payments are processed for contracts that are typically high value, complex and multi-year in nature, in 2004 more than \$114 billion was paid to defense contractors primarily associated with major weapons systems delivery and support. Ninety-three percent of those payments were made electronically to DFAS customers. And in May of this year, the workforce reached a record low of 1.04 percent for over-aged invoices.

I also want to highlight some of the other success stories at DFAS-Columbus. First, in fiscal year 2004, DFAS-Columbus recorded 12 days in which disbursements exceeded a billion dollars, and the facility has already recorded 15 such days in this fiscal year. Total

disbursements for fiscal year 2004 were \$149 billion. And this accounts for approximately one-third of the total Department of Defense budget.

Second, DFAS-Columbus received clean audit opinions for five of its customers. This is the highest mark available and demonstrates DFAS commitment to excellence in financial management.

Finally, DFAS Columbus is responsible for ensuring availability of banking and credit union financial services on military installations worldwide. This ensures that our service men and women, their families, civilian DOD employees have access to their accounts. Online banking, fee-free regular checking accounts and new banking facilities are just a few of the opportunities that have been provided to this constituency.

From my colleagues joining me today, you will hear more details about the military value of DFAS Columbus, the many advantages it enjoys beyond located at the Defense Supply Center Columbus, which is one of the premier DOD installations in Ohio. You will hear about the outstanding workforce at the heart of DFAS Columbus and how they do a remarkable job every day in support of the unique mission performed there, as well as the

outstanding pool of candidates available in the Columbus area to fill incoming jobs.

You will also hear about the modern facility and superior infrastructure available on this installation, as well as the excellent growth capacity available for accomplishing the large-scale DFAS realignment proposed by DOD. As you know, the excess capacity identified for DFAS Columbus is immediately, immediately available, and DOD will not have to spend any MILCON funding to move people in today.

Further, this installation provides an outstanding security environment for its tenants, which really is second to none. Finally, you will hear about the model of jointness demonstrated at DSCC. It is something that we hope the commission considers seriously in its evaluation, as well of course as the economic impact on Columbus and the city of Whitehall.

With that, I again thank the commission for this opportunity. Let me turn to my colleague and my good friend, my congressman, Congressman Dave Hobson.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you. Thank you, Senator.
Congressman Hobson.

REPRESENTATIVE DAVE HOBSON (R-OH): Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission. I want to thank Messrs. Newton and Skinner for coming out to Ohio and

spending the day in Ohio. I want to particularly thank the staff also. I think the staff of this commission has been just outstanding not only on this matter but on other matters. And I know that is not an easy thing to do under these circumstances. But I do want to pay particular thanks to them.

I would like to make one final presentation on the merits of DFAS Columbus and why it's an ideal receiver site for DFAS or any branch consolidation. Last week when Commissioners Newton and Skinner visited DFAS Columbus, I had the opportunity to speak about the installation infrastructure and its growth, capacity for growth. Today I want to summarize those comments with additional emphasis on the excellent security environment of the host installation and the unique jointness, which is in aspect of the installation, which I'm not sure can be found at many other type locations, similar type of locations.

One of the most important advantages to DFAS Columbus is a tenant at the Defense Supply Center Columbus. This is a -- the modern facilities and superior infrastructure in character -- which characterize these locations, which I think Commissioners Newton and Skinner would all agree. At the Defense Supply Center, 87 percent of the workforce occupies

facilities built after 1990, with 70 percent occupying facilities built after 1995. This is an amazing occupancy statistic for any DOD installation. And having been chairman of MILCON, I think I know a little bit about some of those.

DFAS Columbus itself occupies one of the installation's modern buildings being completed in 1999. This fact alone would allow DFAS Columbus to score very high on the military value component of the facilities condition. Surprisingly, that didn't happen because the Joint Cross-Service Group relied on internal DFAS facility condition ratings which classified this modern facility from 1999 as quote, "red," unquote, which is the lowest possible rating based on -- I think this is based on budgetary question to improve the carpeting and the linoleum floor.

This single item facilities condition accounted for fully 14 percent of DFAS's military value. Because of the red rating, DFAS Columbus received a zero for this critical item and would have become number two on the military value list if it had received what I would consider an adequate rating.

Assigning facility rating based on minor improvement requests really doesn't make any sense. This is a first-class office space that any commercial business or

government agency would be pleased to occupy immediately. I'm sure as Commissioners Newton and Skinner toured the DFAS facility last week, they now realize a serious mistake was made by the Cross-Service Group when they -- and they will now hopefully encourage the rest of the commission to assign DFAS a facilities rating that accurately reflects the true condition of this outstanding facility.

Modern facilities are important but they don't mean anything without a comparable infrastructure to keep the installation running smoothly and efficiently. In this area, this property has done an excellent job of modernizing or renovating every key component of the installation and infrastructure, which we again looked at last week. And they have an aggressive preventive maintenance program, which is ongoing.

Next, I want to touch on DFAS Columbus capacity for growth. Of the 26 DFAS sites, only 19 sites have excess capacity. Columbus finished second on the list with 186,000 square feet, which is nearly four-times greater than the next largest site in Kansas City. Based on this capacity, DOD recommended that DFAS Columbus receive approximately 1,300 additional personnel.

But by the Defense Supply Center's calculation, the installation has excess office capacity to actually

accommodate approximately 1,650 people, which exceeds even the current DOD-proposed realignment by nearly 300 people. This provides you the opportunity to realign even more personnel at the Columbus, without worrying if the installation can handle it. And all of this excess capacity is available without additional needed MILCON dollars, which are very precious in the MILCON. And I don't want to take any MILCON because we need it for lots of other things.

I want to talk about one other thing: security. Along with superior facilities and infrastructure, DFAS Columbus enjoys an extraordinary security environment by virtue of its location at the Defense Supply Center. When the Joint Cross-Service Group evaluated the various DFAS locations, secure facilities were identified as the most important component of an installation's military value.

As we can all appreciate, the rationale was that a secure environment is absolutely essential to allow DFAS to provide uninterrupted service to its Defense Department customers, and certainly in a post-9/11 world, we have had no choice but to view each site around the country where DOD employees work within the context of this question: Is it safe? Is it secure? Fortunately, at DSCC, security measures do provide the answers to that

question. Last week Commissioners Newton and Skinner saw the excellent security components and why I think this is a great environment for people to work in in a secure situation.

Lastly, I want to touch upon -- before transition to Columbus community leaders -- on the topic -- is jointness and its importance to DFAS and Columbus. Jointness or collocation is very important to DFAS Columbus as is for all the 23 defense and federal organizations located at the Defense Supply Center, which will soon add Ohio guard and reserve units consolidating in the central Ohio region and the central Ohio VA clinic, which is going to be built right adjacent to this site with -- I know Chairman Principi. I have to thank him for that.

This September, in fact, I hope Mr. Principi and the current VA secretary, Mr. Nicholson, and I will be attending the groundbreaking ceremony for this much-needed facility that is going to be a great benefit for veterans in Ohio as the scores of veterans serving next door at DFAS Columbus.

We understand that jointness was a very important consideration for the defense department and one of its principle BRAC objectives when considering closing or realigning installations. This goal would be to

consolidate units with complimentary missions and create operational synergy while achieving economies of scale. Therefore, jointness should be considered whether you are evaluating an active-duty military installation or a defense installation like DSCC.

Needless to say, I was quite shocked and surprised in a meeting with the Joint Cross-Service Group two weeks ago to find out that they did not -- did not consider jointness in their assessment of military value for any DFAS unit. If they did, I am confident DFAS almost would have scored higher. It is inconceivable to me that the Joint Cross-Service Group, whose very title emphasizes jointness, by the way, could ignore this important attribute and not consider jointness as a major advantage for a facility that is over other DFAS sites.

DFAS Columbus is co-located with multiple Defense Department organizations that have interrelated activities and invite mutual support for a wide range of missions. Being co-located with Defense Department agencies, such as the Defense Logistic Agency, Defense Information Systems Agency and the Defense Contract Management Agency provide DFAS Columbus a tremendous resource to call upon a daily basis that they cannot be found anywhere else.

I have a lot more I would like to say about this jointness but I'm not going to do it because I think the staff and the commissioners have seen it. But I think it's something that was overlooked that should be looked at when you look at this facility.

I want to thank you again for allowing us to meet with you. And I will now let the Columbus community leadership tell you how they will effectively support any BRAC consolidation you propose for Columbus. Thank you for listening to me, again.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, Congressman Hobson. And thank you for your leadership and, Senator DeWine, for all you did to make that Columbus VA outpatient clinic a reality. It will be well served.

Mr. Marsh.

MR. HOBSON: Let me just say one thing before we do that. I know we have a shortage of time. Just in this last week, with these returning kids from Iraq, it was pointed out how much we need that new clinic. And I need to personally -- we both want to thank you for pushing that forward. And it's really needed right now but it's going to be there.

MR. MARSH: Thanks to you, sir.

MR. PRINCIPI: Mr. Marsh.

TY MARSH: Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Ty Marsh. I'm president and CEO of the Greater Columbus Chamber of Commerce. We have an accompanying PowerPoint slide but we're having some technical difficulties. I think we will get that up and running so if you see a bunch of slides flashing, we're just getting caught up to the rhetoric.

I'm joined today by Mike Coleman from the City of Columbus, mayor of the City of Columbus, and Harley Rouda, Jr., CEO and managing partner of Real Living, a multi-state real estate and relocation service firm. Also with our team today -- includes the assistant majority leader of the Ohio House of Representatives, Larry Flowers, who is the dean of our state house delegation. Maryline Oxendorf (sp) of the City of Whitehall. Our facility is located both in the cities of Whitehall and Columbus. Dianne Hopper, the executive director of the Whitehall Chamber and Steve Tugen of the Columbus Chamber.

Our organization leads and supports economic growth and development for our entire region. With the leadership of the congressional delegation, we created Team DSCC, a broad-based coalition of community business and government leaders working to preserve and to grow jobs at DSCC, including DFAS Columbus. On behalf of our

team and the citizens of Columbus, we thank you for this opportunity to discuss DFAS Columbus and why it is an ideal BRAC receiver location.

We understand why DFAS Columbus has been added to your review and applaud your approach in taking an inter-wise wide view of how to best reorganize DFAS. We want to support your analysis and we welcome this opportunity to explain how DFAS Columbus not only meets the needs that have been addressed, but excels in numerous areas. As you consider a proposal to consolidate installations, we want to emphasize the strengths of our facilities, our workforce, and our community, and why DFAS Columbus is the ideal location for consolidation.

As you know, Commissioners Newton and Skinner toured our facility last week. And it is good to see you both again. As a community, we appreciated the opportunity to show them first hand DFAS's premier installation. During their visit, the commissioners saw a superior infrastructure that can accommodate additional capacity at minimal costs. Also additional questions were raised about our workforce issues, which we want to specifically address today. Again, we're going to confirm that DFAS has everything that you need to complete the Department of Defense's mission.

Our goal today is to answer three questions: Why DFAS Columbus is the ideal location for consolidation? Can DFAS Columbus perform the work? And is Columbus the right location to grow DFAS. Congressman Hobson discussed DFAS Columbus' military value. Let me reiterate that DFAS Columbus has a superior infrastructure. This location is among the newest of DFAS facilities. As you know, construction was completed in just 1999. It is modern, it is functional, and it is secure, and it can handle additional employees tomorrow at a minimal cost. It is wired, the workstations are there, it can grow ASAP.

The commissioners can also confirm that this location has capacity. It can now easily accommodate more than DOD's proposed consolidation of 1,300 positions without any MILCON funding, as Congressman Hobson alluded to. In other words, you can move these folks in here and it doesn't cost you anything, minimal expense, no MILCON funding.

In addition, DFAS Columbus is housed with 22 other agencies as DSCC. Economic efficiencies are gained through jointness of shared services and administrative costs. And DFAS Columbus is secure. In fact, the entire 550-acre DSCC installation, which includes DFAS, is in

compliance with the latest anti-terrorists force protection requirements.

On this slide, you're seeing an overview of the entire 550-acre campus. The red marking, if it shows up, which is the whole perimeter of the based is lined and secured by woven high-grade cable fence that current surrounds it. That fence is in place now. The yellow box there outlines the DFAS facility within the whole base. There is no doubt that DFAS Columbus has the facilities to secure Department of Defense's needs.

Let's talk now about workforce. Can DFAS Columbus perform the work? Yes, it can. The workforce at DFAS Columbus is experienced, yet younger in age. Of the 2,000 existing employees, only 37 percent are eligible for retirement. In comparison, about 60 percent of Department of Defense employees are retirement-eligible. A lower rate of retirement keeps the knowledge where it belongs within DFAS and keeps hiring costs and operating costs down.

Although younger than their counterparts at other DFAS facilities, these employees are experienced. DFAS Columbus has a culture of being entrusted by DOD to accommodate new missions. In the past 10 years, DFAS has progressively increased the workload handled by its

Columbus location. Let me cite one example that Congressman Hobson also alluded to.

Recently, the Marine Corps vendor pay workload was transferred from Kansas City to Columbus. As a result of the hard work of DFAS Columbus employees, the percentage of overage invoices plummeted from 25 percent to 2 percent and I think Senator DeWine referred to it now. It is down to 1.4 percent. This drop was accomplished in 14 months, which pays volumes about the facility and the workforce.

When DFAS Columbus needs additional workers, as proposed in the DOD consolidation plan, we can definitely accommodate that as well. Our region's workforce -- 875,000 workers, and more on the way, ensures that DFAS has access to a growing and professional workforce now and in the future. Roughly 8,000 workers are expected to join our region's workforce this year, and we are growing thousands more at our area colleges and universities.

More importantly, our workforce is educated. Our workforce exceeds state and national levels for educational attainment in all categories: high school, college, and advanced degrees. Nearly 90 percent of our workforce holds a high school diploma and more than 63 percent have either an associates or bachelor's degree. And more importantly to DFAS, our strength lies in

accounting and technology. In fact, our region's concentration of accounting professionals is 27 percent higher than the national average and our technology occupations are well above the national average of 26 percent.

As DFAS grows, our community's workforce will keep pace. More than 100,000 people in our region are enrolled in our area -- 18 colleges and universities in our area. The Ohio State University Fisher College of Business -- both a nationally ranked accounting program and there are at least five additional accounting programs in the region, not to mention the state. The next DFAS recruits are waiting in the wings. Through Karen Holbrook, the president of the Ohio State University, we have access to major institutions around Ohio and the nation -- will help DFAS find the best employees.

And, yes, we can retract them to Columbus and they will stay in Columbus because our region has attractions all of its own. Is Columbus the right place to grow DFAS Columbus? Mike Coleman will answer this question for you.

MICHAEL COLEMAN: Thank you very much, Ty. My name is Mike Coleman. I am mayor of the City of Columbus, and the answer is yes. Columbus is a big city with Midwest

character. It is the largest city in the State of Ohio and the 15th-largest city in the nation. And Central Ohio has a population of about 1.7 million people right now. We have a strong workforce, excellent educational facilities, as you have heard, and account for two-thirds of Ohio's overall growth.

Looking ahead, we expect nearly 100,000 people moving to our area over the next five years. And we will welcome another 400,000 new residents over the next 20 years. Why this growth? This growth is because our community has affordable housing, job opportunities, a great quality of life, a strong regional economy, a transportation -- strong transportation network, and we are an entrepreneurial city where the spirit of entrepreneurialism soars in our city. They are coming for jobs, opportunities, and our quality of life.

Columbus is consistently recognize in the nation as among the top-10 cities in almost every category. Even Reader's Digest has ranked Columbus as the fourth-cleanest city in America. Popular Science magazine has ranked Columbus the seventh-most high-tech city in America. Black Enterprise magazine has ranked Columbus as the ninth-best city in the nation to live, work, and raise a family. BET, Black Entertainment Television, has

ranked Columbus as the number one city for African-American families.

We have one of the nation's shortest commute times for workers. We have a very affordable cost of living, and it's getting even more affordable. And even the private sector has turned to our city. KPMG has recently said that Columbus is the sixth-least-expensive city in our country to do business in, and we're proud of that.

The state, including our own local representative, Larry Flowers, right behind me, has joined us today to talk to you about all of the things that they are doing or doing together. For example, in the state -- Third Frontier, a state initiative to attract high jobs to Ohio -- the state representative, Larry Flowers, has worked hard on -- and also reduced the state income tax. We're working with business leaders to reduce cost of doing business in the state as well. And we have a nationally ranked schools -- great sports, top-notch entertainment, and arts matched by none other. And we are proud of these things as well.

I call Columbus America's 21st century city because our best days are still ahead. And we believe that DFAS is a part of our future. And it being located in Columbus will really serve our nation and our community much better with efficient and effective federal

operations right here in Central Ohio. Thank you for your full consideration.

HARLEY ROUDA, JR.: Thank you, Chairman, Commissioners. As Ty mentioned, my name is Harley Rouda, Jr., and I am the senior managing partner for Real Living. We operate -- real estate and relocation company throughout the Midwest with offices in Fort Hood, Texas, as well. What I want to talk to you about was primarily the moving of DFAS employees to the Columbus region, as well as recruiting new employees to the facility.

With moving individuals into a market, there is a basically four key things that are the primary motivators and issues that they need to overcome. First and foremost is the quality of life. And as the mayor just testified, Columbus meets that criteria in a bonafide way numerous times over -- highly ranked through national publications as a fantastic place to live and raise a family.

Equally important to the quality of life in a community is the quality of the work environment. You have heard today the quality of the facility that we have at DFAS. In addition to what you have heard already, keep in mind too that this facility also has fitness facilities, childcare, and cafeterias available to the workers in that building.

The second key component to move is home prices. I'm thrilled with Columbus because Columbus is affordable, stable, and growing. And lots of places have affordable housing, but if it is not growing at a regular clip year in and year out, then it is not building well for the individuals that are investing in home ownership. On the other end of the spectrum, you don't want a market that has wild swings like we often see on the East Coast and West Coast where we see that their personal wealth decline with the market conditions.

The third aspect of moving is schools. And for families with children, this is a predominate factor in that decision. Columbus has a wide diverse set of schools. In addition, we have got the ability for any transferring DFAS employee to match them with the school in the Columbus community that meets the type of school they want, whether it's focused on academics, athletics, student-teacher -- or student-teacher ratios, expenditures per student. Whatever it is they are looking for, we have got a school system that we can match to what they need.

And then finally in that are of moving, is trailing spouses. Columbus is unique in that there is a partnership among the real estate firms and the HR directors in major corporations of Columbus, Ohio, to

help trailing spouses land on their feet. It is often that the person that is coming -- the destination employee is coming to take the job -- that the trailing spouse often gets left behind as to what they are going to do in the destination city. It is imperative that we make sure that the transition goes well for that trailing spouse and the family as well.

Recruiting -- when Commissioners Skinner and Newton were in Columbus recently, we -- the question came up about a recruiting and the ability to fill the need for additional DFAS jobs in the marketplace. And as I was sitting in the audience, I couldn't help but think of the old story of the attorney in the small town. A sole attorney in a small town made a modest living year in and year out doing deeds and occasional probate work, but made a good, modest living for about 10-plus years, until another attorney moved in town, and now they both have more business than they can handle.

And what that shows is that there is a synergy there. That when there is -- there is the ability to bring technology and accounting firms to the market that we have -- insurance companies -- that we are attracting not just from the Ohio Valley, but literally across the United States employees to the Columbus-based area that

are interested in white-collar jobs in the accounting profession.

A good example of that partnership in Columbus is what we have managed with the major healthcare providers in Central Ohio. The future provides the sense that there is going to be a shortage in nursing. That is hitting us now and the indications are that it's going to get worse in the coming years. We brought together four competing healthcare providers, major hospital chains to work together in partnership with the business community in general, as well as the academic institutions in Central Ohio to provide an opportunity to recruit nurses successfully to the Central Ohio area.

In closing, DFAS Columbus has it all and DFAS Columbus can handle more. The facility -- it's modern, secure, conducive to expansion. It meets the Department of Defense's objective of jointness with over 20 different military installations, and no MILCON dollars are needed to handle the proposed moves to the Central Ohio marketplace.

The workforce is experienced and trained in handling new workloads. And remember the history of this facility. They have handled numerous new missions. These workers are young. Few are eligible to retire, and that is a major cost savings to DFAS. And as new workers

are needed, Columbus is growing them in our region with at least six strong accounting programs.

And finally, our community -- our community has come together not just for this BRAC initiative, but we have been together on behalf of the DFAS and DSCC base since its inception, and we will continue to be a great partner with DFAS going forward.

We sincerely appreciate your time today. Thank you very much.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you very much. Any other testimony? Can you tell me, does DFAS Columbus have adequate parking to accommodate the increase of personnel -- 1,300 -- and the same token, access to mass transit?

REP. HOBSON: Commissioner, the answer is clearly yes. As we have shown on the overhead, there is plenty of existing parking already, but we also have 550 acres in the entire base that is fully secured for parking building and any future needs. But the current parking-facility needs are based on the full occupancy of both of the buildings. And as we said, one of those is not fully occupied, so the parking spaces are already there for any of the new folks that would be transferred.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you.

REP. HOBSON: And we have -- the airport is right next door for transit in and out. And we have Coda

servicing the area. We don't have any subways in Columbus yet. But the road situation in Columbus is probably better than most major cities today. And we did pretty well in the highway Bill.

MR. ROUDA: It's a terrific transportation network in Columbus. It is one of the best in the country. You can get anywhere in Columbus, even though it is 230 square miles, in 20 minutes.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you very much. Any further questions from the commissioners? Yes, Congressman Hansen.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you. Mr. Marsh, you made an issue of the fact that the average age of the employees was quite younger than some of the other facilities. Is that correct? Did I hear you right?

MR. MARSH: Yes, there are fewer -- the percentage of employees eligible for retirement at DFAS is much lower than the other DFAS facilities.

REP. HANSEN: What would be that average age? Do you know off of the top of your head?

MR. MARSH: It may be in the material that we provided but we'll get that for you. I don't know the exact average of the DFAS employees at Columbus.

MR. HANSEN: I'd be curious to know that if you have the opportunity to get that.

MR. PRINCIPI: Yes, we'll get that right away,
commissioner.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, Congressman. Mr. Coyle.

MR. COYLE: I don't know if this is working.

MR. PRINCIPI: (Off mike.)

MR. COYLE: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I understand that your focus today is on DFAS, but I wanted to note something about the Air Force Institute of Technology. Is that going to come up?

MR. PRINCIPI: Yeah.

MR. COYLE: All right, I'll hold my comment till then. Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: Well, thank you very, very much. Senator, Congressman, members of the delegation, Mayor, appreciate it. Thank you very much.

(Recess.)

MR. PRINCIPI: Ladies and gentlemen, we'll reconvene and begin the second phase of our Ohio issue. We'll take testimony now on the Air Force Institute of Technology. Senator DeWine, I'll defer to you, sir.

SEN. DEWINE: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I want to again thank General Newton and Secretary Skinner for visiting AFIT. We appreciated their visit very much.

AFIT's location truly impacts the experience that students receive while pursuing a degree. The Air Force research labs are positioned right next to AFIT, giving AFIT students access to about 3,000 of the brightest, most experienced scientists and engineers in the world, more than any single location in the world. This close proximity to the labs also means that the students at AFIT can conduct their research using the major equipment already at these labs.

This location also offers students the ability to receive instruction about classified technology, which cannot be done in a civilian institution. For instance, AFIT was able to teach stealth technology to the Air Force officers who went on to develop and operate stealth aircraft.

Further, the cost for students to live and attend school at AFIT, which is located, of course, in the Dayton area, is dramatically less than stationing a student and his or her family in Monterey.

Finally, at AFIT Secretary Skinner and General Newton heard from an auditorium of students, students representing the Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps, Army and foreign militaries. They heard about the value of the education they are receiving and why they chose AFIT over

any other postgraduate opportunity. That was a very impressive group of students, very impressive statements.

Time and time again to that question, the answer was that AFIT provided the best opportunity for them to meet their individual career goals.

The evidence clearly illustrates that keeping AFIT open and operational at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is the best alternative for the Air Force, the Department of Defense and certainly the taxpayer.

I again thank the commission for your time. With that, I will turn to my colleague, Congressman Dave Hobson.

REP. HOBSON: Thank you, Senator. Good morning again to all of you. I want to begin by thanking Commissioners Newton and Skinner and their staff for traveling to Ohio last week to visit both DFAS and AFIT. With only two minutes, I don't have enough time to present my entire prepared statement, but I'd like to have it officially entered into the record. And I would like to use my available time to summarize three key points.

First, the value and cost-effectiveness of AFIT has been studied many times. In 1997, AFIT surveyed a number of universities to find out whether they would be

interested in taking over AFIT's military-specific course work, and if so, how much would they charge.

The results showed that it would not be cheaper to privatize AFIT, and, in fact, it would be more expensive. As a result of legislation I put in the defense bill in 1998, an independent study was conducted which concluded that the benefits of keeping AFIT were greater than the costs. That study recommended against privatization because AFIT was the most cost-effective way of achieving the Air Force graduate education needs.

Many of the recommendations in the study were adopted by the Air Force and AFIT, which has led to an even stronger and healthier institution today.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to enter a copy of that study, titled "Air Force Institute of Technology Graduate Education Program Cost-Benefit Analysis," into the record.

MR. PRINCIPI: Without objection.

REP. HOBSON: We have attempted to update the findings of that 1998 study. While the methodology is too complex to duplicate exactly, it would appear that an updated data would be about -- that AFIT would be about 25 percent more cost-effective today than it was in 1998. And I would like also to enter that piece of data into the record concerning it.

MR. PRINCIPI: No objection.

REP. HOBSON: As you know, the Air Force position supports the belief that graduate education is a core competency of the Defense Department and that both AFIT and NPS provide necessary services. I support that view and believe that the most cost-effective way is to provide graduate education to keep AFIT alive.

I was really shocked to find out that that study was never looked at by the cross-service people in their analysis of AFIT or NPS.

Finally, last Thursday Senator DeWine and I sent a letter -- and I'm switching subjects on you -- and a point paper to you providing additional data on the Ohio Air National Guard 178 (FW-FTU?) at Springfield, Ohio. The point paper identifies some of the errors we found in the BRAC data, frankly, no savings -- and we still need to train 1,100 pilots. Ironic that in February the Air Force certified that there were no savings from realignment at this base. Then, when they released their report to you, they found dubious savings of less than \$700,000 over 20 years, an amount they can easily lose in a moment.

In light of that, I recommend using programmatic changes to eliminate the F-16 pilot capacities when they're no longer needed by the Air Force. And, Mr.

Chairman, the reason I'm doing this -- I want to make it official into the record that you've gotten that letter.

In closing, I'd like to really thank all of you for listening to the communities, not only ours but others, as you go through this very difficult work that you're doing. And I really, again, want to commend all the staff and everybody for working with us and being so open and listening to the communities. Thank you very much.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, sir. General Nowak, have you been sworn in, sir?

MR. NOWAK: No, sir.

MR. PRINCIPI: Please stand for the oath administered by our federal MS. SARKAR.

MS SARKAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If you'd raise your right hand for me. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give and any evidence you may provide are complete and accurate, to the best of your knowledge and belief, so help you God?

MR. NOWAK: I do.

MR. PRINCIPI: You may proceed.

MR. NOWAK: Thank you, sir. Mr. Chairman and members of the commission, my name is John Nowak. I'm a member of the board of the Dayton Development Coalition and co-chair of our Wright-Patterson 2010 Committee, a group of business and community leaders which supports

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. I'm also CEO of LOGTEC Incorporated, an Ohio-based company that provides program management and information technology services at Wright-Patterson and DOD installations in several other states, as well.

I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify here today. I'd like to start, though, if I could, by first thanking our congressional leadership, who are doing what they do best, leading the way in our community effort and working the challenges and problems that face our community from time to time.

But also I need to thank the people who represent the top-to-bottom leadership across our state who are here behind me today and have been at virtually every meeting. We have our state representative, Kevin DeWine, with us today. All three of our Greene County commissioners -- Marilyn Reid, Ralph Harper and Rick Perales -- are here again. And finally, of course, our city commissioner from that level of government, Mr. Matt Joseph. This has been a team effort, and we really appreciate their support and the opportunity to come here and speak with you.

I'd like to start with where we're going and summarize that we believe the work of the Air Force Institute of Technology in support of the Air Force and

our nation's defense can best be performed where it is today at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

Dayton has a long history of invention and technological excellence, so hence we're very proud of Wright-Patterson and the preeminent location for Air Force science and engineering. Wright-Patterson is the headquarters of the Air Force Research Laboratory and includes laboratories for five of the 10 AFRL directorates.

About 2,000 scientists and engineers work at the labs at the Wright-Patterson site. The lab represents billions of dollars in facilities and equipment, some one-of-a-kind, found nowhere else in the world. And pertinent to our subject today, all of this is immediately available to AFIT students and faculty to both support and benefit from their research.

In addition, another 1,000 scientists and engineers work at other science-related organizations at Wright-Patterson, making it the largest concentration of military scientists in the country. This gives AFIT students unparalleled access to some of the best scientific minds in the Department of Defense. And as you can see on the slide, we're not only Air Force science. We also have the Navy Research Center.

In addition to advanced engineering, Wright-Patterson is also the logical place to provide technical, acquisition and logistics education for Department of Defense officers. The broad slate of missions performed at Wright-Patterson includes the headquarters of the Air Force Materiel Command, which is the center of acquisition and logistics, as well as science and technology, for the Air Force. This gives students immediate access to the expertise resident in the management headquarters, all the programming offices, the planning staffs, as well as the data libraries that are located throughout Wright-Patterson.

Of the 223 master's theses and Ph.D. dissertations by AFIT students in Fiscal Year 2004, about a third were sponsored by organizations that are resident on Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. That means the student has the opportunity to meet face to face with the experts in the sponsoring office, and in the case of engineering students, to use the sponsors' lab equipment. There is simply no other place that comes close to being able to routinely provide this win-win educational benefit for both the student and the Air Force.

The co-location of AFIT with the Air Force experts on research, acquisition and logistics management also helps ensure instruction is tightly focused on current

Air Force needs and results in a wealth of educational resources that cannot be equaled.

At the same time, there are considerable benefits to activities located on Wright-Patterson. For instance, AFIT operational science students have provided real-time study and analysis support to commanders and support agencies located at AFIT or at Wright-Patterson. AFIT acquisition studies also support the major weapon systems program offices. And, equally important, the experienced faculty are readily available to consult on multi-million-dollar acquisition and logistics programs.

AFIT is a new campus with state-of-the-art buildings and facilities. Eighty percent of the main campus buildings were constructed or refurbished in the last 20 years at a cost of \$42 million. Forty percent of AFIT space was constructed in the last five years.

AFIT has room to grow. According to the BRAC data used in the military value calculation, AFIT has 47.3 acres available. I might add, by comparison, the military value analysis for the naval facility listed only four acres available. And I note that in the entire Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, there are 408 buildable acres.

Because of the focus on continuous improvement, scientists, faculty and students at AFIT will have even

greater access to research opportunities through a landmark memorandum of agreement signed just last month between AFIT and the Air Force Research Laboratory. This agreement, in the works for more than a year, clearly clears the path for even more streamlined access and resource-sharing between the labs and AFIT.

I'd like to address a question raised by Commissioner Skinner at the community meeting in Dayton last week. At that time he asked if we would be able to share our analysis of the cost of moving NPS to AFIT. Using the COBRA model, we have determined that the move would produce annually recurring savings of \$41.8 million, with a return on investment after 12 years. A detailed analysis has been provided to the commission as part of the testimony package.

However, our community's position is that both NPS and AFIT should remain open and should continue to work together to improve efficiencies and reduce costs. We respect the Navy's view that meeting critical pieces of their graduate education needs are best handled in-house, just as the Navy understands that Air Force graduate education needs can best be tailored to specific Air Force requirements and be satisfied through AFIT.

We also did our own analysis of the cost of moving AFIT to NPS and found that it was not cost-effective.

The most serious error we found in the DOD analysis was the inclusion of \$200 million in military construction cost avoidance scored against AFIT, which we believe is a case of double-scoring, because mil-con costs are already fully accounted for in the secretary's recommendation to construct new facilities at Wright-Patterson associated with the Brooks City base move.

I would also note that \$200 million is itself significantly overstated. The School of Aerospace Medicine needs less than \$50 million in mil-con.

The complete analysis of three COBRA scenarios involving AFIT is included with our testimony package, along with an analysis of AFIT's military value. In sum, we believe Wright-Patterson is exactly the right place to meet the Air Force's critical graduate education needs. Those needs cannot be met nearly as well, if at all, at any other place or institution, government or civilian.

AFIT has instituted a number of cost-saving efficiencies over the years, some internally, others in partnership with the Naval Postgraduate School. We believe that this is the natural course for continuing consolidation and cost efficiency, without dismantling the basic defense graduate education structure, which has worked so well in developing future defense leaders.

Thank you for allowing me to testify.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, General Nowak.

Congressman Turner. Congressman, I don't believe you took the oath required by the statute. Would you please stand?

REP. TURNER: Certainly.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, sir.

MS. SARKAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give and any evidence you may provide are complete and accurate, to the best of your knowledge and belief, so help you God?

REP. TURNER: I do.

MR. PRINCIPI: Congressman.

REP. TURNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Well, thank you, Chairman Principi and members of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today concerning the Air Force Institute of Technology.

AFIT functions best at its current location, given the synergy between the institute and other missions at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. AFIT is a cost-effective education asset for the Air Force and the Defense Department, as AFIT's home is the affordable Midwest rather than the expensive West Coast.

Relocating AFIT to a high-cost area would increase the Defense Department's housing costs by millions of dollars and could result in lower enrollment, as students may not want to deal with the financial burden of attending school in such an expensive area.

For example, by using COBRA, with complete and correct data, the annual additional cost just of basic housing allowance by moving AFIT to Monterey would be about \$12 million, without any expected education quality enhancement.

The American Community Survey illustrates the higher housing cost in its 2003 data profile. The ACS profile lists the 2003 median house value in Monterey County, California as \$426,103, and the median house value in Montgomery County, Ohio as \$109,088, almost four times as much. The basic housing allowance for a captain with dependents is \$1,081 a month in Dayton, and the basic housing allowance in Monterey is \$2,291, twice the amount.

Though the housing allowance is doubled, the high cost of housing -- again, almost four times as much -- makes it difficult for service members to purchase a home. The GAO report on the analysis of DOD's 2005 recommendations also illustrates the high cost of the Monterey area. According to the report, closing the

Naval Postgraduate School results in annual savings of \$90 million and a 20-year savings of \$1.12 billion. The closure of AFIT results in only an annual savings of \$8 million and a 20-year savings of \$14 million, comparing \$1.12 billion to \$14.

In addition, the quality of education at AFIT is exemplary and is DOD-mission-focused. It is obvious by these numbers that the Dayton area is a cost-effective location for AFIT. Similarly, other defense functions in the Dayton area considered for relocation, such as DFAS and DFSG, successfully meet their mission and illustrate the cost-effective and quality performance of Midwest locations.

But beyond cost, education is an area where we cannot afford to lose our competitive edge. All these schools under consideration for consolidation currently successfully meet their mission and would successfully continue to operate in their current structure and location.

Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: I thank you, Congressman Turner. Mr. Curran, do you have any --

MR. CURRAN: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, members of the commission. Thank you for allowing me to testify today. I am Dr. Dan Curran, the

president of the University of Dayton, the largest private university in Ohio and the number one university in the state of Ohio for Defense Department-sponsored research. I'm also a member of the board of trustees of the Dayton Development Coalition.

And on behalf of the greater Dayton area, let me add my thanks to the commission for its service and its accessibility. And I'd also like to thank Commissioners Newton and Skinner for taking the time to come and see AFIT last week.

My purpose in testifying is to make the case that privatizing AFIT is counter to the interests of the Air Force and to our long-term national security goals. A defense-focused education, graduate education, that tailors courses to meet defense-specific requirements provides significant educational benefits to the students and research benefits for the Defense Department that could not be achieved at a civilian university.

AFIT is a fully-accredited graduate school that offers master's degrees in engineering, management and logistics and Ph.D. degrees in engineering. Since resident degrees were first offered in 1956, AFIT has awarded more than 15,000 graduate degrees and 300 Ph.D. degrees.

My first point that I would like to make about privatization is that privatizing AFIT is not worth the initial cost. In our analysis of the COBRA model, we find that privatizing AFIT will yield minimal operational savings. Because of the one-time significant cost, the scenario for privatizing AFIT's graduate programs will take more than 100 years to produce savings.

As Representative Hobson mentioned, in 1997 AFIT conducted a survey and asked a number of civilian institutions how much they would charge to provide the same military-specific courses and research activities as AFIT. The results demonstrated to civilian universities would cost about the same as performed at AFIT.

This was not a theoretical model, as COBRA-run is. It was a real market test. And let me add, as a university president, the cost of higher education has gone up tremendously, much faster than the cost cited by the representative since 1997.

A second study mentioned by the representative the following year looked at the costs and benefits of AFIT, and it found again it was more favorable than privatization. This study was conducted because of a congressional request in response to the Air Force decision to privatize AFIT in 1996. This study looked at the costs and the benefits of the Air Force operating at

AFIT. It concluded again that AFIT's -- the benefits there were worth the cost.

Let me just point out two key elements of the Booz Allen Hamilton analysis. One, the statement, "AFIT's extreme benefit is in its ability to focus on unique technologies that are key to the evolution of Air Force war-fighting capacity. And second, AFIT provides the most cost-efficient solution."

AFIT's student research is focused to fulfill specific Air Force and defense needs. In Fiscal Year 2004, AFIT students conducted research estimated to be worth \$29.6 million. That is how much the Air Force would have to pay if it did this privately.

If Air Force students went to civilian universities, this focused research would be lost. This is not accounted for in the COBRA model. Over the five-year period that's presented within my testimony, the total savings was \$125 million in research conducted by students.

A complete list of research contributions in Fiscal Year 2004 is contained within my testimony.

My second point is that even if the cost of the tuition at a civilian university might be slightly lower than the cost of an AFIT education, there are numerous benefits to maintaining AFIT that cannot be quantified.

However, these benefits are real and have great value for the Air Force and Defense Department.

AFIT provides graduate programs that are specifically tailored to meet the Air Force requirements. All programs are subjected to periodic program reviews by Air Force organizations which use AFIT and by senior Air Force leadership. AFIT can offer courses in classified technologies. As Senator DeWine pointed out, for example, AFIT was able to teach about stealth technology to Air Force officers, who went on to develop and operate stealth aircraft.

These courses were so secret that the majority of AFIT faculty were not aware of their content. This could only happen because the technology was being developed in the classified labs at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base.

The newly-renovated AFIT Building 640 contains classified labs and classrooms that will open up more opportunities for faculty to use classified material, data and analysis.

Another point --

MR. PRINCIPI: Please wrap up soon, Mr. Curran.

MR. CURRAN: Oh, excuse me.

MR. PRINCIPI: I'm sorry; we have the Maine delegation (waiting?).

MR. CURRAN: I understand. Next point: AFIT can develop courses very quickly. We have a PowerPoint right there. And again, civilian universities take a long time to do that. I should also point out the unique situation that AFIT -- half the faculty members are Air Force officers holding Ph.D.'s. The mentoring, the socializing, the networking that occurs at AFIT cannot be duplicated in a civilian institution.

The relationship with DAGSI was brought up earlier. DAGSI is the Dayton Area Graduate Studies Institute. My school participates in this program. Wright State, which has an outstanding engineering and medical program, Ohio State, Cincinnati and Miami University are all members of this.

This makes it possible for AFIT students to take courses at our institutions. It also makes it possible for AFIT students and AFIT to cut down on unnecessary courses, introductory courses that are not taught at AFIT, therefore reducing costs.

I should also point out that over the past -- since, I believe, 1997, the state of Ohio has put about \$50 million into AFIT scholarships for use by the Air Force.

Let me really cut to the end, because I know you'd like to -- (inaudible). Let me make one final point. It's a great engineering school, one of the best in the

country. The facilities are outstanding; the reputation, the defense focus. Again, the labs cannot be duplicated. I think Commissioner Newton and Skinner both saw that on their trip.

And let me close with a quote from a letter that the chairperson received, I believe, yesterday from former Air Force Secretary Peters. I quote: "Moving AFIT out of the Dayton community would destroy the unique opportunities AFIT students now have to learn from and work with leaders in the Air Force, scientific and procurement communities, with no conceivable offsetting gain in educational value. It is therefore inconceivable to me still that there would be a cost savings associated with privatizing asset that would offset the value to the Air Force of having its own program tailored to Air Force needs and supported by the Wright-Patterson community."

I ask that my full text be included in the record, and I thank you very much.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, Mr. Curran. And your testimony will be included.

Commissioner Coyle.

MR. COYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

With respect to the Air Force Institute of Technology, we learned recently that AFIT has an important partnership with the Naval Postgraduate School, that a Navy officer is a deputy at AFIT and an Air Force officer is a deputy at NPS, that together you have an advisory board, which reviews the curricula at both institutions to avoid duplication, that Air Force officers go to MPS for certain course work and that Navy officers go to AFIT for certain course work. And this sounded like quite an important partnership to us. It wasn't mentioned specifically that I recall in your testimony; I just wanted to ask you about that.

REP. HOBSON: Well, that is true, and that is a relatively new agreement between the two. Part of it comes out of Secretary Roche, who had some questions about how the operations worked, and he worked with the Navy because he was a Navy guy from background. He's a graduate of the Naval Postgraduate School. Came out and looked at AFIT, said we've got to make this work better together. I think there's some structural problems within the services of how they have to go through certain places to get together. But I think the

jointness today is much better than -- I've been in Congress for 15 years -- than when I started. Part of it started back with this study and has moved forward as we go.

He initially pushed a bunch of people out to the Naval Postgraduate School, but then later he made it work better. And so we've got both.

MR. COYLE: Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you.

Mr. Hansen.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

We were just out to Monterey two days ago, four of us. Went through MPS, went through the language training school there. And as Commissioner Coyle pointed out, it was a lot of Air Force folks there, Army people and others. Is there anything in AFIT that they couldn't teach at NPS? In the curriculum, can you put your finger on anything to say, hey, this is only unique to Ohio?

REP. HOBSON: Well, I think what they talked about on the stealth fighter would be very difficult to teach there. It would be very difficult to teach there and use the labs at Wright-Patterson to get between \$9 million savings that they do because those labs are right adjacent to AFIT. There are no labs adjacent to the Naval Postgraduate School. You can't duplicate the equipment that's in those labs at the Naval Postgraduate School. So it would be very difficult to teach many of these engineering courses that are tailored to advance flight and things of that sort and the stealth type of things that we've been doing and in the future without being adjacent to those labs. Those young people go down there and work almost every day.

General, you might explain it better than me.

GEN. NOWAK: Sir, in fact the -- like we said, just sort of the research papers and studies that they're doing for thesis and dissertation are typically sponsored by somebody in one of those laboratories. That's technology of specific concern currently to the Air Force. Those courses are tailored towards the Air Force. And I think when you net all these things together, it would be very difficult to teach that somewhere else.

MR. HANSEN: You know, in Monterey they do have some coordination between the Defense Language Institute, which is three miles away from MPS.

You made a point, General -- and I'm not challenging you; I'm just curious -- you said that there was 4.7 acres available in MPS and 47 available in Ohio. Well, I don't know about the rest of you folks, but that was a pretty big facility we went through. I mean, it went on for blocks and blocks. Of course, I don't know how that figure came about, but I'm sure that there's a lot of available space there.

MR. HANSEN: I was just -- I'm sure that there -- you made an excellent point on the idea of costs. My goodness, costs in Monterey -- I think it's a thousand dollars a square inch down there. (Laughter.) I've never seen a place as expensive as that.

Dr. Curran, in your school, do you have ROTC?

MR. CURRAN: Yes, we do. Sir, we have ROTC at the University of Dayton, Air Force ROTC at Wright State, which is several miles away from AFIT. Our affiliate

schools -- Ohio State, Miami and Cincinnati -- also have ROTC.

MR. HANSEN: Well, that makes me feel better. Thank you.

MR. CURRAN: Can I make one other comment about labs? I think if you look at the labs -- just taking one area -- the research conducted at the base in nano materials and nano characterization, I don't think you see the quality of labs anywhere else in the country that they have at the base. And again, AFIT students have access to that, have access to the composite labs. It's a significant research initiative there.

MR. HANSEN: I would agree that both of them are excellent schools --

MR. CURRAN: I would agree --

MR. HANSEN: -- I wouldn't challenge that one bit.

MR. PRINCIPI: Congressman Hansen --

MR. HANSEN: Where do you get the most out of your bucks? It's one of the reasons we're here is to see where we can get the best out of this.

MR. PRINCIPI: Congressman Turner.

REP. TURNER: Commissioner, one of the things that I thought was a great point when Commissioner Newton and Skinner were out at AFIT, AFIT is not a stand-alone school. It is not something that can be picked up and removed from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in its current functions and operations. I think one of the best illustrations that we had was after they toured the facility. We went up on the roof of AFIT and we discussed the integration between AFIT and NASIC, the intelligence functions that occur at NASIC, and the research and development that occurs at the labs. It's not just that the students there perform functions that are integral to the parts of NASIC and the research labs, but it's also the enhancement to their educations that occur. The campus is much more than AFIT standing alone, and it was great for them to be able to see how the two working together make such an impact on the mission of DOD.

MR. HANSEN: It's on the facility of Wright-Pat Air Force Base -- (cross talk) -- in the actual physical facility.

REP. TURNER: It is there, and the students' instructions and the programming that they undertake is integrated even outside of that building into the other facilities, the research and development labs, and the intelligence functions at the base. Individuals pursuing degrees at AFIT are working and are receiving training at both of those facilities.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: Just one quick question, because we have to wrap up this session.

Mr. Curran, you alluded to quality and so did General Nowak. Is the academic excellence and academic rigor at AFIT comparable to the academic excellence and academic rigor at some of the finer private-sector universities, whether it be MIT or Stanford or Harvard? You would say that they're on a par academically?

MR. CURRAN: I would say they're certainly on a par. I would say that the labs that are available to the students in some areas are far beyond what you find at some of our major research institutions.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you.

MR. CURRAN: And again, the prioritization of what labs are placed there correspond to the Air Force needs. And that doesn't happen often in sort of a university -

MR. PRINCIPI: And the academic rigor is comparable to postgraduate school Monterey.

MR. CURRAN: I cannot comment on Monterey. I'm not familiar with Monterey. But I would assume they're very similar -

MR. PRINCIPI: Private sector --

MR. CURRAN: -- on a minor interaction.

MR. PRINCIPI: I'm sorry. Congressman Bilbray.

MR. BILBRAY: I just quickly wanted to say, at the Naval Postgraduate School they said the same thing. They weren't poaching on yours; they thought both could remain, both should continue to work. The one thing that we as a committee -- or the visitors thought that maybe strengthening of the -- what I would call the board of advisers, board of visitors, to have more than just maybe some sort of oversight. I've served on the board of regents for the University of Nevada system. We ran the system. I was on the board of visitors of the Air Force Academy, board of visitors at West Point, and they're just strictly advisory back to Congress and to the president. So that's one thing we were looking at about potentially strengthening the governing body over both groups.

MR. PRINCIPI: As a Naval Academy graduate, I can attest to the academic excellence at Annapolis.

(Laughter.)

GEN. HILL: Go Army, beat Navy. (Laughter.)

MR. SKINNER: I've got one question, Tony.

MR. PRINCIPI: Yes, Secretary Skinner.

MR. SKINNER: I'm not going to get into that debate.

(Laughter.)

I'd like to ask Dr. Curran -- putting aside Dayton and just looking -- I want to talk about -- and the reason I ask, I understand that both of these are excellent institutions. And I haven't visited Monterey, but I'm giving that. And you haven't either, so -- you said that. But it appears to me, if the secretary of Defense wants to have centers of excellence, as we're doing in medical education, in medical training -- in some of the recommendations at least have been recommended that the idea of having excellence in education and combining -- wherever it is, seems to make sense, and combining it in a location where we have world-class private and public institutions.

In the case of Ohio, for example, AFIT -- as I understand it, AFIT students can attend courses at the various schools at the state school, and maybe at Dayton as well, without cost. The state of Ohio allows them to play there. I think the synergies of a strong center of excellence for the Defense Department located with a strong center of excellence of private universities, both

research and non-research, seems, putting aside the cost, which have to be obviously -- seems to make sense drawing on the best of both worlds. Is that theory correct, and would you just comment on that because --

MR. CURRAN: I would agree absolutely. And if you look at DAGSI, I think it's important to point out that, again, it is the University of Dayton; it is Wright State. But also, in the research area, you're talking about Ohio State, one of the top 10 research institutions in the country in areas like fuel cells and so on; you're talking about Cincinnati, one of the leading medical universities, and Miami University is also very strong. So that synergy is very important. It helps the universities move forward and challenge our students to go into the sciences, to go into engineering. And certainly it benefits the AFIT students and the Air Force.

MR. SKINNER: And I don't know -- and I don't know if Monterey has that; all I'm saying is a great place, great school. But does it have the same synergies of excellence in education? I mean -- and we'll just have to look at that. But -- and it would appear to me this is a logical, no-brainer, putting aside the costs of

having, you know, a consolidation in some form. Just as they've done in medical education, they ought to do it in scientific and graduate education as well.

Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you all very much.

MR. CURRAN: Thank you.

REP. TURNER: Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: We'll now receive testimony from the Maine delegation on the -- (cross talk).

(Recess taken.)

Good morning, everyone. And we will continue our Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission regional hearing.

We'll now receive testimony from the state of Maine. I want to welcome Governor Baldacci, of course the members of the Maine delegation. And Senator Snowe, I'll turn it over to you.

SEN. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE (R-ME): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PRINCIPI: Oh, excuse me. I apologize. In accordance with the Base Realignment and Closure Commission statute, I must ask you all to stand to take the oath.

MS. SARKAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senators, Governor, distinguished members of the Maine delegation, please raise your right hand for me. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give and any evidence you may provide are complete and accurate to the best of your knowledge and beliefs, so help you God? (Witnesses sworn in.)

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SEN. SNOWE: Mr. Chairman and members of the commission, we thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of Naval Air Station Brunswick. We also thank you for taking the time to visit Brunswick to learn firsthand why it is the nation's premiere maritime patrol base.

The purpose of today's hearing is to address your consideration to close Brunswick. We are here to present the facts, facts that demonstrate that closing Brunswick poses an unacceptable risk to our nation's security. In doing so, we understand that pursuant to the BRAC statute, the standard we must meet is that closure would be inconsistent with military value and other criteria of the law. We will meet that standard because closing Brunswick, the only remaining fully operational active duty airfield in the Northeast, is inconsistent with the readiness value of criterion one, the training and staging values of criterion two, as well as the contingency, mobilization and surge values of criterion three.

Our case is built on two overarching and indisputable facts.

First, in defending the U.S. homeland, geography matters. And if Brunswick is closed, it will be the ninth airfield closed by BRAC process in the last 16 years, leaving in the aftermath of the devastating attacks of 9/11 no fully operational active duty airfield north of McGuire Air Force Base in central New Jersey.

Creation of such an expansive, strategic void is clearly inconsistent with each of the criteria one, two and three.

Second, uncertain but foreseeable, as the Department of Defense has repeatedly said, is the very essence of the threat to our homeland defense and security. That is exactly why Congress saw fit to require both DOD and this commission to consider the surge and contingency requirements in criterion three when making your respective recommendations. And that is exactly why DOD concluded when looking out at the mandatory 20-year BRAC window in the face of such foreseeable threats that it could not close Brunswick, the last remaining fully operational air field in the Northeast.

Over the next hour we will demonstrate specifically why the Department of Defense expressly considered and repeatedly rejected such closure. You will hear from two former military commanders, who understand current and future national security, homeland defense and homeland security requirements.

Our first witness will be Rear Admiral Harry Rich, the former commander of all the maritime patrol wings and

squadrons in the Atlantic theater. He will demonstrate that on 10 separate occasions during the BRAC process and on several occasions since, including in testimony to this commission, the secretary of the Navy, the chief of Naval Operations, the commanders of Fleet Forces Command, the Northern Command, the commandant of the Marine Corps, and the OSD's Infrastructure Executive Council all recognized and validated Brunswick's distinct military value. And this position has been restated emphatically twice: in a Department of Defense letter of July 14th to the commission and a Navy letter of July 26th in response to a delegation request for a clear delineation of the homeland defense and surge requirements for Brunswick.

Following Admiral Rich will be retired P3 pilot Captain Ralph Dean, who during several tours with operational squadrons and wing staffs oversaw numerous detachment operations. He will review DOD's documents released by the department after it published the BRAC list in May that illustrate how Brunswick will support DOD's emerging homeland security role, documents such as a strategy for homeland defense and civil support released in June that requires the department to provide maximum awareness of threats in air and sea approaches as well as maritime interception capabilities, where, in the

words of DOD, successful responses are measured in hours not days, and as maintained by the chief of Naval Operations in this report as well, that there is a need, and I quote, "to extend the security of the United States seaward," end quote.

The bottom line is that closure of Brunswick denies our capacity as a nation for rapid deployment -- and documents such as the National Plan to Achieve Maritime Domain Awareness, released in response to the National Security Presidential Directive 41, that requires maritime domain assets to support, and I quote, "the entire spectrum of national security events, from the global war on terrorism and stability operations to disaster response and recovery," end quote.

Of course, Brunswick's squadrons, already consistent with the readiness and support values of criteria one and three, actively and successfully support such objectives. But there's also the distinct military value of Brunswick's crucial future capacity. Here, all of the DOD's emerging homeland defense planning documents make abundantly clear the surprise and uncertainty are precisely what the Department of Defense needs to plan for. And the military values of contingency and surge

included in criteria three are there for exactly that reason. Given DOD's clear and emerging requirements for both flexibility and uncertainty, removing a diverse and strategic asset like Brunswick from maritime and land surveillance at this critical planning stage is simply not a risk the Department of Defense is willing to take.

Captain Dean will explain how the Navy's realignment recommendation to make Brunswick a warm base will require sustained detachment operations that will add millions to the cost of operations, increase already stretched personnel tempo and effectively decrease the remaining service life of the P3s, all counted to criteria four and five. And he will also detail why such detachment operations cannot be run from just any air field; that they, in fact, require specialized air and ground crews, maintenance facilities, mobile operation centers and security for aircraft and weapons and that there had not been any comprehensive analyses of potential detachment operations in any other airfield elsewhere in the Northeast.

Admiral Rich will return to explain why keeping Brunswick fully operational is the only valid option. For example, he will discuss the introduction of the

multi-mission maritime aircraft and its associated maritime surveillance UAV and why Brunswick, with the Navy's only MMA compatible hangar, dual runways and egress over water into 63,000 square miles of unencumbered airspace -- makes Brunswick the ideal MMA and UAV base now.

Finally, Congressman Allen and Governor Baldacci will detail the adverse economic and community impacts that a full closure will have on the state of Maine. And Senator Collins will provide the closing arguments as to why national security dictates a fully operational base.

In summary, the Department of Defense expressly and repeatedly rejected closing Brunswick because DOD knew, from both current operations and foreseeable future events, that closure would tie the planning hands of the Department of Defense and complete the full abandonment of the Northeast. Either result, let alone both, is plainly inconsistent with criteria one through four and the national defense requirements of our country. Or as a high-ranking war-fighting commander told me last spring in our discussion regarding Brunswick, he said we should first do no harm. Well, to close Brunswick would do irreparable harm to our national security, and that is

the essence of the case that we will present here today,
Mr. Chairman and members of the commission.

I now turn to Admiral Rich, who will speak in
greater depth to the strategic value and the component
commander requirements of our base in Brunswick.

Admiral Rich.

ADM. RICH: Thank you, Senator.

Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, again we
thank you for the opportunity to express our concerns
about the future of NAS Brunswick. Your options for
Brunswick, as shown on this slide, are three: close it,
realign it, or leave it as it is.

Closing the last fully capable operational air
station in the Northeast is fraught with danger. It's
contrary to the expressed wishes of both DOD and Navy and
ignores a vital NORTHCOM operational imperative.

The second option, realignment, as proposed by DOD,
just doesn't make sense. We will show that it can't be
justified on a financial basis and it distorts the

defensive posture of the Atlantic Fleet Maritime Patrol and Reconnaissance Force to such a degree that the operational effectiveness would be significantly degraded. Response time to urgent operational tasking would be delayed three hours or more at a time when minutes can make the difference between success and failure.

Finally, we will show that the third option, keeping NAS Brunswick fully operational with its assigned fleet air wing remaining in place, is the only viable option available. In addition, it offers several money-saving readiness enhancing options such as introducing the follow-on aircraft, the MMA, at Brunswick instead of Jacksonville, and moving the reserve C-130 squadrons from Willow Grove to Brunswick instead of McGuire. These options are valid only if the Brunswick Naval Air Station remains fully operational.

The closure option was rejected by senior Navy leaders in DOD and Navy no fewer than 10 times during this year's BRAC deliberations.

The CNO's military judgment is reflected in a statement on this slide, and by undersecretary of Defense

for Acquisition Technology and Logistics on this slide, and by this quote from Admiral Willard's testimony on July the 18th, and finally, by the secretary of the Navy's special assistant for base realignment and closure. And the quotes on this slide, plus Admiral Willard's statement, basically state our case in a nutshell.

The highest priority in your deliberation must be given to operational imperatives expressed by the commander responsible for implementing homeland defense strategy. In March of this year, commander, Fleet Forces Command, NORTHCOM's maritime component commander, told the Navy analysis group, and I quote, "Closure of NAS Brunswick supports operational synergies associated with a single site P-3 MMA base at an unacceptable expense of closing a base offering numerous transformational and homeland defense basing opportunities," end quote. Powerful testimony from the man responsible for homeland defense.

Captain Dean will further discuss why NAS Brunswick specifically is the clear and obvious choice and meet the component commander's requirements.

CAPT. DEAN: Mr. Chairman, commissioners, the Department of Defense determination that NAS Brunswick is essential is founded in stated requirements and in

Brunswick's unique capabilities to meet those requirements.

The national strategy for homeland defense states that -- I'm sorry, I've lost a page. I apologize for that.

Is founded in stated requirements to meet a very real threat, and in the air station's unique capability to meet the threat. The nation's strategy for homeland defense, which I was about to quote, says, "terrorists or rogue states will attempt multiple, simultaneous, mass-casualty attacks against the U.S. homeland," unquote.

Just as chilling is the congressional research service assessment that an attack by terrorists, armed with nuclear device, would kill at least 50,000 and as many as one million Americans.

The strategy goes on to state, and I quote again, "Adversaries will present us with a host of new challenges and may attempt to use commercial vessels to transport terrorists or weapons to the United States, and may attempt to intrude on U.S. airspace with low-altitude aircraft, cruise missiles and UAVs. And may attempt to convert maritime vessels, aircraft, or other modes of transportation into weapons" unquote. And that's serious language, and it's the most specific in the strategy in regard to any threat.

Assistant secretary of Defense for homeland defense, Paul McHale, has stated that he realized as soon as he took office that the biggest single area in which he could make improvements was in maritime defense against attacks on the sea.

That threat has led to the requirement for a layered defense of the U.S. homeland, and that mission is being carried out by assets at Brunswick today.

Commander patrol wing five, at NAS Brunswick and his squadrons have been assigned and designated as commander task unit 20.12.1, responsible to commander's second fleet and NORTHCOM for maritime domain awareness. His area of responsibility extends 1,500 nautical miles into the Atlantic and as far south along our coast as the Virginia capes. The scope of his requirement at any given time varies.

Right now, P-3 crews at Brunswick are providing a 12-hour ready alert to NORTHCOM. After the September 11th, 2001 attacks, a four-hour armed ready was provided at Brunswick, and a two-hour alert expected.

That level of tasking, and more, could return at any time with the turn of events or a single piece of newly gained intelligence.

The second quote in this slide is critical. What is true of homeland defense missions, in general, is true in

spades of maritime patrol and reconnaissance. The two key metrics are how soon can you get there? And how long can you stay? When you answer those two questions, you realize that basing matters.

This slide shows the current basing of both active and reserve PC squadrons, and shows why, when defending a geographic area, geography matters.

The closure option has been soundly rejected by DOD and the Navy and ruled unacceptable by the operational commander because it eliminates its only valid homeland defense basing option in a critical area at a time when the threat is very real. Homeland defense is zero-defect work. A single mistake or failure is unacceptable.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman, closure is not a viable option.

Now, some points about Brunswick itself, Naval Air Station.

It's an enormous difference between any suitable runway and a military airbase. There's a correspondingly large difference between just any military airfield and a fully capable maritime patrol base.

Some may suggest that the operational requirement we have discussed could be met with P-3 detachments to anywhere in the region. That is wrong. As a point of interest only, a nominal P-3 detachment is described on

this slide, about one-half a squadron and enables three launches a day plus a ready until the first aircraft breaks. P-3s can carry a small pack-up kit with some spare parts. Before long, the following is required.

It is a fact that P-3 aircraft and crews perform detachment operations every day. It's just as true that those detachments cannot be performed out of a suitcase for very long. Maritime patrol aircraft are exceptionally complex platforms with a complex set of missions and demanding support requirements. Mission capability declines rapidly without fixed support and/or a very robust and expensive logistics training. At any detachment of any scope or duration, that support inevitably follows and very soon. They don't call it a tail for nothing -- it's attached to the front end and it gets there soon afterwards.

Our maritime patrol and aircraft bases in the United States, and all major P-3 deployment sites overseas, have evolved over time to provide that support, cost effectively relative to operating out of a suitcase.

NAS Brunswick is a system of systems, if you will, command and control, and not just for maritime patrol, but for military ops of almost any kind, flight facilities, air traffic control, security and force protection assistance to respond rapidly to aircraft and

air crew requirements. Many a detachment mission has been lost due to a failed aircraft generator, brake actuator, flight instrument or any one of a thousand other P-3 components, not at Brunswick.

A call on the radio and a part's on the way to the bird. Crews and maintainers, I will tell you, take that for granted, until their first pre-flight on any detachment. The level of support is just not there at the detachment site.

Now, I've gone on about detachment operations a lot longer than I should have, because, frankly, anyone who would say that the requirement can be met in that way is missing the point. And this is critical.

I remind you of the two key metrics for maritime patrol aviation: speed of response and endurance on station. For this requirement against this threat, the metrics mandate total continuous readiness in the region every day, year-round and completely invalidate detachment operations as an option.

So NAS Brunswick isn't just any runway or any military airfield, but a maritime patrol aircraft base, and it is one heck of a base from which to operate. Some of its characteristics are listed here. Of particular importance to fleet forces command are those regarding weapons storage, handling and delivery, completely unique

to Brunswick in the region and the resilience afforded by dual runways. And anyone who thinks that isn't important should try to fly into Naval Air Station Norfolk this summer. It's closed for re-paving until October.

There are other reasons why Naval Air Station Brunswick is the answer, a few of those related to the costs which would be incurred under any other option are listed here. None of them are trivial. The remaining fatigue life in the P-3 inventory is a precious asset, which must be expended efficiently, and not on unnecessary repositions or detachments.

The impact on personnel of the additional detachments and deployments which would be required, the increased family separations and resulting effect on retention also should not be ignored. Family separation is the number one reason which causes sailors to leave the Navy. Further, insufficient P-3 simulator capacity exists at Jacksonville to adequately support the entire East Coast P-3 force. But simulators at Jacksonville are just about maxed out right now. They're in use 18 hours a day at 95 percent of stated capacity.

Moving beyond the maritime patrol community, 29 tenants and supported activities would have to find another home or lifeline. These include the survival

evasion resistance and escape school, ship's crew berthing and flight support for the supervisor of ship building at Bath and the entire Naval Air Reserve demographic in New England, which would be abandoned if Brunswick were to close.

The final bullet on this slide is important, too. Brunswick is a preferred refueling stop for tactical jet and turbo prop aircraft returning from Europe and CENTCOM. I quote Ms. Davis again. NAS Brunswick is, I quote, "an important location for aviation training because it can and will remain capable of logistically supporting all of the aircraft currently in the DOD inventory. The facility is not limited to DOD aircraft, but includes aircraft of the Air National Guard and other federal agencies" unquote.

If you'll permit a personal aside, I've flown in and instructed in the P-3 at every maritime base, every patrol squadron base, from Point Mugu to Brunswick and from Jacksonville to Whidbey Island, Washington. And I can say unequivocally that Brunswick, with its wide-open airspace totally unencumbered, its expandable pattern, its complete lack of encroachment and its very weather is absolutely the finest of all of them for training. It's user friendly; it's always open. It had zero hours of closure for weather in 2004.

With all of that, one wonders how closing the Naval Air Station could have been considered by the Navy, and it was early in the process, before military judgment was applied by senior Navy and DOD leaders. Those early Navy deliberations were founded almost solely on quantitative measures based on eliminating excess capacity. A methodology I would submit is fine for depots or widget factories, but not for operational bases. Those bases must be where they are needed, when they are needed. And, oh, by the way, the Navy miscalculated the capacity of its East Coast -- (NPRA?) -- bases, and we've provided you with a summary of that in your handouts.

Having discussed closure at some length, I'd like to touch very briefly on realignment. And frankly, that's a proposal which has been from the beginning a real head-scratcher for us.

We have finally concluded that realignment is a failed result of Navy's determination to save some money by single siting like aircraft -- that momentum, if you will, running up against DOD's determination, wait a minute, no, you can't close this base, this national asset. Realignment is neither fish nor fowl. It would degrade the readiness of the maritime patrol force and save precious little money in the process.

In the final analysis, it just doesn't make any sense.

We have addressed closure and touched on a realignment proposal. Admiral Rich will now conclude with the third option before you, retaining Naval Air Station Brunswick.

Admiral?

RADM. RICH: Finally, Mr. Chairman, the only option remaining, the clear choice, is to keep NAS Brunswick fully operational with the assigned air wing remaining in place. Only this option realizes -- fully realizes -- the current and future military value of this national asset.

NASB -- NAS Brunswick -- is ready now for the aircraft that will replace the P-3, the multi-mission maritime aircraft, the MMA. No other maritime patrol air station can make that claim.

Brunswick is ready now to accept expansion of current roles, for example, receiving the Naval Reserve squadron from Willow Grove, rather than moving them to McGuire Air Force Base, saving over \$50 million in military construction funds.

NAS Brunswick is ideal -- an ideal site -- for the unmanned aerial vehicle UAV operations from the standpoint of both efficiency and flight safety. The

broad area maritime surveillance UAV, known as BAMS, will accompany the MMA. In the words of Rear Admiral Mike Holmes, Commander, Patrol and Reconnaissance Group, quote "the BAMS UAV is going to play a big part in what the maritime patrol and reconnaissance community does in the future. Much of the intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance that we're picking up with the P-3s and the EP-3s can be transitioned to a UAV" end quote. NAS Brunswick is ready for that future now.

As commander, Fleet Forces Command, noted, there are transformational opportunities at NAS Brunswick, and one of these is the establishment of a homeland security, homeland defense center of excellence. Recurrently funded armed forces Reserve center at Brunswick will site National Guard, Marine Reserve and other units reporting to NORTHCOM for homeland security missions, where homeland security and homeland defense assets are co-located. The potential for expanding missions and synergistic gains is great.

Numerous government agencies, such as customs, DEA, INS and others, beyond DOD and the Department of Homeland Security, all have a stake in the future of NAS Brunswick.

Most important of all, retaining NAS Brunswick and its assigned patrol air wing fully operational optimizes

the defensive posture of the Atlantic fleet long-range maritime patrol and reconnaissance force. It ensures strategic flexibility at a time when the maritime defense strategy is still evolving and the threat seems to be escalating. It takes advantage of and makes good the huge investment the Navy has made to ensure the last remaining DOD operational airfield in the Northeast is ready for the next decade and beyond.

The Navy has done well over the past five years, spending more than \$120 million modernizing and upgrading NAS Brunswick to make it fully ready for the future of maritime patrol aviation, and indeed, all of DOD aviation. As most of you have seen, it is ready now. The new \$32 million hangar is the only of its kind, designed specifically for the follow-on MMA aircraft. And as you have seen, NAS Brunswick is essentially a brand-new air station.

I was stationed at Brunswick three times during my 35 years on active duty. And in my opinion, no military installation in the country enjoys stronger support than men and women at NAS Brunswick receive from the citizens of Maine. It's a great place to live and work.

Retention figures or re-enlistment rates from the Brunswick base squadrons reflect the quality of life in the greater Bath-Brunswick area. Just ask any sailor.

For these reasons, and countless more, we believe our Navy and our country will be best served if the military value and strategic location of NAS Brunswick are leveraged in every possible way to enhance our national defense posture.

The single, most often-used term to describe the value of NAS Brunswick is strategic location. To fully appreciate what that means, you have to look at a map that's showing the location of maritime squadrons or airfields on the East Coast. Take a look at this slide. Those circles are 1,000 nautical miles. That equates to three hours flight time in the P-3. As the chart shows, targets of interest in the southern part of our coastal area, and even the Gulf of Mexico, can be effectively covered by P-3s from Jacksonville.

Now, look at where the targets will be concentrated in the North Atlantic shipping lanes. Note how much of the shipping lanes are included in the 1,000 mile circle from Jacksonville. Ask yourself, if you were the operational commander responsible for defending the Northeast, the most populous part of the United States, where would you locate your maritime patrol forces in order to optimize their effectiveness?

We need to remind ourselves that we are at war, and the enemy is probably the most insidious and

unpredictable we've ever faced. The front lines are no longer just overseas. They are everywhere in the Western world, including our extensive Atlantic coast line. Making changes to critical infrastructure at this time is fraught with danger and can be justified only by showing that the change will significantly enhance our defensive posture.

Clearly, closing NAS Brunswick is not a viable option. Nothing could compensate for the loss of readiness inherent in such a move. The issue is national security, not excess capacity or single siting like aircraft.

Realignment, as proposed by DOD, isn't much better. Yes, it would preserve a strategic asset for future use. But the need, when viewed in the light of September 11th, 2001, is more likely to be for immediate use. With the planes in Florida and a fully capable airfield in Maine left empty, the word immediate just wouldn't fit anymore. It would be worse than having a firehouse with no fire engines.

That leaves keeping NAS Brunswick fully operational with the assigned air wing remaining in place as the only remaining option.

Mr. Chairman, commissioners, you have a most unenviable task. Your challenge is to demonstrate wisdom

and the moral courage to decide what is in the best interest of our country and national security. If you do that, I'm confident that fully operational Naval Air Station Brunswick will continue to be a critical link in our national defense posture for many years to come.

We wish you well, and we thank you for your continued dedication to public service. I will be followed by Congressman Allen.

REP. ALLEN: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, it's good to see you all again. I am Congressman Tom Allen from the first district of Maine. I will speak to the additional, far-reaching, negative impacts that closure, as opposed to realignment, would have on the community and the workforce.

I represent the Naval Air Station's three hometowns: Brunswick, which hosts the main base and the airfield, Topsham, which hosts housing, a commissary, a Marine and Army recruiting headquarters and MWR activities, and Bath, with its supervisor of ship building command that oversees destroyer construction at Bath Ironworks.

NAS Brunswick hosts the tenant command for all ship activities at Bath. I want to emphasize that the towns do not want this base closed. Unequivocally, the community wants NAS Brunswick open and actively defending

the nation. And you can -- there is a statement on slide number one.

The town councils of Brunswick, Topsham and Bath unanimously passed proclamations in support of an open and fully operational NAS Brunswick. And I would ask consent to include in the record copies of these proclamations.

The community and NAS Brunswick have established numerous cooperative arrangements and integrated activities. This next slide highlights examples of community support. And frankly, commissioners, it's very hard to describe the extent to which, the incredible extent to which, the facility is integrated with the community.

The workforce at NAS Brunswick is indispensable to the ability of the base to carry out its mission. Their labors turned \$120 million of investment into a fully modern facility and built the only hangar at any maritime patrol base able to support the new multi-mission maritime aircraft.

I ask consent to include in the record testimony by Bill Bavin (ph) of the National Association of Government Employees, local R177. His statement represents the views of the 643 civilian workers at NAS Brunswick, all of whom would lose their jobs and ability to serve the

nation under closure. Bill speaks to the pride of the workforce, their concerns about closure on our national security and addresses the high quality of life for sailors and their families in Brunswick.

NAS Brunswick plays an irreplaceable role in the military life of the community and the region as the only active-duty operational base for more than 200 miles. Brunswick enables New Englanders to work and train alongside sailors on active duty, from young people in the Naval sea cadet program to the 1,100 Reservists, who come from throughout the region to drill. If the base is closed, this cultural connection will be lost.

Our entire society will suffer if the military way of life and the values of patriotism, service and sacrifice are not accessible to Americans in every corner of the country.

I now turn to Governor Baldacci.

GOV. BALDACCI: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, I am Governor Baldacci. And I'm going to address the economic impact of closing Naval Air Station Brunswick.

First, I'd like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the commission for your accessibility and the extension that you've given our state and our representatives and our people. You and your staff have

been very fair and open to all of us, and we appreciate that.

Also, I would like to point out some of the local people who are here. Don Gerrish, who is the town manager of Brunswick, is here. The speaker of the Maine House of Representatives, John Richardson, representing Brunswick, and also Stan Gerzofsky, the state representative, representing Brunswick. And Skip Tretrove (ph) and the Brunswick local task force are here also. Representative Mike Michaud -- it's not directly part of his district, but he is here showing a united front for Maine, and Maine and Brunswick standing together here today.

The challenges presented by this closure are similar to those presented by realignment, which I discussed on July 6th. However, the Department of Defense's own analysis shows the impact on the region and state from a full closure are far greater.

Naval Air Station Brunswick is one of Maine's largest employers and its loss will be devastating. The Department of Defense generated an economic impact report when it considered closing, rather than realigning Brunswick. A scenario the DOD ultimately rejected for the reasons you've just heard from Admiral Rich and Captain Dean.

The report states that closing Brunswick will result in the loss of 2,700 military, 658 non-military personnel. The ripple impact of these job losses will be an additional 2,659. Thus, the total indirect and direct job losses caused by closing NAS Brunswick will be a loss of 6,017 jobs.

Naval Air Station Brunswick is located in rural, midcoast Maine, in the Bath-Brunswick labor market, which has a workforce of just over 40,000. The 6,017 positions that will be lost through closure represent 15 percent of this labor market. In fact, closure of Brunswick will be the second most devastating BRAC action by economic area in the entire country. Such a significant loss will be a catastrophe and will cause the unemployment rate to go from 4.1 percent to 15 percent.

The economic impact estimated by DOD is only a partial picture of what will happen. Critically, the DOD analysis ignores the economic effects of population migrations. In their analysis, it's as if the military personnel were to leave, but their families were to stay behind. This will be case in Brunswick where 5,700 dependants of military personnel will leave the area under the proposed closure, also having a significant ripple effect.

Job losses will be difficult for every state. But the size of many other states' economies will help them soften the blow. Maine has a small population with a small workforce compared to those other states. Additionally, the midcoast Maine economy is today struggling with the major workforce reductions at Bath Ironworks, builder of the Navy destroyers located next door to Brunswick. In 2004 and 2005, BIW laid off 675 workers from jobs paying some of the highest wages in the region. And 500 of these individuals are still on unemployment. This situation, coupled with the small size of the state workforce to absorb the positions lost through closure, will present extreme challenges for the region.

In 2004, the Naval Air Station had a \$211 million direct impact on the local economy. The removal of 6,017 positions from the area and this significant loss of spending will cripple the region for many years to come. Let me be clear -- the closure of Naval Air Station Brunswick will have the direct effect of a federally-induced, major economic recession for this region, one from which our economists calculate it will take a full decade in recovery.

I want to thank you again for your time. And I'm pleased to now introduce Senator Susan Collins.

SEN. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, commissioners, I am Senator Susan Collins. We complete our presentation today by returning to the critical consideration of military value.

The closure of Brunswick Naval Air Station would be harmful to our national and homeland security. That is not just our opinion. It is the considered and repeated military judgment of the Department of Defense. This judgment has been stated many times during the BRAC deliberative process and most recently was reiterated in a July 26, 2005 letter from the Navy, which I ask be included in the record.

The Department of Defense rejected the closure of Brunswick Naval Air Station because of the base's clear military value, specifically, its strategic location, surge capability and capacity to handle all DOD aircraft.

In its July 26th letter, the Navy puts forth a compelling case for the retention of Brunswick. While this letter does reiterate the department's support for realignment, its assertions actually make a strong case against both realignment and closure.

Let me read the Navy's own words from this letter, quote "Commander, Fleet Forces Command, supports retention of Brunswick because it will support future requirements for homeland defense and surge capability.

The specific maritime homeland defense requirement is stated in terms of response time to any maritime threat against the Northeast Coast of the United States. The loss of NAS Brunswick will increase P-3 response time to any maritime threat against the Northeast Coast of the United States. Because this area is not a standard operating area for U.S. Naval vessels, and because of the proximity of NAS Brunswick to the great circle navigation routes from Europe, P-3s operating out of NAS Brunswick currently provide the maritime homeland defense initial response coverage. United States Northern Command, working in cooperating with the military departments and the Coast Guard, is developing an air-to-surface concept of operations that will address this responsiveness concern with other assets or force packages, that will be combined with the current P-3 mission capabilities to facilitate maximum response flexibility."

Here's the key part of this letter.

"Numerous sites in the Northeast have been considered as potentially feasible locations to conduct P-3 detachment operations, and NAS Brunswick continues to be viewed by the Navy as the optimal site in New England."

The letter goes on.

"In addition to its location in the Northeast, NAS Brunswick is an ideal location because it has a fully functional weapons facility that can support all weapons available for deployment onboard the P-3, and because its geographic location permits armed aircraft to depart on maritime missions without flying over inhabited areas."

The letter continues.

"NAS Brunswick also has enormous strategic value as the last remaining active DOD airfield in the Northeast. NAS Brunswick supports several large NATO joint training exercise opportunities.

"In addition, NAS Brunswick is critical -- is a critical logistics and refueling hub for DOD aircraft flowing in and out of U.S. Central Command and U.S. European Command theater of operation.

"Brunswick will also continue to function as an important location for aviation training because it can and will remain capable of logistically supporting all of the aircraft currently in DOD inventory.

"Its utility is not limited to DOD aircraft but includes the aircraft of the Air National Guard and other federal agencies," end quote.

I would say parenthetically I'm confused why DOD doesn't consider the Air National Guard to be part of DOD aircraft, but that is what the letter says.

Commissioners, these are not my words. They are the Navy's. This is the Navy's analysis. Closing Brunswick would leave the Northeast more vulnerable to threats and would create an intolerable risk for the department and the nation, particularly the Northeast.

Moreover, the DOD recommendation to realign Brunswick ignores what the department itself describes as the base's enormous strategic value -- that's their words, not mine.

Although Ms. Davis' response in this letter is focused on using Brunswick for detachment operations, it clearly states that this naval air station is vital to the maritime homeland defense of this nation.

The closure or realignment of Brunswick and the subsequent removal of the base's aircraft would significantly and dangerously degrade operational readiness, and increase response time. The proposed realignment would not meet the needs of Northern Command's homeland defense mission, and would result in diminished effectiveness and lower efficiency with numerous hidden costs associated with detachments as Mr. Dean, Captain Dean, has pointed out.

Commissioners, closure or realignment would violate the BRAC criteria. The Navy, the Department of Defense,

said national security are clearly best served by a fully operational base at Brunswick, Maine.

Thank you so much for your attention to our presentations.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, Senator Collins. And thank you all for your testimony this morning. It's very, very helpful.

Let me begin with a comment and a question. I tend to agree with comments that seem to indicate that the current recommendation doesn't make a whole lot of sense. It doesn't buy you very much in enhancing the strategic value or the strategic asset of this naval air station.

You don't seem to save all that much money by keeping it in this warm status whereby you move all the aircraft and all the dedicated personnel and equipment, and you move the aviation intermediate maintenance depot to Jacksonville.

And it seems to me, it puts this community in the worst of all possible worlds other than keeping it open. To keep a naval air station or a naval airfield facility with no people and no equipment and no potential for redevelopment, I just don't -- I don't -- I know you want to keep it open, but does it make sense to keep it in this warm status?

I mean, is that the community -- the community feels that the potential for future missions is worth keeping it in this realignment status?

And again, not precluding the option of keeping it open. That's a decision -- fully operational -- that's a decision that the commission must make.

It concerns me that this current option doesn't seem to serve the military very well, and it seems to me, doesn't serve the community very well.

Maybe you can comment on the economic impact of realignment as opposed to closure. You've pointed a very drastic picture of a 10 percent I think it was -- 14 percent, excuse me, 14 percent impact.

What does realignment do when all the people are gone?

GOV. BALDACCI: Mr. Chairman, if I can, let me just say, first of all, the community support that is here stands united -- as a matter of fact there is also a county commissioner, Al Austin (ph), who's also here. Proclamations have been signed.

I don't think you can have economic development or redevelopment if you're not protected with national security. I mean I was here in Washington during 9/11, all of that experience. It doesn't matter how much money

in the world you have, if you don't have your freedoms and liberty, you really have very little.

And I think to leave our Northeast and New England unprotected is just unacceptable. And that's the thing I think we go with first, its national security, its military and strategic value, which is the top criteria for the BRAC review.

And I think you hear that from the Department of Defense, and even lately from the Department of Navy, in terms of its strategic value.

So the point is, it really does need to be fully operational. That really is what I consider to be the only choice, and I think that is where we all stand. We want to be protected. We want to have all the country protected.

MR. PRINCIPI: I understand that, and I fully appreciate your position. And again, that is an issue that this commission has to grapple with, is find a substantial deviation and choosing to keep it fully operational.

I was just concerned about this concept of keeping it warm and how that -- to me it just seems to me it really adversely impacts the community by just having an empty military base. Maybe -- I don't know, and I just wanted your thoughts on redevelopment.

I mean in some communities there is life after BRAC. Other communities, there isn't life after BRAC. It has a dramatic economic impact, as you indicated, for 10, 20 years. And I was just trying to look at some of these different options here, and trying to understand where -- where you feel and what you feel?

SEN. SNOWE: Mr. Chairman, I think that the indication of the community as represented here today by the town manager and other local officials, I think it's an indication of the broad support for the Naval Air Station Brunswick as it has for generations.

The community is prepared, you know, to accept what's in the best interests of our national security. Frankly, I think it's indisputable about the value of Brunswick in this new threat environment.

I am deeply concerned about where we stand today in a post-9/11 environment in being able to have the flexibility and the strategic value of facilities like Brunswick to respond to any you know events of the future.

And I look back, and I think I gave you a chart, and I think it's important to this point. Because we have to have that crystal ball to look down the road, and to have the vision to anticipate. That's why it doesn't think

realignment -- you know, simply doesn't -- you know, make sense.

But I think the fact is that when you look in the past in the previous base-closing rounds, and I reviewed the military threat assessments that were required to be associated with each of those rounds, if the Department of Defense is not able to anticipate terrorists or homeland security threats even four years out, or 19 days after 9/11 they weren't able to mention al Qaeda.

We went back with even all of the other events. I think the point is here, Brunswick is well positioned strategically and militarily to provide a synergy for responses for maritime and land surveillance.

And I think that's what the Department of Defense is saying here. They don't want to lose this facility to prepare for the future, because of the strategic location's value in responding to any of those events in the future.

We're having now to forecast 20 years down the road. Previous base-closing rounds required a six-year window. I don't expect that they can anticipate. And that's what I think reinforces and buttresses the need to keep it fully operational.

And I think the community are prepared to support the judgment of this commission with respect, what is in

the best interests of our national security as it has for generations.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you.

Mr. Hansen.

MR. HANSEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You know as we've gone around America and talked to different people, there seems to be an overriding thread that comes through every discussion. And that is that there's a certain comfort level by having a base open somewhere.

In the Northeast you had eight C-1s -- excuse me, Northwest, C-130s that everyone had a real comfort level having them there. And it was interesting, after that one hearing we had, a past flag officer that I knew from my days in Congress came up to me and he said, what could those C-130s do that would help anything?

And I said, I'm asking you. You tell me your answer. He couldn't do that.

Now you folks I think have a real comfort level by having Brunswick open. You may ask yourself a question, maybe it's not fair I don't know, but let's say in Augusta that you had a similar situation to what they had in England. Somebody in your public transportation system was able to bomb it someway.

What would New Brunswick do to help you on that?
You military folks, what would New Brunswick do to help you on that?

CAPT. DEAN: I can speak to what Brunswick brings to the threat -- brings in terms of meeting the threat. There are 8,000 different merchant vessels that visit -- make port calls in the United States every year, and over 100,000 port calls by those 8,000 vessels.

I think it's hard to know at any given time how much queuing or how much lead time we'll have in regard to response to the threats that the national maritime strategy posited could be on board those vessels themselves.

The comparison or parallel I like to use is, we don't surge or reposition combat air patrol assets to the northeastern United States when they're needed. They are permanently stationed there.

And I think the maritime counterparts should be as well. They should be where they're needed, when they're needed. So the queuing is going to be uncertain for the indefinite future. And that's the parallel I use.

I'd like to go back a little bit, and this answers I think both your question and Chairman Principi's concern. I've been working on the task force for two years now, and people in that little community know me and they

recognize me and they come up to me and they ask questions.

And the question I'm asked most often isn't, what's going to happen to the mid-coast if the base closes? It's, are they going to leave us undefended?

And these are people that don't know a P-3 from a P-38, some of them. But they recognize that that base brings value; it brings value to the region. And I think those people are right.

MR. HANSEN: They may be. You've made a very compelling on the economy of it, no question about it.

But that part always bothers me, every place I've been.

Representative Allen.

REP. ALLEN: Yes, if I could, Commissioner Hansen, just respond to your question a little further.

I can't speak for him, but I know what Secretary McHale would say in answer to that question if he were here. Because what he said to us up in Brunswick, when he visited Brunswick, was that homeland defense is not just about prevention. It's also what you do after an attack occurs. And this would apply to New York City as well as it would apply to Augusta or Portland, Maine.

He says, we are going to need, if another attack occurs, we are going to need immediate real-time data,

photographs, from some sort of aircraft, and that the P-3 is ideally suited to that immediate after-the-fact ability to take photographs and have them sent directly to the secretary of Defense or whomever in real time.

That was his homeland defense answer or his concern when he was up there. And I take the point that Captain Dean and others have made about prevention and oversight. But here is a homeland defense mission that I don't think has been brought out today.

MR. HANSEN: Good point.

Admiral Rich, did you want to comment on that?

ADM. RICH: Yes, sir.

MR. HANSEN: Better grab your mike if you would, please.

ADM. RICH: There has been funded a reserve armed forces center at NAS Brunswick, and there will be members of the National Guard be training there and Marines. And these forces are security items. And they will be readily available to support any incident in Augusta, national security forces, defense security.

And with those forces there the P-3s won't be involved. This is an internal, this is a domestic inside-the-fence kind of thing. And it will facilitate greatly -- they're closing all these National Guard armories, and consolidating all these NAS Brunswick 28

miles from Augusta, your scenario that you posited would be handled mostly by those people.

GOV. BALDACCI: Jim, if I can, also as part of the last tour with Secretary Skinner and General Turner, we also had a regional commander for the submarine fleet. And they were explaining the importance of the P-3 in its communication abilities in being able to communicate with those submarines, and how it's integrated into the military component in the Northeast.

And actually there's a very strong advocate for those, for those services to be used, so that's another asset that I think is there.

I think the point is that we want to focus on what is most important, which is the highest criteria under the BRAC process, which is military and strategic value. And those cases have been made by the Department of Defense, and now of late, by the Department of Navy.

And that really is your issue, and the issue which we have to wrestle with. And we think that this is of strategic importance to the country.

MR. HANSEN: Well, thank you.

I think you've all given us excellent testimony.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PRINCIPI: Yes, Mr. Bilbray.

MR. BILBRAY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, when we added Brunswick to a possible closure, we wanted to give ourselves three options, because we felt -- at least I did, and I'm sure the committee did -- the worst of all worlds would be a warm base, where you can't take it back over, you can't redevelop it, you can't do anything with it, but you don't get much assets at all from nobody being out there.

So that's why we threw it in. So I'm going to ask you, if you had to make the vote of this commission, and it was not to leave it like it is, because I don't know how that vote is going to come down. It may well come down that we deny realignment. We may allow it.

But if it was between closure of the base and being -- with no personnel hardly there at all, what would you prefer?

GOV. BALDACCI: Well, let me just say that what would bother me the most is that you're leaving New England and the Northeast virtually unprotected with an active duty airbase, when both the Department of Defense and the Department of Navy think it has high strategic value. That I would be most concerned about.

And if you don't have your national security, I submit that economic security won't exist. If you're not protected.

MR. BILBRAY: Governor, was that a yes or no? If we came down to a single vote.

GOV. BALDACCI: Yes, but Jim -- I mean Maine has redeveloped. We've had base closures. When you look at the map on your visits, and you saw all the bases before and all the bases after -- Bangor, Dow Air Force Base, Loring Air Force Base -- we've been able to redevelop and to be able to move forward and be stronger for those experiences.

What really bothers me and a lot of people is the fact that the Northeast is like unprotected. There is no sense of security. You heard Captain Dean talk about what the perception is among people, let alone what that does to recruitment and retention in the Northeast.

I think those are bigger issues that the country needs to wrestle with. The State of Maine is pretty strong, and pretty independent. And you've interacted with Mainers, and Mainers are going to deal with these issues. And however it turns out we're going to be stronger for that experience.

MR. BILBRAY: I understand that. But Governor, what I'm saying is, I don't know how the committee votes, but if the committee votes, say we don't want to not realign. We want to go ahead and send the planes our, personnel. And then it comes up to a second vote, now do we close it

or leave it open? I presume you'd prefer we leave it open for future missions if that's the case?

Because I don't know what the economic development value is. I mean it was Nellis Air Force Base in Las Vegas, I could think of a million things. Big casino right there, can you imagine. But I could see a lot of things happening at Nellis.

But the fact is, I don't know the Brunswick economic area. In other words, would companies be willing to come in and take over facilities, make it the regional airport, things like that.

So I mean I don't know how the rest of my commissioners are going to vote. I'm not even sure I know how I'm going to vote. But the fact is if it comes down to that, I want to do what's best for the people of the area. Would they rather keep it open as a warm base rather than close it where they can take control of it and develop it.

GOV. BALDACCI: The best option and the only option in my mind is that it be fully operational in protecting New England and the Northeast is the right answer for the country. It's the right answer for the state.

And I think we as a delegation, and the citizens of the state, stand united behind that effort.

MR. BILBRAY: I understand. Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: Commissioner Coyle.

MR. COYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all for your testimony.

Captain Dean, in recent months the Department of Defense has been calling attention to a specific new threat, namely cruise missile enemy, cruise missile launched from a ship, launched at the United States from a ship off our shore.

And the concern is that such a threat ship would use the regular shipping lanes such as you showed in order not to call attention to themselves for as long as possible until they got quite close; and that early response times would be very important in the case of a threat like that.

Could you explain why the location of NAS Brunswick is important to dealing with this potential threat?

MR. DEAN: That's a valid concern. When I was flying in the 1980s, we would train against a threat that we at the time slightly dismissively referred to as the Scud missile carrying merchant ship from Hell.

That threat is real now, more real than it's ever been. The cruise missile inventory, potential cruise missile inventory, includes about 7,000 silkworm missiles alone, all launchable from a ship.

Authorities far more knowledgeable than I, including Jane's Defense and others, observed that the threat from a cruise missile against the homeland of the United States is more substantial than a ballistic missile attack.

The country spends \$7 billion a year on ballistic missile defense and research. The threat from a cruise missile is real.

Maritime patrol is key to interdicting that threat. Chief of Naval Operations in its 2005 guidance made maritime interdiction, directed the Navy to make it a core capability.

The P-3 in every maritime interdiction operation is the lynchpin. Every exercise, every time it's been done for real. Only the P-3 can get out on station, provide the real-time intelligence using long-range electro-optical imaging radar sensors. As Congressman Allen said get that information real-time back to the national command authority.

It can use the same communication suite, and does, to control the other units in the intercept in that maritime interdiction -- surface vessels, helicopters, special forces units -- and brings them all together. It's a unique capability.

The other thing it can do at the end of the day if necessary is put a weapon on a target -- a highly discriminating precision man-in-the-loop weapon special built for the purpose.

The P-3 can do one other thing, okay. And I performed a little bit of this mission when we were doing Vigilant Shield after 2001. Merchant ships around the world can't see the satellite. They don't know they're being watched. They can't see it, they don't realize it.

But when that P-3 flies over at 200 or 300 feet, they know they're being watched by one of the most sophisticated systems in the world. That's a deterrent. That's a deterrent for the people on that ship, and for the people that they work with or talk to. And it's something that shouldn't be forgotten.

Maritime patrol brings all of that to the table. But as I said in my presentation, it's only as good as the basing. The Navy isn't just in the business anymore in CONUS of preparing forces to be projected overseas. Okay? The front lines, as the admiral said, are right here at our shoreline.

And when that is the case basing really matters. When that base is needed, where it is needed, it becomes invaluable at that point in time, and the business case goes out the window.

I hope I answered your question.

MR. COYLE: Thank you.

ADM. RICH: May I add something, Mr. Chairman?

MR. PRINCIPI: Please.

ADM. RICH: That P-3 can reach those shipping lanes in 30 minutes from Brunswick, the closest point. It's three hours from Jacksonville. The idea is to interdict those systems as far out as possible, 1,000 miles, 900 miles, but as far from our shoreline as possible before they reach their launching range from our coastline.

Thirty minutes from Brunswick; over three hours from Jacksonville.

MR. COYLE: Thank you.

SEN. SNOWE: Mr. Chairman?

MR. PRINCIPI: I'm sorry, Senator?

SEN. SNOWE: I just want to follow up on that point, because I think it is critical. In the conversations that I've had with defense officials on this point. It's the issue of rapid deployment and a quick response that Brunswick provides to any anticipated threat, and not necessarily one that is defined at the moment, but one they could anticipate in the future, not for a current defined event, but something anticipated in the future.

But in my discussions they have emphasized absolutely that we need to have a response in a rapid

deployment for that response, and that's why they want Brunswick, because it is so well positioned in order to provide that critical response.

MR. PRINCIPI: Secretary Skinner.

MR. SKINNER: It's my understanding that the recommendation includes a position by the Navy that they would detach and position P-3s at Brunswick out of the Jacksonville Naval Air Station. So the option that's on the table is, number one, closure; number two, Brunswick open doing other things that they're already doing, plus having a detached flight of five aircraft, which is not absolute -- it's not the best, but it's not the worst. And that it would be all staffed out of Naval Air Station Jacksonville.

And the third option is to keep two bases on each coast.

With that in mind, because Congressman Bilbray asked a question that I asked when I visited, and I thought I heard, although I understand from an advocate's position one never wants to compromise the absolute position, we clearly understand the absolute position of the delegation to keep it open and keep it as is, that rather than closing it -- if I listen to your arguments, Governor, about the necessity for protection -- a realignment with an understanding there would be detached

P-3s on base on a full-time basis -- obviously different aircraft and different crews -- would be a better alternative than a complete closure.

Now that was the impression that was left I think when we asked that question when we visited Brunswick. Is that -- I understand, we really need to understand that. Because what we started this process was, there was some -- as Congressman Bilbray points out -- there was some concern that the realignment was the worst of all worlds.

If we voted for realignment, you didn't get to develop it, and you didn't get the full base, and that it would be better off -- and in some cases that's clearly the case -- realignment is the worst option, and closure. If you're not going to give it the full protection, then closure.

GOV. BALDACCI: I think, if I can, Mr. Secretary.

MR. SKINNER: You and I were the ones that had the discussion, so I don't want to misinterpret your --

GOV. BALDACCI: No, but I think the fact is that the state of Maine, as I pointed out, cannot absorb the job losses. There is just no way. The huge magnitude of job losses with closure would be devastating as I pointed out, a federally-induced economic recession in the

region, just couldn't absorb it, when you're talking about redevelopment.

MR. SKINNER: Is that a reluctant yes, or is that a reluctant no? A very reluctant yes?

(Laughter.)

SEN. COLLINS: Commissioner, I think that what you have said just underscores the point that we've been making that realignment does not make sense because you are going to have to have these detachments come; because the strategic value of the location in Brunswick is essential for maritime patrol of the North Atlantic shipping lanes, and the Northeast. It's why realignment has always been such a puzzling recommendation.

It doesn't make sense, and it really doesn't save money. If you're going to have to --

MR. SKINNER: Senator Collins, I agree. So therefore the analysis, if we're going to have realignment, we need to make -- compare realignment versus full, is what is the cost and savings of a realignment versus the cost and savings of a full declination of the recommendation.

SEN. COLLINS: Just to complete my thought very quickly if I could, so what I would think would happen if this base is realigned as the department recommends, is ultimately it's going to once again become a fully

operational base because it's going to be too inefficient, too slow, and too expensive to keep having these detachments come from Jacksonville.

MR. SKINNER: And that's the analysis we'll have to make.

I have one question that maybe Admiral Rich you can answer this. What is the number of missions today out of Jacksonville? There's the total -- if you take the P-3 missions on the East Coast, what percentage come out of Jacksonville and what percentage come out of Brunswick today? I'm kind of curious as to, if we're going to detach and have a centralization, I wonder if they ever considered putting everything in Brunswick and detaching to Jacksonville, and why the logic was one versus the other. And maybe you can help me there. Other than following the flag; I understand following the flag. I've learned that over the years.

ADM. RICH: Detachment is probably a misnomer. What would happen is that Brunswick would become a full deployment site. If you moved the squadrons to Jacksonville, the only way you can cover the response time gap is to have a full time deployment site at Brunswick, six planes, nine planes, whatever.

And you've moved all the families to Florida, and now you've moved the crews back to the deployment site

four months, six months at a time. But you've got to have full-time coverage in Brunswick to have a response time when you need it.

Now over the years, historically, family separation has been one of the most important -- most single cited -- most important frequently cited reasons for people getting out of the Navy. And you're exacerbating that problem. It affects retention.

And so if you move the squadrons to Jacksonville, and the dependents down there, and then you bring the planes back to Brunswick, you've created another deployment site, six more months departure, away from families, it just doesn't make any sense.

MR. SKINNER: I heard Admiral Clark, before you leave, talk about probably one of the most innovative things that's going on in the Navy today is the fact that we don't deploy -- we're rethinking the way we deploy people with ships and aircraft, and there's always been the theory that we move the ships, then move the aircraft.

In many places, as you know, we keep the aircraft on-site subject to maintenance requirements, and move the people back and forth, and maybe cutting back the deployment and length of deployment might make some sense.

There's all kinds of creative things we could do. We've got to analyze all that. But I was really going to -- I've taken much too much time, and I apologize, but Governor and Senators and Congressmen and all of you, as I understand it, because this is an important distinction -- we have to make the analysis of whether realignment versus a full facility makes sense economically and military-value-wise, taking into consideration the impact on the community, and we make that.

Let's assume hypothetically that we disagree with your analysis -- it's all hypothetical here and not been done by this commission, I'm sure, yet -- and we make the determination that a deployment does make sense economically, although you would agree with us to the dying breath, but we make that decision. And then we come up with, is that in the best interest of the community versus closing the base. And it's my understanding that you don't think it will work; you don't think it makes economic sense, and in the long run you'll have a full complement there anyway. If we come to a difference of agreement and adopt the Navy's recommendation, then I assume you would accept that versus the other thing, as well as just close it, and move it -- say, move the mission to Otis, for instance?

GOV. BALDACCI: Let me just be very clear about this, I think when Secretary Skinner, when General Newton was there with Chairman Principi in his experiences in the Air Force, he said to people there, if it's of strategic value the assets will end up there. And they've made the decision that the strategic importance of the facility is there, and they went through a process of explaining how moving the maintenance with these P3s up there was very costly, added about \$50,000 per flight. Didn't make any sense, and if it was strategic the assets would be there. And I guess it wasn't really -- you know, it's got us all scratching our heads about realignment, because it didn't make any sense. So the point is, the Department of Defense and the secretary said it's of strategic importance. The assets need to be there. That's the issue.

GEN. NEWTON: All right. I'm going to end it, but let me offer a thought here. And it's been interesting listening. And I want us to be very careful how we reach out and take very quick operational snapshots like the cruise missile event. Clearly, if you have P3s in Maine it's a lot better than having P3s in Jacksonville if you have a cruise missile headed your way. Clearly, if you start deploying airframe assets you're going to need a lot of support to go with that. There's no disagreement

about that at all. So I'm not going to ask which you personally think is better, whether that's realignment, or whether that's closure or whether that's -- that's a debate that we'll have and one that I'm sure we'll come to a decision on. I really have appreciated the response that you gave and your testimony that you gave. It certainly is informative, particularly for me, and I think for the rest of the commissioners, as well.

I just want to caution us again, you have to be careful when you reach out and take one sound bite of an operational concept of an attack, even the attack of some place in your transportation system, what can the P3s do. My question would be, what would a squadron of F-16s do at that moment? The answer is absolutely nothing. But you do have a deterrent value there, and you do have the capability for an -- (inaudible) -- response afterwards, because we had a lot of airplanes sitting on alert during 9/11. It was a deterrent value before then, and the capability after that that really paid off, with reference to national security, not the particular event that goes on right at that moment.

I clearly agree with the captain. We do a lot of surveillance out there, and that's critical to getting us to the end game. The question is, how do we do that in the future?

MR. SKINNER: I'm going to just say, before I finish with my comments, I'm going to give you all three stars for persistence. The reputation of Maine has not been diminished by your performance here today on persistency, and I admire that. Thank you.

RADM. RICH: One of my greatest concerns is that if that base is closed, and it's redeveloped, we've lost it forever. We'll never get it back, and that is of great concern to me.

MR. SKINNER: I think that's the one we all look at on all these bases. We've invested millions and millions of dollars, and they've had strategic value for a long time. We've got to make sure we don't take away that strategic value at a critical time.

REP. ALLEN: I would like the opportunity just to make one point, and it's a point about uncertainty, and it goes back to Commissioner Bilbray's question, which you have followed up, Commissioner Skinner. We believe the base should stay open; the communities believe the base should stay open; there's a commitment to National Security. You've heard all that. We also know a little bit about the consequences of closure. We know it would be devastating, but the question is how much help would we get, and there's a whole issue there.

It's realignment that is so puzzling, because what happens? Maybe, maybe, in fact, the planes come back, and the economic damage is not as great as we might fear, but maybe they don't. I mean, I think it is very hard for us, or, frankly, for the commissioners, as well, to figure out how planes are going to be positioned over the next 10 or 20 years and to go from that decision to what the economic consequences may be.

That's why when Commissioner Bilbray asked this question I think a lot of us said, tell us more about realignment. What does it mean? We come back to our basic point, because that's the one we understand today. That's the one where there is more certainty.

SEN. SNOWE: Mr. Chairman, just one follow-up point, and again, in one of my conversations last week with a defense official, we're going by what they're telling us. And I think that's the issue here. Realignment doesn't make sense based on what they intend to do with this facility, which is to have continuing deployments and detachments in rapid response, and to assure a quick response and to have a presence. And they're already using these P3s to the maximum, the few that we have they're using to the maximum. So that is the issue here. That's why realignment doesn't make sense, because what they're saying they're going to do, and how they're going

to use it, and what it means, it's a fully operational facility. They will not be limited detachments. It will be fully operational, based on what they told me, and I have my notes here, they will be routinely flying out of Brunswick, and they will be continuing the P3 deployments. So I expect we'll be where we are. That's why, in focusing on realignment, it's very difficult, because it doesn't make sense, based on what they're telling us and how they intend to use this base for future events.

MR. PRINCIPI: I appreciate your concerns. I think we all share -- as you indicated, captain, we're scratching our heads at times, as well.

This meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much.

SEN. SNOWE: Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: We'll reconvene at 1:15 for the North Carolina delegation.

(Recess.)

MR. PRINCIPI: (Sounds gavel.) Good afternoon. The regional hearing of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission is reconvened.

And this afternoon we will hear testimony from the states of North Carolina, Virginia and the District of Columbia. Each state and the District's elected delegation has been allotted a time, a block of term

determined by the overall impact of the proposed recommendation added by the commission. I'm certain that your testimony will provide information and insight that will make up a valuable part of our review. We would greatly appreciate if you adhere to your time limits, as every voice today is important.

I certainly want to welcome Congressman McIntyre and Congressman Etheridge and gentlemen to the hearing regarding Pope Air Force Base.

I now request our witnesses to stand for the administration of the oath required by the Base Closure and Realignment Statute. The oath will be administered by the commission's designated federal officer.

MS. SARKAR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Congressmen, distinguished members of the panel. Please raise your right hand for me.

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give and any evidence you may provide are complete and accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief, so help you God?

WITNESSES: (In unison.) I do.

MR. PRINCIPI: Mr. McIntyre, I believe you're going to begin?

(Aside.) Thank you.

REP. MIKE MCINTYRE (D-NC): Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of this distinguished commission for all the work that you're doing and for your diligence in visiting and reviewing the bases from all over the country in such a short period of time.

I'm Mike McIntyre, representing the 7th Congressional District of North Carolina.

Those of us from southeastern North Carolina are pleased with the Department of Defense's recommendations to move Army's Forces Command and the U.S. Army Reserve Command to Fort Bragg. We know Fort Bragg is equipped to take on these two new commands and that this will create an even stronger joint environment with the operations command headquarters already in place.

However, the proposal to move the 43rd Airlift Wing from Pope raises serious concern. Maintaining the airlift wing at Pope as well as adding FORSCOM and U.S. Army Reserve Command to Fort Bragg are critical components of a unified structure that is vital to our national security.

For the last 87 years, Pope has been an integral component of Fort Bragg's mission. The two bases have continued to work together as first responders for every contingency operation in the last quarter of a century.

Indeed, Pope puts the air in airborne. They are truly America's 9/11 force, and are considered to be the premier power projection team, Pope and Bragg, in the country.

Therefore, it is vital that Pope and Fort Bragg continue to support each other jointly to have as strong as possible synergy in their relationship to continue to increase their military value and help support future deployments. Now, what I simply want to share with you is what I will call the three Rs of Pope's and Bragg's joint mission: response, readiness, and reality.

First, Pope is a strategic base. For years it's been essential in deploying our military's response to conflicts all over the globe. We know these contingencies not only are continuing, but are very likely to increase, and it will be critical to utilize Pope for the most rapid response and power projection during present and potential wartime conflicts.

If the airlift wing does not remain at Pope, mission support for the crisis reaction team at Fort Bragg will undoubtedly be degraded. For example, a brigade from the 82nd Airborne, designated the division-ready brigade, is required to be staged for deployment in 18 hours and airborne within 24 hours of notification by the

president. Deploying the entire brigade requires approximately 76 C-130s or 20 C-17s.

If an airlift control element or team had to deploy to Fort Bragg to plan, coordinate and control airborne operations, they would not meet the required timelines. In addition, an associate Reserve component squadron would not have the planning section or trained personnel to plan combat operations similar to past operations in Grenada, Haiti or Panama. This is a degradation that our crisis reaction forces cannot afford.

Now the military justification for closing the wing and consolidating an aging aircraft fleet is far outweighed by the responsibility we have to our national security. And I can tell you, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, it's one that I take indeed very seriously. We want to make sure we're developing an increased crisis response capability at a newly designated joint base of Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base working together.

DOD's recommendation to add a brigade combat team to Fort Bragg demonstrates that contingency and surge requirements will likely increase at Fort Bragg, and there will be considerable need for increased coordination, more airplanes for future deployments and surges.

Therefore, you have to have the strongest possible airlift capabilities that are dependable, readily accessible at Pope, folks that are already trained, that know how to do it, when to do it, why to do it and are ready to go, or otherwise we could have serious implications for national security.

Indeed, there would be no room for error or uncertainty. As know, in times of war, Pope has proven already through its great and rich history that it is exactly the right fit for the dynamic military synergy that is needed. Therefore, establishing a joint base, Pope and Bragg working together, Army and Air Force, in maintaining the airlift wing is a tremendous opportunity to increase our power projection capability and adhere to the BRAC guidance to achieve the effectiveness with joint basing opportunities.

Now, in addition to response, it's also about readiness. When that emergency call comes, the 9-1-1 call, we know that the Army does not currently operate airfields at the level of support required for the number of fixed-wing airlift sorties that are flown already on a daily basis at Pope. It is also an entirely different situation, as you well know, than operating helicopters, for instance, from an Army airfield. The Army does not routinely have the type of efficiencies or specialized

equipment to operate a major airfield such as Pope for the purpose for which Pope was intended.

Now, obviously, this can be done, but it would take an additional great amount of time and expense for the Army to maintain and operate Pope to the same levels of standards and readiness that currently exist than it would be for the Air Force to maintain, continue and continue to improve these operations.

DOD should not duplicate roles and missions by turning an Air Force base into an Army airfield that would be capable of supporting airlift operations, thus actually costing as much or more to make this switch that is supposed to be about cost savings. But rather than saving taxpayer money, you'd be spending the same amount or potentially even more to have to go and train the Army in how to do what Pope already does and obviously does exceptionally well. Readiness should not be risked by the unknown or by the unnecessary.

And in third, in addition to response and readiness, the other R that I think is important to remember here is the reality. The reality that the projected cost savings of closing Pope are highly inaccurate. If Pope is closed, the actual savings of closing the base will be realized by the Air Force, but the actual cost will just

be transferred to the Army, a classic example of robbing Peter to pay Paul.

In addition, the proposed realignment will cost DOD additional funds that will not pay back the initial cost, which we know is part of the purpose of the BRAC idea in the first place.

The projected payback the DOD proposal to realign Pope is defined as immediate, and the 20-year net present value savings is projected as \$2.5 billion. But these figures do not reflect the real cost of continuing to operate the installation, which would still have to be operated if we're still going to have the air and airborne, if we're still going to get those troops where they need to be in time of crisis to meet the required 18-hour and 24-hour deadlines that I spoke of earlier

What will happen is these costs will just transferred to the Army, because they're going to have to do it. So there's no real cost savings here, and you're having to train folks in the Army to do the job that the Air Force already does so well in cooperation with the Army.

We know, too, that the BRAC statute requires that BRAC cost assessments reflect any costs that will be transferred to a DOD or non-DOD entity to be reflected in the cost analysis. GAO identified that almost half of

the projected savings in this situation are due to military manpower reductions, but that is actually nonexistent in this situation.

They also identified a large differential between Army cost projections and Air Force savings, but in reality the cost of operating the airfield will increase in this situation, under this proposal, and the initial cost for implementing this proposal will never be paid back, because the costs have got to continue -- you've still got to have the people doing this job that the Air Force is already trained to do, and already does so well, in that synergetic relationship with the Army.

This, of course, will be explained in more detail by the presenters that will follow. General Dordal, especially, will highlight this.

In closing, I would like to reiterate just how critical it is that the 43rd Airlift Wing be maintained at Pope, especially with the addition of ForceCom and the U.S. Army Reserve Command at Fort Bragg. Together, these components make an even stronger synergy. Together, our country will be an even stronger position to be protected during times of war and to be prepared in times of peace.

These three Rs, my friends -- response, readiness and reality -- of this unique, positive, powerful, purpose and position that Pope and Bragg share, is one

that we should not allow to be denigrated or degraded in any way. Pope and Bragg have always demonstrated how effective they are; they are the nation's premier power projection team, with the Army and Air Force working together.

I thank you again for your commitment to our country and your service. We know the addition of FORSCOM and the Army Reserve Command will undoubtedly add to the Army's mission at Fort Bragg, and maintaining the 43rd Airlift Wing will enable the 82nd Airborne to continue to execute its missions with the reliability and the precision that have long been the hallmarks of unparalleled capability and projection power of the Bragg-Pope relationship. Response, readiness and reality require it.

I thank you for your attentiveness. May God bless each of you for your service and your commitment.

MR. PRINCIPI: And thank you very much, Congressman McIntyre.

REP. MCINTYRE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PRINCIPI: Congressman Etheridge.

REP. BOB ETHERIDGE (D-NC): Good afternoon. I'm Bob Etheridge, 2nd District in North Carolina. I thank you, Chairman Principi, and to you fellow commissioners, let me thank you for the opportunity to testify in this

important hearing on behalf of the men and women at Fort Bragg and Pope and for the people of America for the job that you're doing.

I'm going to begin, though, if you will allow me, with submitting this hearing to the record a statement by our governor, Mike Easley. He would have been here today, and our lieutenant governor, except for the fact they're tied up in trying to get a budget through the joint assembly. I also have a statement for the record from U.S. Senator Richard Burr in support of our state's military assets.

MR. PRINCIPI: Without objection.

REP. ETHERIDGE: I am pleased with our state's leadership, of our state delegation that's working together in close partnership through this process. I think it demonstrates to the commission that our military community is far more important than partisan politics. And I think you've heard that already.

I'd like to begin my testimony with a quote. "The military capability represented at Fort Bragg and Pope is a unique and exquisite military capability; unique in the world." Those are not my words. Rather, they are the judgment of Admiral Harold Gehman, a distinguished member of the BRAC commission who paid a second visit to that base just last week.

Your own James Hill, another commissioner, said at the same visit, "We want to make sure that nothing we do in any way, shape or form deters from the mission." I could not agree more, and I trust you agree with them also. The work of this commission is to strive to strengthen and enhance this unique asset. We should endeavor to build on the outstanding success of this power projection platform.

The first step toward the goal should be to approve the Army's recommendation to move the U.S. Armed Forces Command headquarters and the U.S. Reserve -- Army Reserve Command headquarters to Fort Bragg. This action will achieve the goal of optimizing the efficiency and war-fighting capability and meet all the BRAC selection criteria.

Moving FORSCOM and the Reserve component do not require significant downgrading of the Air Force presence at Pope. In fact, the Army recommendation should be approved even as this commission closely scrutinizes the Air Force's procedures and recommendations for Pope. Specifically, the Air Force proposal to realign Pope would violate BRAC guidance and principles, and I urge this commission to reject it outright.

DOD BRAC principles for deployment and employment states plainly, "The department needs secure

installations that are optimally located for mission accomplishments, including homeland security, that support power projection, rapid deployment, and exploratory force requirements that sustained the capability to mobilize end surge and that ensures strategic redundancy." The Air Force proposal clearly violates that principle that must guide the BRAC process.

The 18th Airborne Corps Is the nation's premier power projection force, and it depends on its key relationship with Pope Air Force Base for its training, deployment and support requirements. Approval of the Air Force recommendation would force the Army to replicate a capability it does not possess, cannot afford and already currently exists at Pope.

We must not attempt to fix what is not broken, and the unique and exquisite military capability of the Bragg-Pope team is most assuredly not broken.

Specifically, the Air Force recommendations to stand down the 43rd Airlift Wing from Pope would seriously degrade mission support for the crisis reaction forces at Fort Bragg. As I am sure you know, the division ready brigade is required to be staged for deployment in 18 hours and airborne within 24 (hours) of notification from the president of the United States. There is simply no

way these strategic airlift requirements can be made with the proposed elimination of the 43rd wing.

The Bragg-Pope team is not like any other airfield - - Army airfield. And the cost in terms of money and manpower to replicate this capability are well beyond the Army's assets that are already stretched thin, as you know.

The proposal for reserve associate squadron to assume these duties will be a poor substitute for the 43rd Airlift Wing in terms of operational planning and execution of training, exercises and combat. I am confident that after a thorough review by the BRAC commission, you will agree that our nation must maintain the combat capabilities of this unique force and establish a joint base at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base and that we will maintain the power projection capabilities of America's 9-1st 2D1 crisis reaction force.

I believe the Air Force violated BRAC policy guidelines and caused the secretary of Defense to deviate substantially from the selection criteria. The Air Force proposal would to irreparable damage to the priority goals of enhanced joint service activities I urge you to reject the Air Force's recommendation and instead establish a joint Fort Bragg-Pope Air Force Base that can harness the unique synergies that have been built by

generations of outstanding men and women stationed in North Carolina.

In conclusion, North Carolina will welcome FORSCOM, the Army Reserve command to Fort Bragg, and we look forward to continuing to support our military community for many years to come.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, Congressman Etheridge. General Dordal.

BRIG. GEN. PAUL DORDAL: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the opportunity to address this commission concerning the proposal to realign Pope Air Force Base.

My name is Paul Dordal, and I was the commander at Pope Air Force Base; first the 23rd Wing and then the 43rd Airlift Wing, in 1996 and '97, when the wing went under Air Mobility Command.

There are several actions within this proposal that we feel meet the BRAC guidelines. They're beneficial to DOD, and they're the right actions to take, and those are listed on this slide.

Transferring Pope Air Force Base to the Army would combine the two installations and provide efficiencies in caring for the infrastructure and the facilities on the installation. Moving Forces Command headquarters and Army Reserve Command headquarters to Pope Air Force Base

is absolutely the right move, which allows them to coordinate with the operational headquarters the 18th Airborne Corps, the Joint Special Operations Command, and the Army Special Operations Command that are already at Fort Bragg. And this results in efficiencies and synergy in a secure location and allows the headquarters to stay in touch with each other as well as to stay in touch with the soldiers that are under their command.

Now, it's important to emphasize that these headquarters moves are not dependent in any way on the issues concerning the airlift wing at Pope Air Force Base. These are separate actions, and they should be addressed independently. They're the right moves to make.

But we are concerned that although those are the right actions, there are some actions in this proposal that we feel would be detrimental to our mission support capability, especially moving the 43rd Airlift Wing and the various functions that directly support Army airlift requirements.

Now, there's a lot of confusion about what the airlift wing -- actually how they support the mission at Fort Bragg, and we'll get into some detail about those functions and what that support actually is. But we feel that the transferring airfield operations to the Army

would result in considerable disruption and degradation of the mission response capability at Fort Bragg. And it's essential for the mission support and for safe-flight operations that the Air Force continues to operate the airfield as it currently does.

Now, a follow-on proposal by the BRAC staff's 13 July hearing recommended removing all permanently assigned aircraft from the installation, and we feel that this proposal is not feasible and does not support the airlift operations and would not support them as required at Pope Air Force Base.

But we welcome the opportunity to address these issues with the commission. And at this point, I'd like to turn the briefing over to Terry Peck, who is a retired Army colonel and was a former director of operations at Fort Bragg.

Terry.

COL. TERRY PECK: Chairman Principi, distinguished members of the panel, it's an honor to have the opportunity to address our concerns on the BRAC recommendations to realign Pope Air Force Base and reduce the Air Force presence as part of the crisis response force.

In addition to being director of operations for 18th Airborne Corps, first under General Keane and then under

General Kernan, from 1997 to 1999, I was also a war plans officer for 18th Airborne Corps during Desert Shield/Desert Storm and then a follow-on SOUTHCOM -- Southern Command -- plans officer for 18th Airborne Corps under General Luck.

Paul addressed briefly the broad scope of our concerns and the fact that if these two recommendations were to be implemented, it would make both the Army's and Air Force's crisis response tasks far more difficult to execute than they are today. The current leadership at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base will do everything in their power to ensure that the war-fighting mission is not compromised.

But there was clear guidance in the BRAC process that stated that not only should the services be able to execute the mission as given by the BRAC recommendations, but they should gain efficiencies in so doing while sustaining or enhancing the joint war-fighting capabilities. This is where we believe the process missed the mark; when it made the recommendation to transfer the operational responsibilities of Pope Air Force Base to the Army and to reduce the Air Force presence as part of the joint crisis response force at Pope Air Force Base, even while the Army is increasing

its part of that team. These actions would be neither the most efficient nor the most effective.

Pope's primary mission is the mission of an Air Force base, a strategic power projection platform on which the Air Force can stage and prepare a mix of airlift aircraft to project the combat power of Army airborne forces or Army and Joint Special Operation forces to any point on the globe as directed by the president of the United States. It is not an Army airfield whose primary mission is to be the sustainment base for Army rotary wing aircraft from which they will train in the local training areas.

An Army airfield is a power projection platform by exception. In most cases, more Air Force airlift sorties are flown out of Pope Air Force Base in one month than are flown out of any Army airfield in a year. Today there are over 25,000 airborne and special operation soldiers on jump status at Fort Bragg. They have to jump at least every 90 days just to stay proficient. In addition to the basic airlift missions to support that requirement, the 82nd Airborne Division's ready brigade of 3140 paratroopers must exercise its joint forcible entry mission at least four times a year. Each time the brigade takes off, it requires nine C-17s and six C-130s.

In addition to that joint training requirement, the 82nd Airborne Division conducts battalion-sized joint exercises at least four times a year, and each time the battalion takes off, it requires four C-17s and six C-130s. These numbers are just for routine, basic training requirements for the joint war-fighting team that is our crisis response force. It does not include the ongoing, real-world deployment missions that you would see executed from Pope every day, but are above and beyond those numbers.

The Army can absorb the facility support missions of heating, water, building maintenance and other infrastructural responsibilities for Pope into those same duties they already execute for Fort Bragg, and do it efficiently and effectively for a joint-based infrastructure. They cannot execute the air traffic control, logistics support, and base operations responsibilities inherent to Pope while sustaining the airlift operational tempo addressed above as efficiently or as effectively as can the Air Force, simply because these missions are routine requirements for the Air Force, would be unique to the Army and, in fact, are inherent missions of the Air Force.

The wing organization at Pope brings much more to the crisis response team than just airframes, airspace

control and ramp operations. A critical part of the joint team at Bragg-Pope is the inherent experience of the personnel in the wing for crisis response planning.

Assigned to 18th Airborne Corps there is an Air Force liaison office that provides, along with selected personnel from the 43rd wing, the initial planning cell for potential crisis response missions. On any given day, the 18th Airborne Corps may be required to plan for evacuation of U.S. citizens from a riot-torn country, a country whose government was overthrown overnight, or any number of other unexpected missions across the spectrum of combat and humanitarian undertakings. Many of these missions are never actually executed, but the planning process and the requisite experience to conduct that planning has to be immediately available in order for them to prepare to execute within 18 hours, if directed by the president. That level of strategic mission planning experience would not be found in an Air Force squadron organization, which is the organization recommended for Pope by BRAC.

Equally critical to the joint team is the ability to rapidly repair aircraft that break on touchdown and the flexibility to reconfigure aircraft as a mission profile changes during crisis response planning. With the wing at Pope, the backshops and logistical support was robust

enough to rapidly repair tactical and strategic airlift platforms that became non-operational. With the sophistication of navigation, station-keeping and other aircraft systems and the continuous wear and tear on airframes, these shops are important during daily airborne sustainment training and absolutely critical to the success of crisis response missions when backup airframes just are not available.

Additionally, in virtually every crisis response mission our joint team has executed, the requirement to reconfigure aircraft from air-land to air-drop and then back again, has been a common denominator during the planning stages as the critical information on the target area was received. That flexibility to rapidly reconfigure multiple airframes was provided either directly by the robustness of the wing's logistical support base, or its ability to absorb the necessary outside support into its existing facilities.

That robustness would not exist under the current recommendation. Just in the last few years, both services reconfirm the unique power projection requirements of the Bragg-Pope complex by committing millions of dollars to a one-of-kind outload enhancement plan. The Army's portion of that plan was a \$110 million project as part of the Army's strategic mobility plan.

No other joint complex has this unique capability. In the future the homeland defense mission will make tactical airlift aircraft, like the C-130, a much more probable platform. And the requirement to execute not within 18 hours but to execute as soon as forces can be made available, the more probable scenario.

Those missions, just like the crisis response missions today, will require the requisite planners to be immediately available, the requisite logistical infrastructure to be on site and a sustainment of habitual joint training relationships that build the joint leadership and joint teams that will be required to execute these non-negotiable missions. That structure is in place today with the 43rd Airlift Wing, the 18th Airborne Corps and the joint special operations command.

On the Bragg-Pope complex that helps conceal preparations in staging for the execution of these strategic crisis response missions. That joint team could easily be sustained or improved while the Army assumes the facility support mission of a joint base Bragg-Pope. The current BRAC recommendation is not the most efficient method to operate Pope, nor does it sustain or enhance the joint war-fighting capabilities of a Bragg-Pope. With our nation currently at war with a very deceptive and ruthless adversary, why would we want

to create unnecessary risk in our ability to rapidly respond to either an internal or external crisis.

Why would we tear apart one of the most successful joint war-fighting forces available to our nation when there are more viable options available. We would suggest that this was not the intent of the services as they work to gain efficiencies in BRAC, that the recommendation as it currently is stated has flaws in its logic. I'll now return the floor to Paul to address some of these points.

GEN. DORDAL: Thank you, Terry.

I think it's very important to understand the mission requirements at Fort Bragg as we look at the airlift support from the wing to support that mission. Now, the primary objectives of BRAC are to reduce excess infrastructure and save money for DOD, and that's what this commission is trying to do. But historically the savings are generated from actually closing installations and not from transferring functions from one service to another.

The proposal to realign Pope Air Force Base does not reduce infrastructure, and it does not save money for DOD. Now the Air Force strategy was to right-size and realign organizational units, which is an operational strategy that probably should not have been part of the

BRAC proposal. But many of the actions contained in the BRAC proposals, including the proposal to realign Pope Air Force Base, are not about real estate or cost savings for DOD. And in this case they're about moving aircraft and realigning organizations.

And this puts the commission in a very difficult position having to deal with operational issues, such as the organizational structure and where aircraft should be assigned. Now, a potential outcome of this commission is to not approve organization changes in this proposal and to let the Air Force and the Army work out these operational issues on their own at another time. If you do decide to take on this task, there is sufficient guidance in the BRAC statute, as well as in DOD guidance regarding BRAC actions, and that's that they should not decrease military capability, and they should not degrade mission capabilities.

However, if you approve the original DOD proposal to remove the airlift wing, many of the critical functions that successfully support the missions at Fort Bragg will be adversely affected. And if you approve the follow-on recommendation to remove the permanently assigned aircraft from Pope Air Force base, the lack of response and the lack of airlift support for the crisis response

force mission would generate additional risk, which could affect our national security.

Now, the military value of Pope Air Force Base is very high, and it was rated high in the mission areas that it supports. Pope was rated the number one Air Force base for its support for special operations and combat search and rescue, and it was third overall for its airlift support. But these ratings didn't keep Pope off of this realignment list. However, the base provided such critical support that in the last BRAC, in 1995, the Secretary of the Air Force exempted Pope for consideration from closure. And in 1997, the Air Force proposed turning Pope Air Force Base over to the Army. Now, the chief of staff of the Army left that up to the Corps commander, and he emphatically said no, and he told me at the time that he was very pleased with the support provided by the airlift wing, and he had no intention that the Army would operate the airfield.

Now I think those comments are still valid today. The Army should not be required to run an Air Force base, and you should call it anything you like, but it's supporting fixed-wing sorties by the Air Force, and that the primary mission of Pope Air Force Base, and that's what it'll continue to be in the future, regardless of what it's called. And our contention is that the

military value of Pope Air Force Base would increase even more if the wing was re-equipped with a new aircraft, the C-130J, and this would provide an ideal solution to this problem, and it would better support the crisis reaction force requirements at Fort Bragg.

And in fact, the 43rd Airlift Wing was planning and projected to received the new C-130J aircraft starting in 2007. They'd already started military construction on new hangars, and the facilities were being prepared. However, OSD cut the funding from this program last year, and it was not restored until after the BRAC announcement. So, during the entire BRAC process, Air Force planners were forced to deal with what to do with the C-130Es there were at Pope Air force Base. It's an old, aging aircraft, built in 1964. It's got wingbox cracks in it now. A number of those aircraft are grounded.

But the solution to this is not to move the airlift wing out of Pope; it's to replace the 130Es with the 130Js, like they were projected to do in the first place as part of the AMC's global mobilization plan. Now the military value of Pope has also increased due to significant investment by the Army and the Air Force of over \$100 million over the last ten years to improve the staging, deployment and search capabilities at Pope Air

Force Base, and this provides a very unique capability to support this critical mission.

And we feel that the original BRAC proposal, specifically the action to disestablish the 43rd Airlift Wing, deviated significantly from the DOD selection criteria guidance and that this action is not based on military value as the primary consideration. Now this is one of the few BRAC actions that could directly affect our war-fighting capability, and implementation could have a negative effect on the power projection and crisis-response capability at Fort Bragg.

Now the point that must remain first and foremost is the importance of the crisis-response force at Fort Bragg. Any degradation of support for that mission could affect national security, and since there is no reduction in infrastructure in this proposal, it's only a transference of real estate, and it's doubtful that there's any long-term cost saving involved in this proposal. What this issue really boils down to, is what's the best way to support the mission requirements at Fort Bragg without disrupting or degrading the current mission capabilities.

So what's unique about this crisis response force and about its relationship with the 43rd Airlift Wing? First of all it's the type, the quality and the training

and the specialized units at Fort Bragg that provide a unique response capability, ranging from classified special force and missions, right on through to 82nd air drop and airfield seizure capabilities. And the requirement to be ready to deploy within 18 hours airborne, within 24 hours, provides a rapid response power projection capability that's also unique.

And having a major Air Force base that's adjacent to an Army installation is not only unusual but it's very advantageous. Army units can prepare for deployment and load on aircraft without leaving the installation, and that reduces responses time and allows that movement without being observed. The airlift wing provides immediate response when necessary, combat aircraft when required and support for all of the rest of the airlift operations. And I'll concentrate my comments on the last bullet, which concerns the relationship and the support provided by the 43rd Airlift Wing, because that's again the key to the actions that you'll have to decide on.

Now if the training and the war-fighting capabilities and response capabilities requirements at Fort Bragg have decreased in the last few years, it might make sense to reduce the Air Force presence and support operations from off stations. However, since 9/11, the mission requirements and ops tempo of forces at Fort

Bragg has increased. We're supporting combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, fighting a global war on terrorism, and at the same time, the units at Fort Bragg, the crisis response force, has to be ready to respond to other contingency operations anywhere in the world, as well as to the new evolving missions with homeland defense.

They may need to deploy a significant force to either prevent a terrorist act or to support stabilization of any area after a terrorist act. Now the relationship and airlift support provided by the 43rd Airlift Wing for this crisis response mission needs to be the baseline for any proposed actions that change the relationship and the level of support from the Air Force. Now there's four types of airlift missions, and I think it's important to get into the details so you have this information as you go through your deliberations and make your decisions.

They support, first of all, the daily sustainment training, the (JAT?) missions, and that happens on a daily basis. That gets the proficiency for the 25,000-plus troopers that are Fort Bragg. The strategic airlift moves personnel and equipment to overseas theater, and that occurs almost on a daily basis. Then you have the special-assignment missions, about 1,000 a year, that

support requirements in any number of areas. But the one that's most critical is the crisis-response and the surge-contingency operations that they operate out of Fort Bragg to support American interests around the world.

The level of support provided by the wing is critical to all four of those mission areas. However, the breakdowns and failures that concern the crisis response force during contingency and surge operations could lead to the most serious consequences and failure to meet crisis action timelines. Now, this is the most difficult mission to support, and it's also the mission that causes the most concern if the wing departs.

Now, the airborne sustainment -- or the (JAT?) missions -- at Bragg are flown on a daily basis out of Pope. Approximately 65 percent of those missions, of the C130 (JAT?) missions are flown by the airlift wing and supported by airlift wing aircraft. And that's somewhere between 30 and 40 percent of the total (JAT?) requirements, so that the wing is augmented on a regular basis by C-17s and C-130s from other bases. However, equally important to where the aircraft come from, and using the wing airlift assets, it's the role that the wing plays in supporting the airlift support, the maintenance support and the other functions, such as

command and control and coordination that integrates the off-base aircraft into the wing operations.

The wing supported more than 2,500 sorties flown this year by off-base aircraft, and its air mobility command's busiest en-route base, and over 740 sorties were flown in support of JCS-directed exercise, which validate the division-ready brigade's capabilities and response times. Now one of the key principles that we've learned over and over in the military is to ensure that we have unity of command in all organizations.

And regardless where the aircraft are coming from, the airlift wing provides a command-and-control structure, and a chain of command that ensures the operations are properly planned, coordinated, and executed. It provides the basic structure that aircraft personnel -- deployed personnel -- can fall in on and the standard operations that needs to be maintained for successful operations. There are approximately 5,000 people in the four groups that are supporting airlift operations in the wing.

Now this is probably going to get into more detail than you care to know about air base operations. The information that you received about Pope we think may have been oversimplified and probably undervalues the support from the wing. But it's important to understand

what functions are supported by the airlift wing and why we consider it so supportive to mission success at Fort Bragg. At the heart of the command section is the command post, and it's the nerve center for all of the operations which provide the network that links the aircraft, the units and outside agencies together.

The operations center -- the maintenance operation center -- coordinators, supervisors and ground liaison supervisors are all located in the command post. Other functions on the wing staff are plans and inspections and the safety office for flight, ground and weapon safety. Now the 43rd Maintenance Group has the supervision and quality assurance for all aircraft maintenance actions on the base, and it also provides the back-shop support to fix the ground equipment, the avionics, engines and all the other equipment requirements when they break.

The 743rd En-route Maintenance Squadron is unique. It's the only one of its kind in the United States, and it maintains launches and recovers any kind of aircraft that lands at Pope Air Force Base, supporting over 3,000 missions a year. The 43rd support group includes the 3rd Aerial Support Squadron, and that supervises and conducts aircraft loading and aerial delivery support. It coordinates all the loading operations on the green ramp, which loads the Army requirements and Army soldiers from

Fort Bragg. It operates specialized payloaders and other loading equipment, and the logistics readiness squadron moves the cargo, fuels the aircraft and maintains the specialized equipment, such as firefighting and refueling equipment and trucks.

The 43rd operations group coordinates all flying operations, manages the airfield and airfield operations. It provides standardization and evaluation, a critical function, and inspects all air drop loads. The operation support squadron runs flight operations, providing tower and air traffic control, personnel and training, runs current operations such as rain scheduling, flying ops and the (JAT?) scheduling.

Now, you put that together and the airlift wing is the glue that holds together all of these operations and units. It provides command and control and responsibility for the operations. When something isn't going right by the Army out at Sicily drop zone, the corps commander turns to the wing commander and it gets fixed ASAP. It's a very simple flow with a direct chain of command. Now, the Air Force units that are going to remain at Pope under these proposals are listed here. As you can see, the two primary elements to support airlift operations are the 3rd Aerial Port Squadron, which actually loads the aircraft, and some portion at least,

the 743rd En-route maintenance squadron, which fixes the aircraft when they break. Now it's the functions that depart when the wing stands down that are disconcerting.

The command-and-control element, which provides that unity of coordination for all operations on Pope will not remain. Plans and inspections, safety and operational training will also depart. Maintenance group supervision and backs-ops support leaves the base. All of the operations-group coordination functions, the mission schedulers range and flying schedulers, as well as airfield management, flight operations, standardization evaluation depart. Now many of these functions must be transferred to other units that remain, or they must be transferred to contractors or to deployed units when they arrive in.

Less than optimum situation in that case. Airfield operations will be turned over to the Army, which includes tower and air traffic control functions, and maintenance airfield equipment, which supports flight operations. Now, compared to the existing mission support structure with the wing in place, where you have coordination back and forth and very simple flow in the command and control, under the proposed organizational structure, as you can see -- next slide -- it's considerably more complex.

Everyone is still trying to accomplish the mission. However, they have to go through various other units for coordination and support. It's very similar to the support structure that existed in the early 1990s, and that proved to be a disjointed organizational structure with poor command and control. And to illustrate that point, the AMC, which was the Air Mobility Support Group in the early 1990s, went through an operational readiness inspection.

Twenty four C-141s landed as part of a Haiti scenario, and at the time where the troops were supposed to be loading the aircraft, only 10 of those aircraft had actually been refueled. The other 14 were still waiting for the maintenance -- (inaudible) -- to get refueled and be ready to load. They flunked their readiness operation inspection and developed a number of lessons learned from that operation. In fact, there are serious lessons learned from every exercise and operation that's been integrated into the wing procedures which are in effect right now.

Now due to those problems, Air Mobility Command decided to fuse all of these functions into an airlift wing. And if we go back and get rid of the wing, we're going to go back to exactly what caused the problem in the early 1990s. Without a wing structure, there's far

too many organizations involved and too many moving parts to operate successfully, and the risk of failure goes up rapidly. It's not an optimum situation.

Now, the airlift wing currently supports mission requirements currently at Fort Bragg very successfully; it provides the command-and- control and unity of command that essential to operate Pope Air Force Base. The functions that depart when the wing stands down comprise key elements of the wing capability, which would be very hard to replicate. Building new relationships and capabilities when those capabilities already exist, ensuring that the mission is not degraded results in an unnecessary level of risk. And the disruption of moving almost 6,000 personnel and reorganizing the base is not worth the risk of detriminting the mission. This is a proposal that if it's implemented will probably be turned around in a few years after they determine that it's not working very well.

Now a key factor in your deliberation will be whether aircraft need to be permanently assigned to Pope Air Force Base, and if so, how many. The question of supporting Army airlift requirements with permanently assigned or off-base aircraft needs to consider the cost of those operations, the responsiveness and the support requirements for deployed forces. When the Army needs to

respond quickly to a crisis, they don't want to be delayed by having to wait for aircraft to arrive. Assigned aircraft provide an immediate crisis response capability, and that's becoming even more critical to respond to a terrorist act.

The wing has command and control of these aircraft, which also expedites diverting aircraft to higher priority missions, which happens on a regular basis with the 18th Airborne Corps and with JASOC. The air crews operate with the Army on a regular basis, developing a wealth of experience that they share with the other crews when they rotate in.

It's also less expensive for the Air Force to support operations with assigned aircraft than it is to deploy units to Pope on a regular basis. The wing has on-base capability to fix aircraft that break and need repair. Now the original DOD proposal to replace the wing with an associate reserve component squadron also has some drawbacks. First of all, there's a two-year gap between when the wing aircraft leave and when the reserve aircraft arrive on station, or projected to arrive on station. Aircraft also come from an Air National Guard unit and Reserve unit in Pennsylvania and West Virginia. With Air National Guard opposition to moving aircraft and with legal action pending, those moves may never occur.

And unless the wing remains in place, the Air Force will be required to develop a stopgap measure to support operations at Fort Bragg, and they risk degradation or disruption of the crisis reaction response force while that happens.

The number of aircraft on the base would be reduced from 28 to 16, and many of the functions currently supported by the wing cannot be supported by a Reserve squadron. Requirements will need to be fulfilled with other Air Force units, either the ones that are remaining in place that can partially support the sustainment training, or if not, to support them with off-station units deploying in. A Reserve squadron has considerably less capabilities to support airlift operations than an active-duty airlift wing.

Aircraft deploying to Pope and from other bases require a flight line of maintenance support while they're deployed to Pope Air Force Base. With a wing in place, that's usually a very small team. However, if the functions supported by the wing are no longer in place, the support team needs to be much larger. The risk of breaking and not being fixed for a long period of time goes up. The cost of operation needs to include the cost of operations from the deployed location, which is from Pope Air Force Base, as well as including the additive

cost for deployment of the aircraft, the flight crews and the support personnel from the home station. So if you're operating from a temporary location, that's an ideal solution. But if you're operating daily from a fixed location, like they would be at Pope, it's considerably more expensive to support this operation from off-station than it is with permanently assigned aircraft.

Currently, aircraft units supporting airlift operations at Pope, they rotate and integrate easily into the 43rd Airlift Wing structure and command and control function. That would not be the case if the wing stands down. And in addition, deployed units, even if there are aircraft on the ramp, may not be able to respond to crisis response contingency operations like the wing aircraft currently can. They may not be properly equipped, they won't have the equipment with them to change from airdrop to airlift, or they may not have the required personnel with them to conduct combat operations or deploy to another location.

The proposal made in the BRAC hearing on July 13th to permanently -- or to remove all permanently assigned C-130s from Pope would degrade this mission support and response capability at Fort Bragg. It would also cause the disruption of support for a long period of time, the

cost savings are nonexistent, and it could end up compromising national security and the mission at Fort Bragg.

Now, another weak link in this proposal is asking the Army to take over airfield operations, and I'll ask Colonel Peck at this time to address how the Army operates Army airfields and how they would plan to operate Pope Air Force Base.

Terry?

COL. PECK: As mentioned earlier, the Army airfields are not power-projection platforms. They're used primarily by Army helicopters to launch from and conduct training in the local training areas and on gunnery ranges. When the Army first received the guidance that they would be taking possession of Pope Air Force Base, they had not anticipated that they would also be taking over the mission of operating a strategic airlift platform. Only when the Air Mobility Command conducted their visit in June -- to Pope -- of this year, the Army realized that the Air Force intended to turn over most of the base operations to the Army. That's when the Army first started looking at the cost of operating all aspects of Pope, and not just the administrative and facility support functions. During the BRAC process, it appears there was a disconnect between the services on

who would be doing what duties on Pope after it was transferred.

So what it comes down to is, how best can we most efficiently and effectively operate the Bragg-Pope complex? For sure, the Army can execute the installation support mission of a joint base Bragg-Pope. Maintenance abilities, provisions of utilities, water, sewage and other needs common to any base can be most efficiently executed by a single service. Acting as a joint installation manager for Pope Air Force Base would be a common and expected duty of the Army, especially since most of Pope's property is already owned by the Army.

Making the Army the manager of a joint base Bragg-Pope would be the efficient in the execution of administrative and facility support missions only, though. However, the operational missions of the Army and the Air Force on the joint base Bragg-Pope must be executed by the service which has the requisite expertise in that mission to ensure efficiency, effectiveness and timely success.

For the Army, the primary organization would be the 18th Airborne Corps, and they would train, prepare, sustain and stage the combat organizations and equipment that would airdrop from or air land in Army aircraft.

For the Air Force, the primary organization has been the 43rd Airlift Wing, and they would oversee training and sustainment of air crew to conduct airdrop and air land operations, as well as control the airspace and ramp and ground operations, logistical support infrastructure, and emergency response personnel to stage and prepare their Air Force platforms for execution from Pope.

The Army does not have the military operational skills within their service to execute the operational missions of Pope as a strategic power projection platform. Therefore, they would have to contract much of that expertise at a much higher cost to the Department of Defense than is currently incurred by the Air Force, who executes many of those duties with their skilled and qualified airmen and officers.

The specific expertise that the Air Force brings to the operational duties on Pope would be best addressed by Paul. Paul?

GEN. DORDAL: Thank you, Terry.

And even for training operations, Pope Air Force Base operates fixed-wing sorties at a magnitude of probably 10 times what occurs at the Army airfields. More than 2,500 fixed-wing sorties have been flown at Pope through June of this year, whereas the fixed-wing Air Force sorties flown at Army airfields probably don't

exceed more than 100 per year, unless they're supporting a major deployment.

COL. PECK: Skip to the next one.

GEN. DORDAL: Regardless of the BRAC actions, due to the large number of Air Force flights at Pope Air Force Base, the necessity to operate safely and not endanger aircraft or personnel, airfield operations and support need to be maintained at a level consistent with Air Force requirements and standards that currently exist, and not just with the Army requirements for Army airfields. They're not operated the same. They don't have the same requirements. They don't have the same certification. Firefighting training, aircrew rescue takes place at Army airfields, but not for large aircraft such as the DC-10, 747. They don't have the same equipment. They'd have to reequip with new equipment in order to do that. There's a myriad of differences that the Air Force would either have to waive or change in order to operate on a regular basis out of this Army airfield. Now, all that increases the risk of an accident.

Now, from a role and missions perspective, it doesn't make much sense for the Army to operate an Air Force base. And it's not that the Army couldn't operate this base; it's that -- given enough man power and money,

it could probably be done -- but consider the analogy of asking the Air Force to operate an aircraft carrier. And we could probably do it, given enough time, money and training, but it doesn't make sense, and it's not our mission and it's not our role in the Air Force to do so. And we'd never run it as efficiently, as effectively, or as safely as the Navy could operate that carrier. The same analogy applies to Pope Air Force Base. You could ask the Army to operate this base, take over airfield operations, but it doesn't make sense to do that.

Now the GAO specifically identified in its cost analysis referred to -- you know, Congressman Etheridge and Congressman McIntyre both referred to this cost analysis -- that it was flawed in its assessment of Pope Air Force Base. Savings for military personnel moves were inadequately or inaccurately applied to the cost savings, and the remaining savings were based partially on the difference between airfield operating costs between the Army and the Air Force. The COBRA runs don't reflect accurate cost data, and the reason for that is that the Army hasn't fully assessed its cost for picking up airfield operations and running those operations. They're in the process of assessing that, but they didn't know the actual impact of taking over airfield -- that

they were taking over airfield operations, and hadn't done any cost assessment for that.

What you can determine -- next slide -- that as you're transferring the same functions from one service to another, and the first service is very efficient and very effectively operating that airfield, and then you have to relearn and reequip in order to support those same functions, that it's going to be more costly to do so.

Take the case of air traffic controllers. The Army expects to contract out that function, and civilian air traffic controllers make between three to five times what military controllers make. You could possibly hire enough to sustain 24/7 operations like we currently do, but it would probably be cost-prohibitive. Contractors are also not very flexible when it comes to surge or combat operations, whereas military and active-duty personnel are.

America's 9-1-1 rapid response force is critical to our national security, and the relationship between the wing and the Corps is working very well at this time. The proposed actions at the very best will be disruptive, and could seriously degrade this capability. While the Army mission requirements at Fort Bragg and the need for rapid response is increasing, if this commission accepts

the original DOD proposals or the follow-on proposal, the operational impact would be to reduce the Air Force presence and degrade the Air Force's capability to support the airlift mission at Fort Bragg. Secretary of Defense guidance and an overriding principle of BRAC is to not reduce our military capability through BRAC actions.

Now we can't leave today without proposing a solution to this issue, and we think this could be a win-win scenario for both the Army and the Air Force. If you realign the base to establish a joint base Bragg-Pope with the Army running the installation and being the executive manager, leave the wing in place with Air Force operating the airfield and providing the same current level of airlift support, but replace its C-130s with the C-130Js -- that's what drove this scenario and the proposal in the first place, was what do we do with these 130Es that are not operational in a lot of cases? So you get rid of them, you replace them with the C-130Js that are in the global mobilization plan for the Air Force, and that solves the problem of what to do of consolidating an aging aircraft fleet.

Our crisis reaction force needs to maintain its full capability. And at a time when the Army is building its warfighting capabilities at Fort Bragg, the Air Force and

Pope Air Force Base need to be in a position to fully support the joint warfighting mission.

We thank you for your consideration of our concerns and for your important role in this BRAC process, and we'd be happy to answer any questions that you might have about this realignment proposal.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you. Thank you General Dordal. Thank you, members of the delegation and Colonel for your testimony. We are just about out of time, perhaps a minute or two to ask a question.

General Newton?

GEN. NEWTON: Yeah.

Colonel Dordal, I just need you to clear up a couple of things for me. With reference to the crisis response team and the work that they do, normally when that team completes its work -- and the deployment of the forces is normally not done with C-130s; it's normally done with strat airlift, correct?

GEN. DORDAL: It depends on the location of the crisis.

GEN. NEWTON: Right.

GEN. DORDAL: If it's within the Western Hemisphere

--

GEN. NEWTON: But normally it's going to be -- mostly it's going to be C-117s -- C-17s, big kinds of airplanes going long distances?

GEN. DORDAL: That's right.

GEN. NEWTON: Okay.

GEN. DORDAL: Overseas crisis --

GEN. NEWTON: So the point I'm trying to make, there are two parts to this problem. One is the concern is about that infrastructure that needs to be there to support the Army on its day-to-day activities, as well as this crisis action team that needs to be -- crisis response team that need to be there to plan for these very important missions, okay, and the use of the C-130s, which is another part of the issue.

So I want to clarify for the commission that there's a separation between those two. Yes, there are times when we might deploy with C-130s, but not usually. It's usually one of the strat lift kinds of aircraft.

GEN. DORDAL: That's correct, sir.

GEN. NEWTON: Okay.

GEN. DORDAL: And when the C-17s come in, they'll be supported by wing in order to load the aircraft, turn them, and get them off on their mission.

GEN. NEWTON: Yeah. As well as there are other training missions that are done by C-130s that are not

always at the location where the Army may need them. So the Army comes to the Air Force with the requirement, and I agree with you there's certainly a disconnect here about having the Army to run installations that's foreign to our thinking being airmen, and I understand that. And therefore, the staff is studying that very, very carefully, and we'll take a strong look at that.

Thanks.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, General Newton.

Again, my thanks, Congressman McIntyre and Congressman Etheridge, gentlemen. Good day.

REP. MCINTYRE: Mr. Chairman, with the chairman's indulgence, I just wanted to speak. Congressman Robin Hayes had asked that I express his regrets for not being here. He was with two of the commissioners last week at Pope and was unable to be here today, and he along with Congressman Etheridge and I jointly represent Cumberland County, which is the county where Pope and Bragg are located.

MR. PRINCIPI: I had a good talk with Congressman Hayes as well on this entire issue. Thank you very, very much.

REP. MCINTYRE: Yes, sir. Thank you.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you.

(Recess.)

MR. PRINCIPI: Well let me just, let me just start out by saying we're honored that we have --

SEN. WARNER: I'll do whatever you want to do. I want to keep you on schedule.

MR. PRINCIPI: -- we have Senator Warner, members of the delegation, Congressman Davis, Congressman Moran to testify on this regional hearing on the consolidation of our military medical commands.

Gentlemen, if you'd please raise your right hand consistent with the statute, our federal compliance officer will administer the oath.

MS. SHARKUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

(The witnesses were sworn.)

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you.

Senator Warner?

SEN. WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We want to adhere to our time frame of 30 minutes. I'll make a few opening remarks, then turn it over to my two colleagues and our distinguished chairman of the Fairfax board.

Mr. Chairman, this morning, or I guess it's now afternoon, I've just returned from traveling in my state, and my colleague, George Allen, is in the other side of the state. We try in this period of the recess cover the

entire state of 7 million people. So on his behalf, I'd like to submit a record.

Likewise, I spoke with our governor, Governor Warner. He also asked me to put his statement into the record.

MR. PRINCIPI: Without objections.

SEN. WARNER: And I also ask to put in an extensive statement which I'll cover not verbally, but put into the record at the end.

MR. PRINCIPI: Without objection.

SEN. WARNER: By way of introduction, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, again I thank you for your very, very hard work. As I look at the extensive number of hearings you've had, the thoroughness of which you're proceeding, I just as a citizen say thank you, and as a member of the Congress who had something to do with the BRAC situation, thank you again. It's absolutely vital, what you're doing, to our present and future security interests of this country.

I thank you for the opportunity to testify today. We're on the subject of the Joint Medical Command headquarters, consolidating activities from leased office space in Northern Virginia and other activities from military installations in the national capital region. I'll cover a second subject following my colleagues.

Now I understand the initial logic of the scenario that the commission developed in regards to a Joint Medical Command headquarters. However, I most respectfully say that before you decide to pursue such a concept, the commission must first determine, as required by Section 2902 of the BRAC law, if the secretary of Defense deviated substantially from the legislative criteria or force structure plan when he did not make such a recommendation. I say to you most respectfully I feel that he did not.

Likewise, you must also determine if your proposal would result in a savings to the department. And I say, again respectfully, I do not find that savings.

Finally, you must determine if moving activities from leased office space requires the authority of BRAC. And again, I respectfully say it does not.

As I stated in my earlier testimony, closure and realignment decisions must be based on the legal framework provided by the BRAC law. Any decision which is not grounded in that law must be addressed separately and outside the BRAC process.

And I go back to a very important memorandum issued on July 14th, 2005 by your senior legal counsel, entitled, "Discussion of Legal and Policy Considerations Related to Certain Base Closure and Realignment

Recommendations." Your deputy general counsel opined on the use of the Base Closure Act to effect changes that do not require the authority of the act. In other words, the act was put there to expeditiously deal with those things you felt were mandatory at this particular time. The inherent statutory framework of the department, the existing law, enables them to do a number of things beyond the BRAC process, what they're free to do. And we're fearful that they're trying to mix in that framework of decisions in the -- really the important high-priority matters which are before the commission.

But your counsel said -- and I agree with him -- as follows. Quote, "In order to protect the Base Closure Act process, where a recommendation to close or realign an installation falls below the threshold set in 2687 of Title X, United States Code, but does not otherwise conflict with existing legal restrictions, it would be appropriate for the commission to consider even a minor deviation from the force structure report of the final selection criteria to be a substantial deviation under the meaning of the Base Closure Act. For a recommendation to close or realign an installation (that) falls below the threshold set by Section 2687 and conflicts with existing legal restrictions, the

commission must act to remove that recommendation from the list."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll now turn it over to Congressman Moran.

REP. MORAN: Thank you, Senator. Thanks, John.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Battaglia, members of the commission, and particularly my former colleagues and good friends, Congressman Hansen and Congressman Bilbray -- it's nice to see them as well.

Congressman Davis and I and Chairman Connelly and Supervisor Gross wish to address a proposal that is essentially your proposal, that was not part of the Department of Defense's recommendations to you to realign to one location the Bureau of Navy Medicine, Air Force Medical Command, TRICARE management activity, Offices of the Surgeon General, the military departments, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense for Health Affairs.

Members of the commission, as you know, this recommendation was not one put forward by the Department of Defense, and that's why we are particularly concerned. It doesn't have the kind of backup that we would expect from the other recommendations. And in fact, it runs counter to the Department of Defense's conclusion in this regard.

It was briefly considered by the Medical Joint Cross-Service Group, and it was rejected. DOD analyzed possible receiving sites, and only one was deemed feasible: the Navy Campus at Bethesda. But that site was ultimately rejected because it did not have any room for the construction of a new facility large enough to house all of the medical commands. DOD determined that there was no military value in relocating these commands to another site, and that such reallocation was very costly, requiring a 20-year payback.

Mr. Chairman, I want to highlight several key points that Mr. Davis, Chairman Connelly and I want to emphasize.

The first, of course, is what Senator Warner, the senior member of Virginia's delegation and as you know the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has stated twice now and for the record, with more authority than anyone else could state so because of his intimate involvement in the development of the BRAC process, it is a deviation from the charge that was given the Base Realignment and Closure Commission to bias all leased space so that any leased facility is automatically put at the bottom of the list below any other military base facility, regardless of the other considerations.

Secondly, this proposal, as I say, was considered and rejected by the Department of Defense because they couldn't find a suitable site to locate -- to co-locate the medical personnel working at these agencies. The Department of Defense's July 14th response to the commission's inquiry on this topic plainly stated that co-location was not cost effective.

Third, the Skyline complexes offer proximity to the Pentagon, where many of the leaders in the DOD medical community are located, and has easy access to the Metro transit system through free shuttle service. According to our data, approximately 70 percent of the personnel at these facilities reside nearby in Northern Virginia. So obviously this would be a major disruption. In fact, I'm going to mention this later, but we're looking at, in some respects, 10, 15 minutes versus over an hour for most people to get out to the proposed relocation.

Fourthly, and most importantly, DOD has a study currently under way on the broader issue of consolidation of these military medical units that makes any decision on co-location a premature decision at best when we're talking about spending \$100 million to build a new facility to house medical personnel. That's a policy decision that has not been made.

This proposal also neglects the inefficiency of moving these facilities, which would impose lengthy commutes on employees and affect the ability of these commands to effectively meet their mission requirements. According to Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs Dr. Winkenwerder in his briefing to the commission during your site visit, close proximity to the Pentagon is imperative for the TRICARE management activity because of its necessary day-to-day interactions with the Office of the Secretary of Defense. We have checked; it takes them only a few minutes to get from their offices to the Pentagon today. If they're out at Bethesda, on a good day it's a 40-minute commute. And if they happen to leave in the morning or in the evening during rush hour, and rush hour is now a one-and-a-half to two-hour period, it can take two hours to make that trip. So we don't think that this is efficient.

And I want to mention one other thing because I just noticed in your backup material for the media and the media packet, you state that there would be savings due to a reduction of personnel in the military of 739 and 600 among civilian employees -- 598 was your figure. That, I would suggest -- and I do so with great deference -- but I don't think that comes under the purview of the BRAC commission to be consolidating activities in order

to achieve these personnel savings, particularly when a study is ongoing to determine whether or not this is feasible and effective. There may be savings if there was a consolidation, but that decision is being made by experts. And to reach a conclusion that you could eliminate over 1,600 people I would suggest is very premature.

Finally, if your commission -- and I know how concerned you are about ensuring that these buildings are compliant with DOD's new antiterrorism standards for buildings and lease space -- the existing complexes can be made secure at the existing locations for a quarter of the cost of building a new facility and relocating all of these personnel; would be about 28 million (dollars) versus 100 million (dollars).

So we think it's very important to stress what is not under or should not be under consideration here. You are not considering -- and I know that you understand this -- because the commission doesn't have the authority to consider the creation of a new Joint Medical Command. Your charge, as I know you are very much aware, is the physical relocation of these commands to a central location. I would submit that before a decision is made to spend over \$100 million and to cause the disruption of well over a thousand people that we let the study be

concluded and let the Department of Defense reach their own conclusions with regard to consolidation. And thus, we would oppose the recommendation that -- proposal that you are considering on your own initiative to relocate these military medical units from Skyline Towers to another location, probably Bethesda.

With that, we -- I've got a lot of backup as you can imagine -- all of us do -- but I know you want to hear from Congressman Davis and Chairman Connelly, and Chairman Connelly's going to introduce Supervisor Gross -

MR. PRINCIPI: I would just like to clarify one point, Mr. Moran.

REP. MORAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PRINCIPI: There seems to be some confusion or misunderstanding here. This commission has not proposed by its actions to consider the consolidation of the medical commands out of Skyline, out of leased space. We have not in any way proposed a location for this consolidated medical command. As a matter of fact, Skyline could be -- very well be the place that would be most appropriate for a consolidated medical command. Our action was premise solely on the military value issues and the -- and sure, yes, some cost effectiveness by reducing some base operating support, but by the synergy

that comes with bringing our medical commands into one location where they can work closer together across the full spectrum of medical issues that our military faces today, which is clearly within the purview of this commission.

But I just wanted to be sure -- want to assure you we have not said that this is a lease issue, that we need to move people out of leased space. It may be most appropriate to move people into leased space in Northern Virginia close to the Pentagon.

REP. MORAN: Mr. Chairman, if I could, then I would like to clarify that because this is somewhat inconsistent with my understanding.

When we see this chart that cites the savings, the elimination of 1,339 military and civilian personnel, which is your media packet -- it's chart number 12; you may want to put it up, I don't know -- that goes directly to the point that I'm making. And because of that chart, I have emphasized this issue, whether it's really appropriate to come to what we think is a policy decision to eliminate 1,339 personnel. I'd draw the people's attention to chart number 12.

MR. PRINCIPI: Our chart, our chart -- we're only talking about the potential elimination of 180 people,

not 1,800 people. So, you're looking at the wrong chart

--

(Cross talk.)

REP. MORAN: It says net loss 739 military, 598 civilian.

MR. PRINCIPI: Well, it's my understanding that -- and if the chart is incorrect we can certainly look at that. But the elimination is 97 military and 78 civilian.

REP. MORAN: Well, you can understand, Mr. Chairman, that people whose jobs are at stake when they see a figure of 1,339 jobs being eliminated --

MR. PRINCIPI: Those are being relocated, Mr. Moran. They're not being eliminated. They're being relocated through the consolidation. That could very well be all at Skyline, it could be at Potomac Annex, it could be anywhere. But the elimination is 97 military, 78 civilian. The figures you're citing are the total number that would be relocated through the consolidation.

REP. MORAN: It says net loss on the top of the column and then it says total direct. I don't want to be argumentative at all. But I think it's important to clarify this, because --

MR. PRINCIPI: I just want to --

(Cross talk.)

REP. MORAN: -- people's job's are at stake and they understand that you intend, without other information, to move forward with this relocation of these medical command units. And that's what we are addressing.

MR. PRINCIPI: Sir, I just want to emphasize that no decision has been made. There is no elimination of 1,600 or 1,700 people. That was the relocation. The consolidation could be at any location. Again, I want to emphasize it could be at Skyline, where TRICARE in the Army is, or at another location that's suitable, that's most cost effective. Again, our purpose in adding this to the list for consideration so that we could hear from you and hear from the experts as to whether synergy could be derived through breaking down the stovepipes and bringing these commands together.

The planning that's being done today by the Pentagon has nothing to do with consolidation. It has to do with creating a unified medical command with someone over the three services, but not necessarily consolidation. So, I think there is a little misunderstanding.

REP. MORAN: Well, I hope that's the case. And then, mission accomplished if you understand the concern and if it is not consistent with your plans. But I think you would also recognize, Mr. Chairman, the fact that there has been such a bias against leased office space in

northern Virginia, that these -- the location of these jobs, which is working so well now, would be jeopardized.

MR. PRINCIPI: And that bias is not on the part of the commission.

REP. MORAN: Okay.

MR. PRINCIPI: I mean, I think that's pretty important. We have not recommended any moving out of leased office space. That's a recommendation from the Pentagon, not from this commission.

REP. MORAN: I think that statement alone is a very good point at which to move to Mr. Davis, because that's just what we want to hear.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Tom?

REP. DAVIS: Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to testify regarding the proposed realignment of medical commands from Fairfax County.

Like my colleagues, Mr. Moran, Senator Warner, and Chairman Connolly, we are opposed to the moves as we understand them. We're going to offer additional testimony. I ask my entire testimony be in and I'll try to sum up.

The department pointed out in a July 14th response to the BRAC commission's inquiry on this topic that the

medical joint cross service group determined that consideration of a joint medical command, with its complex command and control ramifications, was outside the group's charter. And I think we've just talked about where you're coming from on this.

The headquarters and support activities joint cross service group, citing inherent complexities, also declined to make recommendations regarding instituting a joint command structure. But during the commission's deliberations on this recommendation, there was a discussion of eliminating support positions. And our judgment is the BRAC commission should address facility issues.

Now, as Dr. Winkenwerder pointed out to the commission members during the TRICARE and management activity site visit, the department is undertaking a joint medical command study as we speak. It's going to provide a comprehensive evaluation and a set of recommendations on the future structure of military medical commands. That can have an affect on how things are located after that study comes back. Work on this study is ongoing and involves the evaluation of multiple organizational models to address the complex command and control issues associated with this proposal and will also, I think, affect locations.

I don't think that this commission should assume any particular result of that study, both in terms of co-location and consolidation with the various commands. Given the lack of a core vision for the military medical command activities, not to mention the lack of data on the benefits of any realignment, I think it makes the most sense at this point for the various commands to remain in their current space until we get the result of that decision. Any attempt to predict the future structure could make short-term co-location meaningless and result in a waste of resources.

Another important consideration, as my colleague, Mr. Moran noted, is that 70 percent of TMA and Army Surgeon General employees live in northern Virginia. As we've testified in the past, the commission has to be sensitive to the interest of minimizing disruption of these highly skilled and valuable employees. With such a large portion of the employee base of the medical commands currently working at Skyline and living in northern Virginia, maintaining the current location of the TMA and the Army Surgeon General would eliminate any disruption in mission effectiveness that would certainly be caused by relocating from Skyline.

Now, one of the suggestions is we move people from Skyline to Bethesda. And on a map, it may not look that

great a distance. But in northern Virginia, you're talking about going around the Beltway, going through the Tyson's traffic, going over the American Legion Bridge, to get to Bethesda. And that is a minimum of an hour at most rush hour's difference in the commute for the people that are currently living in northern Virginia.

Our unemployment rate is under 2 percent in Fairfax County. There are a lot of other jobs available for a lot of these people where the commuter factor has to be taken into account. And relocating these people with an additional hour on their commute could have ramifications on the workforce as we know it today. So, for that and a number of other reasons, we would ask that you defer a decision on this at this point.

Now, I'd like to introduce the chairman of our county board of supervisors, Chairman Gerry Connolly.

MR. GERRY CONNOLLY: Thank you, Congressman Davis. Mr. Chairman and members of the commission, it's a great pleasure to be here before you and I know how difficult your work is. I want to say on behalf of the citizens of our county how much we appreciate your deliberations and the difficult choices you make. And we understand that. I also want to, on behalf of the citizens of Fairfax County, applaud the work of our congressional delegation, led by Senator John Warner, Congressman Davis and

Congressman Moran, trying to make sure that the interest of our community are well represented.

Fairfax County, if it were a city with 1.1 million people, would be the 13th largest municipality in the United States. We're very pleased the Department of Defense recognizes the vital role our county plays as a place where thousands of defense personnel can live, work, and play. Just last year, we were ranked by "American City" business journals as one of the top 10 places in the country in which to live.

By recommending the transfer of almost 20,000 personnel to Fort Belvoir, for example, the Department of Defense has made it clear that we in Fairfax play a critical role in our nation's military operations. And we're very proud of that fact. However, we do have serious concerns about recent discussion concerning the relocation of military medical commands from the Skyline complex in Falls Church, which is represented by my colleague, Penny Gross (ph), who's here today.

Welcome, Penny.

And it was heartening to hear what you said, Mr. Chairman. But again, we're concerned about the Pentagon point of view, as Congress Moran and Congressman Davis pointed out, with respect to leased space. It may not be

the view or the purview of this commission, but it seems to be a bias built into some of the Pentagon's thinking.

Two of the Pentagon's stated goals in the northern Virginia relocations, eliminating leased defense space and increasing building security, are not included among the eight criteria that govern the base closing process, as pointed out by Senator Warner.

On the first issue, the Pentagon's basic premise seems to be that vacating leased space is a goal unto itself. In a recent report, the General Accounting Office stated that while our prior work generally supports the premise that leased property is more expensive than government-owned property, the recommendations related to vacating that leased space also raise questions about a limitation in projected savings and impacts on local communities.

And you've just heard Congressman Davis and Congressman Moran point out that -- if you look at this area from the space shuttle, it seems diminimous, this kind of relocation. But looked at from the ground, in terms of peak hour commuting traffic, we have the second-worst congestion in the United States. And you're adding at least an hour to somebody's commute moving to Maryland. And that's probably on a good day.

In discussing building security, the report goes on to say that DOD created a task force to develop minimum force protection standards for DOD locations, but that, quote "the application of the standards in BRAC was not the result of a threat or vulnerability assessment of the affected facilities." In fact, the Pentagon force protection agency has not yet begun its assessment of about 60 DOD occupied leased buildings in the national capital region in order to determine both the costs and feasibility of upgrading current leased space to meet new anti-terrorism standards.

Fairfax County is committed to working with property owners to ensure the necessary security adjustments are made to satisfy DOD concerns. It seems more prudent to wait until current facilities are properly assessed before moving substantial groups of personnel to new facilities, forcing families to make decisions about selling their homes, long commutes, a change of schools, communities for their children, and also, possibly, job changes, as Congressman Davis pointed out.

Fairfax County last year created a record number of new jobs in our community, 25,000 net new jobs -- the largest number in the history of our county and the largest number in the Commonwealth of Virginia. There are lots of opportunities. The relocation of the medical

command is, in fact, not required to meet anti-terrorism standards.

It is my understanding, for example, that the Charles A. Smith Company, which is the landlord at Skyline, has committed to undertake appropriate refurbishments to meet the Pentagon's security requirements, both for the medical commands and another major DOD presence at Skyline, the Defense Information Systems Agency. Upgrading those lease facilities will cost far less than building new offices on military bases and the associated costs resulting from upending the operations for the medical commands and their staff.

While Fairfax County will do what is necessary to facilitate a smooth transition for all involved if the current recommendations are enacted, making that promise a reality will require a true partnership among the federal government, Commonwealth of Virginia, and Fairfax County. We stand ready to do our part. We thank you for the work you're doing, and thank you for your attention to these critical issues.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, Mr. Connolly. I'll just ask one question. Would it make sense to consolidate the medical commands at Skyline?

MR. CONNOLLY: Yes.

REP. DAVIS: I think you have to take a look at where all the workers live and what effect that's going to have, but 70 percent of them do live in northern Virginia.

REP. MORAN: Mr. Chairman, I think that we should really wait until this study is completed. It's being done by people who are intimately familiar with the issues, the ramifications. DOD ordered the study to be conducted. And it's probably a little premature for us, certainly, but perhaps for the commission to make that conclusion.

I mentioned the chart, and the chart that you have provided to the media shows that consolidation would, in fact, save \$395 million, approximately \$400 million. Whereas co-location, which is what the most the BRAC commission might be able to do, would save only a fourth of that, really -- \$111 million.

So, clearly if savings were the principle objective, consolidation would produce almost four times as many savings. But again, it's the consolidation that should probably be decided after the study has concluded, which has been commissioned by DOD.

MR. PRINCIPI: We certainly should look at that.

Mr. Skinner?

MR. SKINNER: It is this kind of consideration that we're going through, always the human impact on human beings and employees and government employees is always critical in our mind. We are looking at a number of reorganizations to create centers of excellence, much the way we're talking about here, where people -- they're not talking about an hour commute. They're talking about hours of commute or maybe having to relocate completely. And so, you understand it -- if overly weighting, weighting but overly weighting, movement of individuals would end up requiring much different situations. So, it has to be balanced.

Number two, in a number of situations we have vacant military space, that was created by prior BRAC or reorganizations of the military, that is basically available for free. We discussed one of those this morning, the DFAS facilities and various facilities. And those are government owned buildings. So, obviously as we weigh these consolidations, if we look at leased space, wherever it be -- because we're looking at leased space throughout the country, just not -- we're looking at owned space throughout the country. If we have vacant government space that we can use, it seems to be a compelling argument if all other factors make sense, to use government owned space versus leased space.

And that's a general principle I'm sure, Congressman Moran, you wouldn't disagree with, because it's economically sound. Now, we have to take a lot of other factors into consideration. But you got to understand there's a lot of vacant government space that can be utilized. And if it can be utilized, we ought to use it if everything else is equal.

REP. DAVIS: Could I respond just briefly. I mean, the one difference here in terms of an hour commute time versus somewhere else with a very highly skilled employee base -- there are a lot of private sector alternatives in northern Virginia. And I think that makes it so much different from other places.

The government in northern Virginia, to compete for top talent, has had to do things that we don't do in other areas. A lot of these people can walk across the street -- we have several hospitals within a very short distance of Skyline right now that are out there with ads looking for doctors and medical personnel. And so, what you don't want to do is gut the brain trust of the people you're trying to transfer. And that's the only point I want to make.

Every time you move a building, somebody's disrupted. You just don't want to lose the workforce. I

just hope you'll take that into account, maybe do an employee study or something, before you make a decision.

MR. SKINNER: Having formerly resided in Fairfax County, Congressman Davis, and commuted, I also know that there's a lot of people from Fairfax County that already do this commute, reverse commute in other areas, for a good paying, thorough, fairly challenging job. So, the people of Fairfax County have demonstrated, year in and year out, that while they don't like the commute, for the right job, and the right position, and the right environment, they will commute because it gives them an opportunity to fulfill their career.

And, I'd also say, we just signed the highway bill. And I hope Virginia came out well in the highway bill.

(Cross talk.)

SEN. WARNER: It did. Very well.

MR. SKINNER: And you can do something about that.

SEN. WARNER: I was the senior man on the committee.

(Laughter.)

MR. SKINNER: So, I'm confident that some of these gridlock problems are going to be resolved shortly.

MR. PRINCIPI (?): And by the next BRAC, the roads will be ready, but anyway --

REP. MORAN: Commissioner Skinner, if I could respond, though, to the point that you made. We think

that that is valid, the commute time, a valid consideration because as Congressman Davis and Senator Warner and Mr. Connolly have said, it could affect the decision of many people that we want to retain within the military. But another point we were making is one that Dr. Winkenwerder made at the hearing that the site visit that you had out in Fairfax.

He made the point that it is necessary for a great many of his employees to go to the Pentagon, back and forth, throughout the day. They can do that within a matter of a few minutes now. If they were out at Bethesda, they wouldn't have that ready access, particularly for TRICARE management activity. So, that's a different consideration than the commute time before and after work.

The other thing that you mentioned -- and we agree that we should maximize space that's available on military bases. But again, the Department of Defense looked at the joint military medical commands, moving them to Bethesda, which was the most proper place, and rejected it because they concluded there wasn't space at the Bethesda campus. So, it is a somewhat different situation than using excess space that is not now being used.

SEN. WARNER: Mr. Chairman, I want it to be remembered that the Virginia delegation stuck to its schedule. And therefore, I'll forego what I had planned with a little longer dissertation. But I ask, most respectfully, that I be able to submit a detailed brief to be matched up with the brief I gave you on July 7th regarding the concentration of leased spaces in northern Virginia. That is a diamond that we just hope will not be fractured and broken up for so many reasons.

I have, these many years, been privileged to represent our state with these colleagues, and others who have gone before them. And it represented a long, hard process, with the cooperation of several administrations, to put together this complex of leased facilities.

And I say, most respectfully, day in and day out, I work for the Department of Defense with its problems to relocate and do various things. They have the authority, and they've had it all along, to do what they want with leased spaces in that region. When we designed the BRAC process, we carefully put it together so that other issues in the department could not be coupled onto your train as it moves swiftly and decisively.

And I fear that this whole concept of packaging together these leased spaces is not permitted within the strict interpretation of the BRAC law, is permitted, of

course, within the existing statutes that the department works on year after year. And that it would be, in my judgment, respectfully, a violation of the BRAC law to piggyback on issues, which should be treated with existing laws and procedures, such that the community has a better opportunity to present its case under the regular laws of the Department of Defense.

So, I thank the commissioners for this attention. We note -- I hope we finished right on schedule.

MR. PRINCIPI: You did. Thank you very much, Senator Warner and members of the delegation.

Your testimony and brief will be made part of the record. Thank you very much. Good luck.

SEN. WARNER: Thank you.

(Recess)

MR. PRINCIPI: Good afternoon. It's certainly a pleasure to welcome Dr. Eleanor Holmes Norton and Dr. Greg Payne for further discussion of the consolidated medical commands. I would ask that, consistent with the BRAC statute, you both stand to take the oath required by the statute.

Thank you.

And, Mr. Roberts -- (Off mike)

Excuse me. I apologize. There's a -- I can do it right? Let me do it.

(Laughter.)

I do apologize. Our MS. SARKAR seems to have disappeared here.

Please raise your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give, and any other evidence that you may provide, are accurate and complete, to the best of your knowledge and beliefs, so help you God?

(Panelists answer in the affirmative)

Thank you very much.

Congresswoman Holmes Norton.

DEL. HOLMES NORTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and members of the commission, for the opportunity to express our views.

First I will address the staff recommendation for joint medical command headquarters. Then, I will briefly present new information on the negative impacts of moving Walter Reed in light of the emergency disaster response capabilities that the hospital is central to maintaining in light of the risk of a terrorist attack on the nation's capital.

For purposes of answering questions you may have, I have asked Dr. Greg Payne, the director of the District of Columbia Department of Health, to be available. He is an expert on the emergency health capabilities of the

nation's capital, and previously served as director of policy and planning for the Veterans Health Administration.

Also appearing with me as an expert witness is Mr. Robert Malson, who is CEO of the District of Columbia Hospital Association and the District's primary liaison between our hospitals and the federal government. He serves on the secretary of Health and Human Services advisory council on public health preparedness, and the Department of Homeland Security's critical infrastructure task force.

First, I turn to the staff recommendation concerning medical command co-location. It does seem to me you have to exercise at least a presumption against this recommendation because DOD considered it and declined to move forward with it. I believe this is because there is a lot more to creating a joint command than the savings that the BRAC staff recommendation is based upon.

If, in fact, you decide to move forward, then it seems to me you have an obligation to do so with minimal movement of staff and dislocation of present operations. And the most rational choice in that case would be to use Bowling, where there is available space, and where one of the units is already located. Where, in fact, there are jobs, at least as to a prior recommendation -- failed,

expected to leave. The influx of personnel is -- to whatever location -- would be decided is critical here. The units involved occupy about 166,000 square feet of leased space in this national capital region.

It is important, I think, to your decision that the joint medical command study is still in progress. We believe that that study will consider all of the factors that are not before you. You, of course, are aware that you cannot create a joint command. At best, you could recommend co-location.

We're talking about about 3,300 jobs. So, the primary reason for joint command, or co-location without joint command, is clearly space. The military doesn't make such decisions on space alone, especially when it is saying to all branches of the service you will now be under a joint command.

We recommend Bowling, however, should you decide that even absent a joint command, co-location is your recommendation, because of the clear efficiency; when you have at least one of the units remaining as it would where it is now located. And particularly considering that whenever there is a movement of personnel, particularly in this region, you're going to lose some valuable personnel.

The figures in the staff recommendation, of course, are based on co-location at Naval Medical Center in Bethesda. This is quite extraordinary considering what is already scheduled to move to Bethesda. We think even greater savings could be achieved, should you decide on co-location, rather than crowding up with 400,000 more square feet into Bethesda's already crowded campus, to use Bowling where such crowding would not take place, and already the home of one of the four units.

Employees at the two Virginia units could more easily, I must say, far more easily, reach Bowling than they could reach Bethesda -- which we consider to be located at the other end of the world and most people in Virginia do also, considering what the congestion is like on those highways. Moreover, Bowling is closer to the Pentagon itself. We don't even think Bethesda is feasible.

You have pending a recommendation for a joint extramural research center there. Co-location, instead of requiring what is already thought to be needed -- that is, a blacktop deck -- would require the building of a whole new parking deck going upwards going to at least \$20 million or more instead of \$1 to \$2 million it would cost to do the blacktop deck. Therefore, we recommend that if, in spite of the DOD's own conclusion to the

contrary, you decide that co-location is appropriate, then co-locating these units in the District of Columbia at Bowling would be the most rational and efficient option.

Let me move to the substantial homeland security risks that affect military value to the nation's capital of moving Walter Reed to Bethesda. According to all the available evidence, that move, so that it creates 50 percent greater distance from the federal presence, would present a very significant and potentially fatal risk to federal employees, military personnel if the base is located in the District, as well as residents, visitors, tourists, and others conducting business within the city limits. That business is conducted around the mall, almost exclusively in downtown Washington.

The District of Columbia is the only municipality in the United States that is a federal city. Yes, 600,000 of us live here. Those of us who live here understand it to be a federal city. Thus, it's emergency response planning is unlike that of any other city because it's uniquely focused on protecting the city's critical role as the center of the country's federal government activity.

That's why I've attached to my own testimony a memorandum to Mayor Williams from Dr. Payne, who is the

critical officer for the nation's capital in this indispensable work. We believe that it would be hard to contradict our conclusion that the military value of Walter Reed to the homeland security of the nation's capital would be significantly undercut if Walter Reed was no longer in the nation's capital. Why do I say this?

Walter Reed is five and a half miles from the White House, six and a half miles from the Capitol, six miles from the Washington Convention Center -- small, compact city, straightaway to Walter Reed. Its surge capacity -- and much of what we're talking about is surge capacity -- is vital, indispensable. We don't have enough of it as it is. I'm trying to get additional capacity at our other hospitals. But it is essential to an emergency response. And here we're talking about emergency response -- if you're talking about somebody going to the hospital over the next several months, fine. We're geared toward an emergency response.

And who would this emergency response be for? Whenever the president of the United States is in trouble, he goes to a hospital -- the nearest hospital that can, in fact, serve the purpose. So, the offices we are talking about are the president of the United States, members of Congress, over 200,000 federal workers, and

military personnel, and of course, residents, and thousands of visiting tourists. We have to bear this in mind in every part of our planning for emergency response.

It is unthinkable that a critical emergency facility would be 50 percent further away from the center of federal activity than it is today, or that that would serve the military value that you must take into account. The federal health resources and services administration has requested us to establish a system, allowing for a triage treatment and initial stabilization of 500 adult and pediatric patients per one million inhabitants with acute illnesses or trauma requiring hospitalization from a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, or explosive incident. This is above the daily-staffed bed capacity of the District and cannot be achieved without Walter Reed's available resources.

Walter Reed is not simply a hospital that we might turn to if we need something extra. Walter Reed is a full member of the D.C. Hospital Association. It maintains extensive memoranda of understanding with all the District's hospitals. My testimony describes in detail the role it plays.

Suffice it to say that because of its expertise and medical personnel, Walter Reed personnel have served in

leadership positions in the D.C. Hospital Association. The emergency department director of Walter Reed is the current co-chair of the D.C. Hospital Association Emergency Preparedness Committee. The personnel of Walter Reed often serve in that capacity because they have unequalled and unparalleled expertise. Walter Reed personnel currently serve as chairs or co-chairs of emergency preparedness and of the infectious disease subcommittees.

Walter Reed is critical to our search of bed capacity. It would help us provide beds for adults and children. Again, I stress we're talking about emergency response. So, if there were an emergency, we would be expected to provide beds for adults and children within three hours, 24 hours, and 48 hours of the incident.

We are required to maintain negative pressure isolation capacity for certain highly infectious diseases because of the growing risk of a biological and chemical attack. The Department of Health in the District of Columbia needs every negative pressure isolation room and decontamination facility that Walter Reed now has to offer. And we need more. And they need to be available right after the incident, not after fighting their way through the traffic from either northern Virginia or from Maryland.

Walter Reed's closure and our ability to access its tremendous capabilities in time would -- I'm sorry. Walter Reed's closure would undercut our ability to access its tremendous capabilities quickly. It provides, for example, the fastest and most reliable ramp up in surge capacity in the District, faster than our other hospitals.

The use of Walter Reed's heliport for rapid deployment of antibiotics and other medical equipment and supplies will be necessary if a strategic national stockpile has to be deployed. The helicopter is also part of the Department of Health's bioterrorism response plan. Not only would movement of Walter Reed from the nation's capital put us in stark noncompliance with the federal emergency preparedness plan, it also would place the nation's capital at significant greater risk in case of a terrorist attack requiring a well-organized emergency response team.

The increased distance alone that hospital emergency personnel and first responders would have to travel over congested highways to get to downtown Washington is far greater than the distance itself alone represents. Walter Reed could not continue to provide this capability at Bethesda because the recommendation is only that the

tertiary tier capabilities be moved to Bethesda. Other beds would be moved, as you know, to Fort Belvoir.

Whatever use Bethesda would have in the case of an emergency would be left to taking care of people after the emergency had died down. That's not what we need. At that point, we can send people to hospitals all over the region.

It's clear that the department did not adequately consider the relationship between the health functions and homeland security specialties of Walter Reed in evaluating military value. Beyond my prior testimony on that score, there is recent news from the Northern Command that that command is preparing the armed services to meet -- or the military -- to meet new homeland security challenges right here at home with the first ever war plans for guarding against and responding to terrorist attacks.

The assumption of the Northern Command study is that in the event of a severe attack -- and I certainly don't need to tell you what the two or three most vulnerable cities in the United States are -- that the emergency capacities of the local jurisdiction might well be, and almost surely would be, quickly overwhelmed. We note that the NORTHCOM strategy talks about something called a dual use approach. This dual use is precisely the role

that Walter Reed Army Medical Center literally already plays in the current emergency response capabilities of the nation's capital.

There is absolutely no difference between Walter Reed and the Washington Hospital Center, the George Washington University Hospital Center. All of that has been put together. Vital partner gone, you put the security, in case of attack of the nation's capital, at risk.

The department's BRAC planners were, we believe, not aware of NORTHCOM's homeland security study. It was still in progress, if it had been started at all at the time. We think that the requirements of law and the commission's own guidelines require the commission, however, to take into account the homeland security implications of closing or moving Walter Reed and the serious impact it will have on military value and the security of our nation's capital.

Finally, let me say, we recognize we know Walter Reed very well, that it needs substantial, physical renewal. That matter is beyond the purview of this commission. Suffice it to say that we believe that the most efficient way to accomplish this need is renovation of the hospital where it is, because it would do so without harming the hospital's homeland security mission

or to the military value of the nation's capital. And it would do so without risking the iconic medical reputation of Walter Reed.

I sit on a committee, which has seen how a substantial renovation of this kind is done by the federal government. So, I have no doubt that this could be done or the approach that would be taken. We urge the commission to give the homeland security mission of Walter Reed great weight in light of its military value, because of its mission in the nation's capital, and therefore, to leave the hospital here.

The two expert witnesses and I will be pleased to try to respond to any questions you may have.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you, Congresswoman. Are there any questions?

Thank you. Dr. Payne, it's good to see you again, sir.

DR. PAYNE: Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

MR. PRINCIPI: Thank you very, very much. Thank you for your testimony. We very much appreciate it.

DEL. HOLMES NORTON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PRINCIPI: I would only, not on this point, but I would like to read into the record, or state for the record, that the business of BRAC is military

installations. Earlier there was some discussion about leased spaces and the authority of the commission over leased spaces.

I want to note that section 2910 of the BRAC statute defines military installations as a base, camp, post, station, yard center, home port facility for any ship, or other activity under the jurisdiction of the Department of Defense, including any leased facility.

To clear it up, the BRAC commission does have authority to consider leased facilities as well. And I just wanted to make that note for the record.

With that, this hearing is adjourned. Thank you very, very much.

(The hearing was adjourned.)

END