

2005 BRAC COMMISSION HEARING

THURSDAY, JUNE 30, 2005

GEORGIA TECH HOTEL AND CONFERENCE CENTER

800 SPRING STREET, NW

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

ADJUTANT'S GENERAL AIR NATIONAL GUARD HEARING

COMMISSIONERS:

COMMISSIONER SAMUEL SKINNER

COMMISSIONER JAMES BILBRAY

COMMISSIONER HAROLD GEHMAN, CHAIRMAN

COMMISSIONER LLOYD NEWTON

CHAIR:

COMMISSIONER SAMUEL SKINNER

APPEARANCES :

COMMISSIONER GEHMAN

COMMISSIONER BILBRAY

COMMISSIONER SKINNER

COMMISSIONER NEWTON

DAN COWHIG, Deputy General Counsel

CERTIFIED

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: The afternoon hearing will come to order. I am Samuel Skinner, and I have been designated as the chairperson for this hearing as the Defense makes a reassignment commission as it deals with the Air National Guard issues. I am pleased today to be joined by my fellow commissioners, Jim Bilbray, Harold Gehman and Floyd Newton. They will be here today for the session as well.

The purpose of our hearing this afternoon is to hear testimony, first of all, from the Department of Homeland Security as well as representatives of the Adjutants General Association of the United States regarding the Department of Defense of BRAC recommendations. The commissioners have traveled throughout the nation visiting many installations and specifically Air National Guard bases. A number of issues have been raised and presented to the Commission regarding the Department of Defense's recommendations.

We have heard representatives of Air National Guard facilities speak of the potential negative aspects the recommendations would have on retention, recruitment and training. We've heard them tell us how airport -- aircraft relocations may not provide the optimum mix of how Guard support for

the Homeland Security mission may suffer. We have heard the adjutants general's concern that they were not an integral part of the Department of Defense's decision-making process as it relates to BRAC.

All of the above issues concern us as commissioners, the most important being the potential effect of the DoD recommendation of the Homeland Security mission. No mission is greater nor ever been more historically apparent in our duty to protect America's homeland. Since September 11th, 2001, our nation witnessed several state and local partners -- public partners working together like never before.

We've transformed our intelligence enforcement and response communities at the federal and state level. We have mobilized our air and sea defenses, including the United States Coast Guard, to adapt to this enhanced mission. With those concerns come this hearing, we have invited a representative of the Department of Homeland Security to testify to this impact. We are pleased to welcome Rear Admiral Tim Sullivan, who will speak in a minute. We've also invited the Adjutants General Association of the United States to provide issue-oriented testimony about the effects of the DOD recommendation and the effects that it will have

on the overall mission of the Air National Guard. We welcome Major General Lempke of Nebraska, the president of the association, and thank him for helping us coordinate the hearing and providing the distinguished panel before us.

Admiral Sullivan will begin with an opening statement, followed by General Lempke's statement. After General Lempke, we will have the opportunity to hear a statement from each of the attending TAG's, who will offer us their insights on this issue. Following the statements, the commissioners will have an opportunity to ask questions of our witnesses.

I now request our witnesses for this hearing to stand for the administration of the oath of office as required by the Base Closure Realignment Statute. The oath will be administered by Dan Cowhig.

(Panel sworn.)

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Normally, we take questions at the beginning of each section. And Admiral Sullivan, we might under normal circumstances ask questions of you right after you present. But if your schedule permits, I think we probably would like to hear from the members of the panel as well, and then I think we will probably

have some questions for you. And we will probably be better informed, our questions will probably be -- first of all, some of the answers may have been answered by the Guard presentation.

No. 2, we will be better informed to ask you questions after they present. So if that's all right with you, we will proceed along those lines.

With that, Admiral Sullivan.

Admiral Sullivan is an admiral in the United States Coast Guard. He has appeared here today not as an admiral of the United States Coast Guard, but he is a special advisor to the Secretary for the Department of Homeland Security. Thank you.

ADMIRAL SULLIVAN: Yes, sir. Members of the 2005 Defense based closure realignment with the commission. Thank you for allowing me to testify before you today. I am here on behalf of Secretary Chertoff, who sends his regrets that he could not attend today's hearing. I am a rear admiral in the United States Coast Guard, an organizational element within the Department of Homeland Security. I appear before you today not as an officer of the United States Armed Forces, but as a representative of the Department.

The Commission's purpose, as directed by law, is to provide an objective, nonpartisan and

independent review and analysis of the lists of military installations and recommendations that the Department of Defense has issued.

Among the factors for your consideration are operational and financial impacts that base closures and realignments will have on securing and defending the Homeland.

I am here today to talk a little bit about the impact of base closures and realignment on the Department of Homeland Security's mission. I would like to start first by providing you with potential specific impacts on Homeland Security facilities and then close by addressing concerns within the broader context of homeland defense.

There are a number of components within DHS that have facilities co-located at Department of Defense installations. As well, DHS components often rely upon DoD for operational support. The proposed realignments and closings of the Department of Defense installations are expected, in general, to have limited impact on DHS's ability to carry out its mission. However, they do bear a financial impact.

The Coast Guard, with its long history of interoperability and shared infrastructure with the

Defense Department is the most impacted by the BRAC initiatives. The Commandant of the Coast Guard identified a category of potential efficiencies that could result from BRAC and two categories of financial impacts resulting from BRAC.

An example of potential efficiencies is evident on the West Coast, where realignment potentially frees up ground facilities and critical unrestricted air space at Naval Base Ventura County, California. There's potential for the Coast Guard to consolidate at Ventura, which offers a unique opportunity to co-locate several commands and achieve efficiencies in mission performance. Ventura is the only west coast location that meets all the Coast Guard requirements for a consolidated facility, with access to airspace that allows unrestricted UAV deployment. UAV deployment is an emerging capability for increasing maritime domain awareness in support of homeland security.

The first of two financial impacts of the BRAC proposal occurs in the cases where Department of Defense vacating a facility places a significant direct cost impact on Coast Guard mission performance. This is the case with the movement of the 102nd Air National Guard Squadron off the

Massachusetts Military Reservation at Cape Cod, closure of the Portsmouth Shipyard in Kittery, Maine, and closure of the Naval Station in Pascagoula, Mississippi.

In each of these three cases, the preferred Coast Guard option is to remain at the legacy site, establish a new fence line, and assume operations, security and maintenance for the new, smaller facility. For each of the two naval stations, the costs are estimated to be about \$1.5 million up front and an additional \$1.0 million recurring.

At Cape Cod, the costs associated with operating an airfield as the sole user are comparatively much larger. Most of the Coast Guard air stations share their operating costs with a public facility or multi-unit military facility. This will not be the case if the 102nd Air National Guard leaves Massachusetts. The 102nd Air National Guard's share of common airfield operating requirements totals about \$17 million per year. This figure, set upon by the Coast Guard, will reflect a very significant portion of the agency's discretionary spending. But if the Coast Guard were forced to move from the current site, there would

also be a significant cost impact one-time and recurring. Plus, there will be an opportunity cost if the Coast Guard is forced to move from the central location of its busy northeast U.S. operating area. This operation will increase mission response times beyond current accepted standards.

The second financial impact is increased support costs due to loss of Coast Guard access to the Department of Defense's housing, medical treatment facilities and supply sources. The Coast Guard has alternate sources for these forms of support, but it comes at an incremental cost. A very rough estimate puts this right in the 8 to \$10 million range annually.

Housing and medical services on the local economies, are expected to cost more to our soldiers, sailors, airmen than on military facilities. And storage of mission critical components cost more at commercial facilities than the current arrangements at Department of Defense facilities.

The closing of Fort Gillem in Atlanta, Georgia could force the relocation of the FEMA Logistics Center in Atlanta. The logistics center

is currently located on the premises of Fort Gillem and is one of five FEMA logistics centers in the United States strategically located to provide critical commodities and supplies during disaster response operations and/or national special security events. The logistics center in Atlanta primarily serves the Southeast United States region, and also provides backup and supplemental support for all the regions and states.

Fort Monmouth in New Jersey currently supports the FEMA Region II COOP Facility. This facility is 7,500 square feet and serves as a joint field office and a regional response coordination center. Travel time from New York City to these vital national response facilities is only 80 minutes, and the Army post offers significant backup communications capabilities.

Many of the proposed closures could affect potential sites selected for FEMA mobilization centers, which are used extensively during incidents of national significance. However, mobilization centers are temporary sites that are frequently relocated due to space issues or proximity to the affected jurisdiction.

As with the Coast Guard, alternate sites

