

2005 BRAC COMMISSION REGIONAL HEARING

FRIDAY, JULY 8, 2005

8:35 AM

KRAUSHAAR AUDITORIUM

GOUCHER COLLEGE

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

STATES TESTIFYING:

MARYLAND, NEW JERSEY AND DELAWARE

COMMISSIONERS PRESIDING:

The Honorable Anthony J. Principi, Chairman

The Honorable Philip E. Coyle III

General Lloyd W. Newton, USAF (Ret.)

Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret.)

CHAIRMAN:

The Honorable Anthony J. Principi

OPENING STATEMENT OF ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI, CHAIRMAN,  
DEFENSE

BASE CLOSURE & REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

Chairman Principi: Good morning. I believe we're ready to proceed.

I'm Anthony Principi, Chairman of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. I welcome you to our Baltimore Regional Hearing.

I'm also pleased to be joined by my fellow commissioners: General Lloyd Newton, United States Air Force; Brigadier General Sue Turner; the Honorable Philip Coyle.

As this Commission observed in our first hearing, every dollar consumed in redundant, unnecessary, obsolete, inappropriately designed or located infrastructure is a dollar that is not available to provide the training that might save a marine's life, purchase the munitions to win a soldier's firefight, or fund advances that could ensure continued dominance of the air or the seas.

The Congress entrusts our Armed Forces with vast, but not unlimited, resources. We have a responsibility to our nation, to the men and women who bring the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force to life to demand the best

possible use of our limited resources. Congress recognized that fact when it authorized the Department of Defense to prepare a proposal to realign or close domestic bases. However, that authorization was not a blank check. The members of this Commission accepted the challenge and necessity of providing an independent, fair, and equitable assessment and evaluation of the Department of Defense's proposals, and the data and methodology used to develop those proposals. We committed to the Congress, to the President, to the American people that our deliberations and decisions will be open and transparent and that our decisions will be based on the criteria set forth in the BRAC statute.

We continue to examine the proposed recommendations set forth by the Secretary of Defense on May 13th and measure them against the criteria for military value set forth in law, especially the need for surge manning and for homeland security. But, be assured, we are not conducting this review as an exercise in sterile cost accounting; this Commission is committed to conducting a clear-eyed reality check that we know will not only shape our military capabilities for decades to come, but will also have profound effects on our communities and on the people who bring our communities and our military installations to life.

We also committed that our deliberations and decisions would be devoid of politics, and that the people and communities affected by the BRAC proposals would have, through our site visits and public hearings, a chance to provide us with direct input on the substance of the proposals and the methodology and assumptions behind them.

To avoid the appearance of lack of impartiality and enhance the public confidence in the BRAC's process, four of our nine commissioners have recused themselves from participating in deliberations and voting on matters directly relating to installations in their home states. Those commissioners continue, however, to attend regional hearings, even if unable to deliberate and vote on all of the installations discussed at the hearings.

I would 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 about the base closure and realignment proposals.

Today, we will hear testimony from the states of Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey. Each state's elected delegation has been allotted a block of time determined by the overall impact of the Department of Defense closure and realignment recommendations on their states. The delegation members have worked closely with their communities to

develop agendas that I am certain will provide information and insight that will make up a valuable part of our review.

I now request our witnesses for the state of Maryland to stand for the administration of the oath that is required by the Base Closure and Realignment Statute. The oath will be administered by Major Dan Cowhig, the Commission's designated federal officer.

Danny?

[Witnesses sworn.]

Chairman Principi: Again, it's certainly a pleasure to welcome Governor Ehrlich and the members of the delegation, Senator Sarbanes, Senator Mikulski, members of Congress, and leaders. And, Senator Sarbanes, I'll turn it over to you, sir.

STATE TESTIMONY - MARYLAND

TESTIMONY OF HON. PAUL SARBANES, U.S. SENATOR FROM MARYLAND

Senator Sarbanes: Well, thank you very much, Chairman Principi and distinguished members of the Commission -- Commissioner Coyle, Commission Newton, Commissioner Turner.

Thank you for this opportunity to appear before you today to support our communities in their response to the 2005 base closure and realignment recommendations of the Department of Defense. I do want to express my appreciation to Goucher College and President Unger and Baltimore County, County Executive Smith, for hosting this event here this

morning.

I'd like to take a moment, Mr. Chairman, right at the beginning, to extend our sympathies to the families of those in London who either lost members or have injured members, and also to express our admiration for the courage and the perseverance of the Londoners, something that has been noted for two or three years. What occurred in London underscores the brutal nature of the challenges we face and the necessity of using all of our resources as a nation in the most effective and efficient manner.

During the past rounds of BRAC, Maryland has demonstrated an outstanding ability to accommodate significant expansion of the military's most critical functions, and, as you will hear this morning, we believe, can certainly accommodate the moves that are recommended in this round.

I think it's fair to say that the capabilities of our workforce are unrivaled. The Baltimore Sun noted, in a recent editorial, Maryland arguably has the most highly educated workforce in the nation, particularly for science and technology. We really rank at the top of every statistical category of workforce proficiency in this particular dimension, and we're well positioned to maintain this high quality because of the world-class institutions of higher education located in this state, one of them we're

sitting in right now.

Our plan this morning would be for the governor to speak, and then Senator Mikulski, and then Congressman Ruppertsberger. And I also have statements for the record from other members of the House Delegation. We'll then go to the Aberdeen Proving Ground, then Fort Meade, and then General Tuxill, the Adjutant General for the State of Maryland, will speak with respect to the Maryland National Guard. And then as we draw towards the conclusion, we'll hear from Secretary Melissaratos, the extremely able Secretary of our Department of Business and Economic Development. And then I'll close at the end of the 60 minutes that's been allocated to our presentation.

And so, with that, now I would like to turn time over to our distinguished governor, Robert Ehrlich.

TESTIMONY OF HON. ROBERT EHRLICH, GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND

Governor Ehrlich: Thank you, Senator.

Mr. Chairman, it's good to see you. Commissioner, as well. I'm sorry for the weather.

We, obviously, are extremely proud of the role that Maryland bases play, and have played, in defense of our nation during very challenging times. Senator Sarbanes just articulated, we lead the country, we lead the world, in many respects -- research and development at Aberdeen and Fort Detrick, intelligence at Fort Meade, aerospace at Pax River,

energetics and ship development at Indian Head and Carderock, and transportation support at Andrews.

I think all of you know that I am a former member of Congress. I have lived through this process before. It is a difficult process. It is not an easy process. It is a process I do not miss. Nevertheless, it is a process that is best for the country.

"Maryland stands ready," is our theme. And, I'm not sure you saw it, but when I saw Senator Mikulski this morning I gave her a high-five, and she gave me the old secret handshake on Team Maryland. And we do talk about Team Maryland an awful lot, not as a cliché, but as a fact.

We obviously have a diversity of views with respect to our philosophical orientation and partisan orientation -- and have for many years, and always will -- but my experience as a member of Congress and now as governor of this great state, the Free State, has been, once -- to take Maryland-centric issue -- all the lines fall away. The lines are gone. It is Team Maryland. Everyone supports each other. We make a united front, and always have. And, Senator, I will potentially share the secret handshake with the Chairman later today.

As a function of that spirit of that approach, Team Maryland, we have been anticipating this day and this process for a number of years. In 2003, our Administration

established the Maryland Military Council, wherein state and the private sector worked with our seven military alliances around the state. Our Business and Development Agency's referred to as DBED. Secretary Melissaratos will be heard from in a few minutes with General Tuxill -- he represents the best of the best of this Administration. Within that Business Development Agency, we have the Office of Military and Federal Affairs. Its purpose, its charter, to facilitate partnerships between our bases and our communities. It has been, and will be, a one-stop shop with respect to the BRAC process.

Further, our Business Training Agency Secretary Fielder is here today -- and Secretary Melissaratos, as I said -- are here. Our institutions of higher learning are prepared to move forward with your recommendations and any workforce issues that might arise as a result of your decisions.

As Senator Sarbanes articulated, we have a lot of pride in Maryland, because we have one of the most highly educated workforces in the nation. Not opinion; simply fact. We have now seen the confluence of technology companies, federal laboratories, and higher education institutions. The bottom line is, we take our federal assets, we leverage those federal assets with a dynamic private sector, which draws businesses to Maryland. And, by the way, we've taken that up for the past two and a half years.

We have a world-class transportation infrastructure, including the Port of Baltimore, Marshall BWI Airport, and commuter rail service. We have a terrific quality of life -- a subjective determination; I'm a little prejudiced -- but a fact, nonetheless.

You will hear a number of concerns from my fellow panelists today. One of my primary concerns -- one, Mr. Chairman -- is that I understand you have heard from other governors regarding our concerns impacting the capabilities of the Maryland National Guard -- and National Guards, generally. We are concerned about the proposal to move the C-130Js -- an issue that I have worked with Senators Sarbanes and Mikulski on for many, many years -- but to move our C-130Js from our 135th Airlift group, which is playing a critical role in our war on terror. Later this morning, you will hear from General Tuxill, our adjutant general, who will detail our concerns regarding the impact of this proposal on our state and our nation.

Again, this is an incredibly difficult and uneasy process. I've lived through it, and there's very little else to say, other than, we are prepared to receive your recommendations. We are prepared to increase our, our nation's, military presence in the state of Maryland. I can only add a personal thank you to you, Mr. Chairman, and your fellow commissioners, with respect to your time, your

efforts, your caring, and your love of country. And we welcome you.

Thank you.

Senator Sarbanes: Mr. Chairman, I'd now like to yield to Senator Mikulski.

TESTIMONY OF HON. BARBARA MIKULSKI, U.S. SENATOR FROM  
MARYLAND

Senator Mikulski: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. And to Commissioners, we welcome you and, two, express our gratitude and the service that you are providing the nation.

I am here today -- I'm here as part of Team Maryland -- to ask the BRAC Commission to do some very specific things: number one, to keep the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency in Maryland; number two, to agree with the Pentagon's recommendation to move jobs from Fort Monmouth at White Sands, to the Aberdeen Proving Ground; number three, to approve moving Walter Reid to the campus of the Naval Bethesda, and creating a new facility there; and, number four, as to Martin's Airport, I ask you to listen to General Tuxill, professional soldier, who will tell you what I believe will enable you to make wise decisions.

I will speak only to NGA and APG.

Commissioners, I come here today not only as the junior Senator from Maryland, but I'm not here as a Maryland booster; I'm here as a member of the Senate Intelligence

Committee, I'm here as a member of the Defense Appropriations Committee. I know what it's going to take to make the tough decisions to make our country safer, stronger, and smarter. And I believe our recommendations are absolutely based on mission and merit. This is not a booster exercise for us. We, too, take national security very clearly and seriously.

Let's talk about NGA. NGA is an "I Spy" on the world. It provides telemetry that protects our troops and our nation. It's been located at Bethesda, but, if it's got to move, I recommend strongly that it move with other technical intelligence assets in Maryland. NGA's mission is closely tied to that of the National Security Agency, America's greatest listening post. NGA and NSA are the technical eyes and ears of U.S. intelligence in the world. And on this melancholy day, given what's happened in London, we must commit ourselves to making sure these agencies work well together. By moving NGA to Fort Meade, you can get rid of bureaucracies, the old frameworks that have often shackled us since the Cold War, and to provide the synergy to really fight in the global war against terrorism, for counterterrorism, intelligence, and proliferation.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I've spent a substantial amount of time becoming familiar with technical collections. We believe that it is in the nation's interest

to have located here in our state a national listening -- the national home for signals and imaging intelligence.

Why Fort Meade? Because, number one, it would be with the National Security Agency. Number two, it could go, right away, to one of the most secure facilities in the Washington area, the Fort Meade campus. It will have upgraded infrastructure that would literally allow NGA to plug in. There are those within the intelligence community who feel very strongly that a national collection -- a national technical collection agency is very, very much needed. By moving this to NGA, we can really accomplish that.

Originally, it was to move this to Fort Belvoir. Well, now there are 20,000 jobs moving to Fort Belvoir. There's just too much for any base to absorb, the security and transportation. Maryland can alleviate this by keeping these 2,000 jobs in Maryland and creating a framework for a new national technical collection agency.

But, in addition to that, know that I feel very strongly, I want this country to have the best technical collection agency that we can produce, and not the worst traffic jam that we can produce.

Now, as to Aberdeen. Aberdeen, the recommendations should be confirmed -- again, based on mission and merit. Aberdeen is a one-stop shop for military technology. It

helps our warfighters be safer and smarter. Aberdeen was founded to serve the nation back before World War I, but it's gone from a gritty ordnance munition agency to a culture of transformation in creating itself into an Army super-lab. With the legacy of the Cold War, we've gotten rid of mustard gas, we've built new laboratory facilities. And what do we do there? We develop and test everything from concept to combat, from protecting equipment -- from protective equipment for our troops, to the communications systems that give them unchallenged command on the battlefield, to road vehicles.

Why do we say this is based on merit? We work to ensure that Aberdeen is ready to meet the new challenges for these new threats.

What is being proposed? APG would gain, from the Army Research Lab and other parts of the country, the ability to test new vehicles. And we have a road-testing facility that could make sure that they were combat ready for the new transmissions -- where right now we're only getting 20,000 miles out of them -- so that we can make sure we harden up our troops.

Number two, by moving the Computational and Information Science Directorate from White Sands, and it goes right to creating the center of excellence that we want to create, called C41ISR. What does it mean? It's by -- that means a

new framework for technology and a new framework for tactics to protect our troops and our equipment by finding and fixing vulnerabilities, things used by the warfighter. It would allow -- literally enable the warfighter to see the battlefield coming at him and be able to protect himself and be able to protect this nation. But we need others to maximize their synergy.

And this is where Fort Monmouth comes in. Their Army communications and electronics community is an outstanding one. It manages contracts and inventory. It acquires field and sustaining technology in the battlefield. It manages inventory for these items. Most of all, it maintains the computer software and fixes the problems with information systems.

So, you see, what we're doing at Aberdeen, spunky Aberdeen, is to move the -- to use the technology we have, where we are already testing, from concept to combat, value-add these new facilities to get our troops ready for the new battlefield.

Aberdeen is ready. We produce a rocket science -- Mike Griffith, who heads up the National Space Agency, Cal Ripken, the Iron Man, and we bring values, patriotism. And we hope you bring the best to us.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, Senator.

Senator Sarbanes: Mr. Chairman and Commissioners,

we'll now hear from Congressman Ruppertsberger. Actually, a number of these installations are in his congressional district.

TESTIMONY OF HON. C.A. "DUTCH" RUPPERSBERGER, U.S.

REPRESENTATIVE FROM MARYLAND

Rep. Ruppertsberger: Thank you, Senator Sarbanes. And thank you, good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. It is truly an honor to appear before you today, literally in my backyard and representing my constituents in the Maryland 2nd Congressional District.

Our nation and the President have charged you with a critical mission in this BRAC round, and we certainly recognize the monumental challenge that has been placed in your care. In the words of General Douglas MacArthur in 1931, quote, "We must hold our minds alert and receptive to the application of unglimped methods and weapons. The next war will be won in the future, not in the past. We must go on, or we will go under," end quote.

I proudly represent three critical assets that would be greatly impacted by this BRAC Commission's recommendations: the Maryland Air National Guard C-130J Wing, assigned to Martin State Airport, Fort Meade, and Aberdeen Proving Grounds.

Major General Tuxill will be speaking specifically about the C-130J Wing. I would like to give my full support

to his comments and add my concerns about removing this asset, given its role in the National Capitol Region protection. Should the wing move, the next-closest asset with the legal authority to respond in civil matters would be over 200 miles away. The unique state-to-state agreements that exist in the NCR today must be taken into consideration when you make your recommendations.

Regarding Fort Meade, my role on the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and as the first congressman to directly represent NSA in the House of Representatives, I see every day what our troops on the ground go through and what our intelligence officers face. I believe we need to unify our capability to make sure all elements can effectively communicate in real time, sharing research and technology, and testing equipment and capabilities as quickly as possible to get them in the field. In order to win the war on terrorism and protect our homeland, our military and intelligence officers must come first in all that we do.

Fort Meade is picking up capabilities that are essential to the warfighter. Sound intelligence is the key to any defense system. And I'm pleased to see that the adjudication of military clearance services will be brought to Fort Meade. This Department of Defense recommendation is a critical step in reforming our current clearance process,

ensuring that we get the people we need in the field as quickly as possible to protect our nation.

Finally, I would like to talk about Aberdeen Proving Ground. APG already supports an array of joint mission and capabilities, and this one -- this is one of the reasons it rates so high in military value. The establishment of a life-cycle management command for C4ISR fits perfectly with what already happens at APG. APG is already home to Research, Development, Engineering Command Headquarters, which is responsible for the Army Research Laboratory and the Communications Electronic RDE Center. The Development Testing Command is located at APG, and its headquarters, the Army Test and Evaluation Command, is recommended for relocation to APG. This offers a high-payoff opportunity to further transformation of DOD by allowing infrastructure to provide seamless, joint RDT&E capabilities in communications and electronics for the Department of Defense. The alignment is completed when the acquisition and sustainment activities are brought together under the LCMC, as proposed.

These recommendations represent the kind of transformation objectives Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld is trying to achieve in this round of BRAC.

I want to make it clear, I am not simply advocating a position because it benefits my state or district. BRAC always involves gains and losses. But the goal here is to

do what's best for the nation. As General MacArthur said, as leaders we must make decisions that will prepare our nation to win the wars of the future. That means we need to be more resourceful in our military industrial decision-making. And I believe this DOD recommendation is the right decision.

As you will hear throughout our presentation, Maryland stands at the ready, not just in testimony, but with a true and proven track record.

Thank you.

Senator Sarbanes: Mr. Chairman, one of the strengths, we think, in our state, is we have these military alliances, seven of them, connected with each of the major facilities.

The alliances are made up of representatives of the local community -- the defense contractor, the business community, the local elected officials. They work together, as the Governor pointed out, under the Maryland Military Council. And we think they're an important strength. And they don't come into existence just for BRAC; they're there all the time, trying to figure out ways to be supportive of the facility, to back up their mission, to help respond to any infrastructure problems that may exist, and so forth.

We're going to hear now from two of these alliances -- one related to Aberdeen Proving Ground, and the other to Fort Meade. And, for the Proving Ground, I'm going to yield

time now to Wyatt Colclasure, the President of the Army Alliance there, 30-year veteran of the Army, and now a leading defense contractor; and Tom Sadowski, who's the Director of the Harford County Office of Economic Development.

Wyett?

TESTIMONY OF WYETT COLCLASURE, PRESIDENT, ARMY ALLIANCE, AND  
TOM SADOWSKI, DIRECTOR, HARFORD COUNTY OFFICE OF  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Colclasure: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and  
Commissioners.

Senator Sarbanes has already spoken to the alliances and our activity. We appreciate our military forces, and we are all very proud of our partnership with them.

Because the DOD staff has an objective of BRAC 2005, the transformation of our Armed Forces, the recommendations are far more complex than for previous BRAC rounds. And that has compared in the impact on APG with the loss of the Army Environmental Center, the Ordnance Center and School, and the Ordnance Museum, one of our most popular tourist attractions. But we do recognize, at this time in the global war against terrorism, the need to remake our military into a more effective and flexible military force.

We recognize the changes at APG to create a new C4ISR life-cycle command, the consolidation of chemical and

biological defense activity, and the Army Research Laboratory as part of that transformation. Relocation of the Army Test and Evaluation Command provides for a consolidated and more efficient command structure. The result is to create a critical mass for the Army and many joint research, development, acquisition, and sustainment activities.

APG is admirably suited to host these organizations. For instance, it has ample space to accommodate all aspects of the proposed LCMC at a single location. The scientific and technical demands of APG organizations are high, but they take advantage of Maryland's academic and business leadership in technology and its strong and plentiful technology workforce. The organizations at APG are already involved in all phases of RDT&E and acquisition, and these are the same functions as for the activity recommended for relocation. Those joining us at APG will fit in easily.

APG is the Department of Defense major range and test facility base and a national center for technology. Its ongoing operations support development and testing of ground vehicle systems, soldier systems, chemical/biological materiel, and a wide variety of laboratory-type investigations and environments.

And even with its orientation toward R&D and high technology, APG installation operating costs are the second-

lowest in the Army. Those costs will go even lower with the enhanced use-leasing activity already underway and a second opportunity that will be open to bidders next month.

The proposed new organization would benefit from synergies with those already here. APG already has a major joint-service role. A significant portion of its budgets are funded in the Defense budget, rather than single-service budget lines. Its rapidly increasing multi-agent role, not just Department of Defense, in the national homeland security effort brings benefits because of the Army's essential part in that mission.

APG is experienced in siting and hosting new organizations. Because of the attributes I've mentioned, the list of tenant organizations has steadily increased. The continuing operating benefits of proposed actions at APG actually exceed those that are discussed in the DOD justifications. For instance, all Army and Marine Corps reconnaissance vehicles -- the "R" part of C4ISR -- are tested at APG. The upgrades and variance for them are managed and developed here, as well. Co-location permits concurrent T&E of our critical electronic and communication subsystems. The new LCMC can benefit from the use of the \$20 million network-centric node now being built at the Proving Ground to test, prove, and develop the Army's future combat system, which includes unmanned aerial and ground

vehicles, as well as manned ground vehicles.

The combined actions of locating all DOD nonmedical, chemical/biological Defense assets at APG and the Life-Cycle Management Command, co-locate DOD's R&D on radiation detection and monitoring, an area which the Department of Homeland Security emphasized when it established the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office in April of this year.

Perhaps most important, the incoming organizations would benefit from being placed in the larger culture of research and development that APG provides, the ability to draw team personnel from diverse specialties, or simply to walk across the street and talk to the one in charge of the previous or the next stage of system development and testing.

DOD rated the Proving Ground highly in military value in the first quartile, above other installations whose names are much better known. This rating takes into consideration factors such as APG's flexibility, its readiness to adapt to new missions in the future, its low cost of operation, and the large amount of space that it has available for maneuver and test ranges.

The next diagram demonstrates the synergy which already exists from the variety of technical organizations and resources presently located at APG, and it would take the advantage of the factors I have mentioned. It all fits

together, and it provides a crucial start-to-finish capability in support of military requirements.

The organizations at APG benefit from a close partnering relationship with the community and region, a partnership which has developed over many decades. As examples, we participate together in several regional councils and boards. APG personnel coordinated on the development of a science and mathematics magnet high-school program that serves as a model for the application of federal assets to the improvement of science and math education nationwide.

The installation commander and Harford county executive have detailed quarterly meetings, and we work together on technology planning. If the proposed new organizations are, indeed, placed at APG, they, too, will benefit from this close and cordial relationship.

There is a strong contractor support base already in place at APG. Many of those firms already have significant presence at Fort Monmouth, also. This will facilitate the transfer of programs and technical operations and their supporting industrial base for Aberdeen Proving Ground.

The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that Aberdeen Proving Ground is already a high-performing installation, and it is ready to accept the proposed consolidation of functions and organizations to achieve more effective and efficient life

cycle support. APG and the region are ready.

And, with that, I'll turn to Mr. Tom Sadowski, of Harford County, to continue our presentation.

Mr. Sadowski: Thank you, Wyett.

Mr. Chairman, members of the BRAC Commission, thank you very much for this opportunity to testify on behalf of the residents of Greater Baltimore and Northeastern Maryland.

As a community, while we regret the significant loss of the Army Ordnance School and the Environmental Center, we stand ready, as we have said, to receive and foster the continued success of those operations recommended for relocation at Aberdeen Proving Ground. In my testimony, I will present facts and illustrate our readiness, and answer the question: Why Aberdeen?

The answer to this question is found in the following areas: military value, professional technical workforce, industry base, community planning and infrastructure, and, finally, quality of life.

Aberdeen Proving Ground's value to the military was somewhat addressed in previous testimony. It is important, however, to reiterate that APG did, in fact, score high, with a rank of 18 out of 97 installations evaluated by the Department of Defense as a part of their military-value index process.

When addressing labor force, keep in mind that APG is a

significant regional employer -- 87 percent of APG employees live in Harford, Cecil, and Baltimore Counties; 90 percent of employees live in the state of Maryland, while 10 percent reside in nearby communities in Pennsylvania, Delaware, Virginia, Washington, D.C., and even New Jersey. Should impacted employees choose not to move, for retirement or otherwise, Maryland has a young skilled workforce ready to satisfy any labor need. In fact, Maryland ranks among the top in the nation, number one in the percentage of professional and technical workers -- nearly one in four people; number two in the number of people with advanced degrees; and we are ranked four on the Milken Institute State Technology and Science Index.

Within a 90-minute commute of Aberdeen Proving Ground, there are more than 500,000 professionals employed in the management, business, computer, and mathematics sectors. More than 200,000 such professionals reside within a 60-minute commute of APG. Maryland and Delaware universities keep a steady flow of graduates coming into our regional labor pool, awarding nearly 10,000 bachelor degrees in high-tech, business, science, and engineering programs, combined.

In all, there are 58 accredited institutions in Maryland, 15 in the immediate area, including the world-renowned University of Maryland and Johns Hopkins University.

Partnerships with higher education and industry are vital to the military mission. For this reason, the State of Maryland and Harford County developed the Higher Education and Applied Technology Center in Aberdeen. Here, Johns Hopkins, University of Maryland, and local community colleges offer advanced degrees and workforce development programs to support APG operations and meet their employee training needs.

It's important to note, at this point, that we, in the state of Maryland, have received a U.S. Department of Labor grant in the amount of 1.2 million to help further workforce development efforts and address accelerated skill training needs. We can do that at HEAT, if necessary. In 2001, the HEAT Center welcomed, as a significant industry partner, one of the largest private R&D organizations in the world, Battelle Memorial Institute. They have plans to have as many as 1500 scientists and engineers at the HEAT Center at some point, and they've begun the construction of their new Eastern Science and Technology Center there.

Along with Battelle are Booz Allen, Bechtel, Northrop Grumman, Lockheed Martin, TRW, SAIC, Smiths Detection, all international defense firms who today work to support the Army's communications and electronics activities, and have roots here in the community. More importantly, these are just a sampling of the firms located here.

Local industry growth has been a significant factor leading also to upgrade Harford County's bond rating four times in the last five years. We're very proud of that. That's the ultimate economic measure.

In 2004, we led the state of Maryland in job growth, and we have added more than 16,000 net new jobs to our private sector since 1999. Regional out-commuters present another source of skilled labor, people -- allowing people to work closer to home, given the opportunity presented by this current -- by the current BRAC recommendations.

We have the community infrastructure in place to receive these operations. We have a master plan in place that allows for continued growth. For example, new and expanding industry can select from the more than 4,000 acres of office parks and R&D-zoned land along the I-95 corridor in our three-county area, all projects within ten miles of APG. This includes a 200-acre, 2.5 million square-foot enhanced use leasing project on post at APG, known as the Government and Technology Enterprise. Project information has been submitted as part of the record.

With regard to housing, the current median sales price of a home in the Baltimore Metro Area is 52 percent lower than that of some BRAC-impacted communities. In the three-county area, there's a net residential inventory just shy of 100,000 units; and, combined, we're averaging more than 5600

new housing starts per year. We have planned for this growth. We are investing in it, investing in the infrastructure and public services to accommodate it.

Public education is a priority. We have built ten new schools in 15 years in Harford County. We are spending \$130 million to construct new schools to expand middle- and high-school capacity. We have leveraged federal, state, and local dollars to build a magnet science and math academy at Aberdeen High School. And we are developing three additional magnet programs, one in the area of homeland security studies, all with the help of APG and local industry.

Our collaborative relationship with the post has allowed us to budget and implement key transportation improvements. Together with the state, we are building -- we are improving and building new Amtrak and MARC commuter rail stations at both Aberdeen and Edgewood areas of APG. Harford County is spending more than 56 million on roads to and from the post. The State of Maryland is spending more than 115 million on interchange improvements to help serve growth at APG. It's important to note that these are actual capital projects, and not just proposals. Harford County is expanding bus service to and from the post. And, collectively, these investments will offer improved access to a regional multimodal transportation system that includes

four major international airports.

In terms of quality of life, the Baltimore Metro Area ranked number one in a recent "Military Communities of Excellence" study completed by Expansion Management. A copy of the study is available on the Department of Defense Website. Our healthcare system is among the best in the country. We offer all the benefits of being close to Philadelphia, D.C., Annapolis, and Baltimore's Inner Harbor, abundant cultural amenities. Major/minor-league sports are well represented, as are major collegiate sports. We're home to Ripken Way. We have some of the top golf courses in the country, one of which is being named the new home of the McDonald's LPGA Championship. We have historic waterfront communities, 350 miles of shoreline on the Chesapeake, the Susquehanna River, thousands of acres to explore in our state and national parks.

All of this comes at an affordable price. Our cost of living is below the national average, and yet Maryland still reports the second-highest median household income in the nation.

So, as you can see on paper, in practice, in reality, we are ready. And, more importantly, we answer the question more than adequately, "Why Aberdeen?" We appreciate the impact that these recommendations bring, particularly on the impact of the families involved. We have drawn from

successful examples at Pax River, at Redstone Arsenal, to help facilitate employee relocation and to better serve those impacted.

We have recently launched MarylandReady.com, a comprehensive Website offering cost-of-living data, schools information, community information, shopping opportunities, and more. We stand ready for this assignment and to assume the great responsibility that comes with it.

Thank you, once again.

Senator Sarbanes: Mr. Chairman, we'll now hear from the Military Alliance for Fort Meade. Speaking in this regard will be Colonel Clemon Wesley, now retired from the military, engaged in private business. Actually, he was picked as the National Minority Small Businessperson of the Year by the U.S. Small Business Administration. And joining with him on the presentation on Fort Meade will be Joseph Rutter, the Planning and Zoning Officer for Anne Arundel County.

TESTIMONY OF COLONEL CLEMON WESLEY, PRESIDENT, FORT MEADE ALLIANCE, AND JOSEPH RUTTER, PLANNING AND ZONING OFFICER, ANNE ARUNDEL COUNTY

Colonel Wesley: Thank you, Senator. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission.

I am the president of the Fort Meade Alliance, the nonprofit organization that supports Fort Meade and the

surrounding communities.

Fort Meade is a big part of our military transformation into the kind of force we need to defeat current and future threats. Fort Meade stands ready to accept future missions related to its core competencies, including strategic-level intelligence, singular-level education and training, communications, information operations, and security.

Since September 11, Fort Meade has focused on force protection and infrastructure renewal. The Fort Meade comprehensive master plan supports a population growth far more than the BRAC recommendations require, and in a manner that will ensure that Fort Meade gets better as it grows.

The privatization of utilities and housing and installation of a secure communications network infrastructure are currently underway at Fort Meade. Force-protection initiatives include tightening of the installation security zone and pursuing enhanced use lease options and other activities to make operational facilities more secure, and to make space for future requirements.

A more detailed statement is provided for the record; however, time dictates that I turn to Mr. Joe Rutter, of Anne Arundel County, to continue our presentation.

Thank you.

Mr. Rutter: Thank you for the opportunity to talk to you about the partnership that exists between Anne Arundel

County and Fort Meade.

The communication and working relationship between this federal campus and the county is a model for the future. We appreciate the economic development opportunities that are provided by Fort Meade and NSA, and have worked to provide the infrastructure to support the mission of the Fort and NSA. We believe we are ready for the proposed growth and the additional private-sector growth that will be driven by the BRAC initiative.

Anne Arundel County is at the center of the fourth-largest regional labor market in the United States. The labor force is highly educated, highly mobile, and focused on the Defense industry. Chesapeake Innovation Center, located in Anne Arundel County, is the nation's first homeland-security incubator creating new technology. Eight of the top ten Defense contractors already have a presence in Anne Arundel County. General Dynamics, in announcing a move of additional offices to Anne Arundel County just last month, said, "We find that the workforce is certainly qualified to meet the needs of our company and our customers."

Anne Arundel County is positioned to provide the labor force for future growth. In the immediate area surrounding Fort Meade, we have over 4,000 housing units ready to come online over the next several years, and even more in the

pipeline to provide a supply over the next decade. Anne Arundel County has over five million square feet of office space ready to move forward along the I-295 corridor. In addition, our neighboring counties have significant opportunities for both residential and employment growth.

The transportation network is in place. Baltimore-Washington International Airport, located in Anne Arundel County, is just north of Fort Meade. The north-south highway links to Baltimore and Washington are excellent, with both interstate and U.S. highways, supplemented by rail passenger service on both the CSX and the Penn lines. Immediately east of Fort Meade is the Odenton town center, which contains a MARC rail station that provides a direct connection to D.C. from the Fort. This town center, as well as other developments in the vicinity of the Fort, will provide all of the commercial services to support the workforce and the residents of the area.

In conclusion, I want to thank you for the opportunity to talk about our partnership with Fort Meade and ask for your support of the BRAC 2005 recommendations to realign these functions to Fort Meade.

Senator Sarbanes: Mr. Chairman, I notice that Fort Meade people came in on the yellow light, not the red light, so we commend them for that.

[Laughter.]

Senator Sarbanes: Next, we now want to shift and hear from General Tuxill, the Adjutant General for the State of Maryland, a very experienced military person. And we're very proud of our National Guard in this state. We think it's just tops, it's handled some very important responsibilities around the world. And General Tuxill, I'm sure, will address those.

General?

TESTIMONY OF MAJOR GENERAL BRUCE F. TUXILL, ADJUTANT  
GENERAL, STATE OF MARYLAND

General Tuxill: Thank you, Senator Sarbanes.

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, good morning. I'm Bruce Tuxill, as stated, the Adjutant General for the State of Maryland. And, for the record, I'm testifying in my state capacity today. I'll present the facts relevant to the movement of the C-130Js out at Martin State Airport for the 135th Airlift group.

Let me begin by stating, we fully embrace the majority of the recommendations of the BRAC proposal as it relates to Maryland. The Army and Navy processes in the BRAC recommendations were collaborative between the Active Duty, the National Guard and the Reserve components, and the results of their recommendations will allow citizens, industries, and governments of Maryland to continue to strongly support the nation's defense requirements. All the

concerns addressed today will revolve around the Air Force's recommendation and the negative impacts and long-term consequences to the state of Maryland and our nation.

Let me start with the first slide, please. Data used -- well, let me start with military value -- the data used in the BRAC process did not reflect the current military value of Martin State Airport. The runway calculation is not correct. There is 8,100 feet of runway available for military use. Nearby drop zones and landing zones were not included in the calculations. And we feel that personnel relocation estimates are flawed.

The Air Force assumption that 16 PAA, primarily assigned aircraft, or 12 primary PAA units, are more efficient than eight for the National Guard, the Air National Guard, has not been fully studied, and is not, in our opinion, one of the best ways to array force structure.

Let me go to the next one, which is strategic location. The BRAC recommendation would strip all tactical airlifts supporting the National Capitol Region, the military district of Washington, and FEMA region three.

Here is a chart showing the bases with tactical airlift that are currently ready to respond to homeland security or homeland defense emergency. This next chart shows the closest base with tactical airlift to the nation's capital,

if an emergency were experienced. Please note that that is over 212 miles away, and also please note it is a Reserve unit and not under the Emergency Management Assistance Compact. The strategic location of the 135th Airlift group is involved -- I can't say that enough -- the 135th Airlift group is involved in an ongoing collaborative first-responder and emergency mission reconstitution initiatives with national intelligence agencies that can only be effectively accomplished by the 135th, due to their proximity. We also feel that cost savings will not be realized.

Let me talk a little bit about Banner Express. It supported the President. It was hosted this year by the 135th Airlift group. It is a nine-month-long mission. By operating out of Martin State, there was no need to position or de-position aircraft. It reduced TDY funds. It reduced man days. And it introduced the needs for hotels and rental cars. Overall, it saved the United States Air Force Air Mobility Command \$8.5 million. The BRAC's six-year net implementation savings of \$13.7 million are immediately reduced to \$5.2 million with this mission alone.

In addition, the loss of human capital has not been factored into BRAC. Pilots and load masters are designated as critically short skills. Maryland is a fully manned unit. Pilots and other disciplines are not likely to follow

the aircraft to the new location. Only ten of 33 pilots in the 135th Airlift group fly for airlines. Of those, only two or three said they might consider commuting. Of importance is the fact that the dual-status citizen airmen that fill our Guard positions have full-time professional civilian jobs in the local area. They can't just relocate, based on their volunteer duty. Maryland estimates over \$16 million in training costs for pilots alone if the 135th Airlift group is subject to BRAC.

As for recruiting and retention, please note that Maryland's recruiting and retention market is richly rewarding and conducive to assessing highly skilled personnel from parallel civilian careers. As to our unique unit, the 135th Airlift group is the only fully operational C-130J unit in the Air Force today. It is combat-proven. We have -- as I speak right now, we have two aircraft, eight air crews, maintenance and support personnel deployed to Southwest Asia, flying missions into Iraq and Afghanistan. We were the first in the Air Force to field the C-130J, and led the nation in the operational test and eval. We have the most experienced pilots, maintenance and support personnel, and their knowledge will be lost, not to be replicated for many years, if this unit is dismantled.

Also, some recent changes that I think were not considered in BRAC. First one is, the Secretary of Defense

has reopened the production line for the Air Force to continue to buy the C-130J. Secondly, the C-130E has experienced wing-box cracks. It has been discovered in over 100 aircraft. This has crippled the effectiveness of the C-130 fleet, which is saving soldiers' lives today by transporting supplies by air, rather than vulnerable truck convoys. Maryland's C-130Js right now are picking up these missions in Iraq.

In conclusion, BRAC has omitted -- has omissions in the military value. It also strips FEMA region three, the NCR, and the Washington-to-New-York corridor of all tactical airlift. The projected cost savings of dismantling the 135th Airlift group will not be realized, both in real dollars and human capital. The 135th Airlift group is a one-of-a-kind in a very strategic location. And recent changes and experiences in the 130 fleet were not considered in the BRAC recommendations. And, finally, the C-130J units of Maryland, California, and Rhode Island are an insulated part of the BRAC recommendations, and removing the realignment of these three units would have little consequence on the BRAC process.

Thank you, sir.

Senator Sarbanes: Thank you very much, General.

Before I recognize Secretary Melissaratos, let me say we have a number of letters from institutions of higher

education in the state of Maryland -- the University of Maryland system, Johns Hopkins, other institutions -- underscoring their ability to provide the higher education dimension to these proposed changes, and we'd like to submit those for the record.

Secretary Melissaratos, now our Secretary of Business and Economic Development for the State of Maryland, had a 40-year career in industry, in defense electronics and defense technology at Westinghouse. He was here at the Northrop -- now -- what is now the Northrop Grumman site at BWI Airport as vice president for engineering and manufacturing, and then went to Pittsburgh to be the vice president for science and technology of the entire Westinghouse system. And we're very pleased to have him with us this morning.

Aris?

TESTIMONY OF ARIS MELISSARATOS, SECRETARY, MARYLAND  
DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Mr. Melissaratos: Thank you, Senator Sarbanes.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman, esteemed members of the BRAC Commission, Members of the BRAC Commission executive staff. Welcome to Maryland.

We are delighted to present Team Maryland to you. You've heard from all of our leaders. I want to tell you that in his very first legislative session after he became

governor, Governor Ehrlich worked with the Maryland legislature to put in place the Maryland Military Installation Strategic Planning Council, a group of 40 citizens from around the state that pulled together and accelerated the formation of the military alliances around each of our military installations, and worked closely with our Capitol Hill delegation to assure that every Maryland military installation would demonstrate to the nation that we would be the very best host of a military installation of any state in the Union. I believe we have succeeded in that effort.

Maryland's economy is driven by science and technology. We think we have the model knowledge-based economy. And the BRAC recommendations have really given us a firm positive sign that we are on the right track.

We have demonstrated that we can handle the influx of as many as 6,000 jobs, when we relocated, at the last BRAC, 6,000 people for the Naval Air Systems Command in St. Mary's County's Patuxent Naval Air Test Station. You've heard from Senator Mikulski the importance that we place on our Fort Meade installation and the recommendation that we can make it not only the signal intelligence center for the nation, but the imaging center for intelligence for the nation. And you've heard from the county how prepared we are to handle the large influx of technical and military personnel that it

would take to maintain leading-edge technical capability at that location.

At Aberdeen, we are better positioned than any place in the world to become the world center for land -- C4ISR. Already being the headquarters of the Army's Research, Development, and Engineering Command, and consolidating there the Army Test and Evaluation Command, the Chemical and Biological Command, and, obviously, the Communications and Engineering Command, Maryland has the workforce that can achieve the maximal synergy among all of these very sophisticated technical functions. We understand the importance of network-centric warfare, of electronic warfare, of informatics, and we have a workforce, as has been stated so ably and articulated so well by Economic Development Director Tom Sadowski for Harford County, that we have a workforce that is already number one in the nation, for four years running, in the context of professional and technical workers. In the content of PhD's, master's, and bachelors, we rank either number one or number two among all states.

But, more importantly, our Governor's Workforce Investment Board, under the leadership of Secretary Fielder of the State's Department of Labor Licensing and Regulation, is assuring that we are listening to demands from all sectors of industry, from all technology clusters, to

further train that workforce and to assure that we can step up to any demand from any employer.

Our higher-education system has been mentioned with much pride. The world-renowned Johns Hopkins University and the University of Maryland system lead a network of public and private colleges that are geared to support the national effort across commercial endeavors, across military endeavors. So, we're there. We have a magnificent community-college system that prepares every employee for every industry need, including service needs, on a just-in-time basis.

And our pre-K-through-12 system is improving dramatically. And, as you heard, it's focusing on math and science at each of the relevant military installations in this state.

Furthermore, every cabinet department in state government has gotten involved in planning for this BRAC process. We are ready with transportation plans around every installation to enhance the capacity required to get people in and out of the bases. We're ready with housing plans to provide workforce housing. And you've heard from the planners how many -- literally tens of thousands of building permits are available in the vicinity of the bases, ready to go.

In the environmental impact, we're prepared for that.

We're prepared in the labor-force arena. Literally, every cabinet department has been involved in the planning process, prepared to handle it, up or down, no matter how it came.

But my key message to you, sir, is that the State of Maryland understands the technical mission of each of our installations. We have worked with the military commanders to assure that we are ready to handle any expansion that has been bestowed upon us. We are prepared, in every installation, particularly at Aberdeen, to create the world center for C4ISR. And I believe we can meet the synergistic impact and the cost impacts, and return to a cost level on the investment within a five- to ten-year period to achieve the best technical joint cross-service mission for land-based C4ISR.

So, whether it's in the sea or on land, whatever the technology of the future is, Maryland is prepared to lead the way with the best workforce, with the most integrated Team Maryland approach at every level of government. We are ready in every one of our installations. We are prepared to handle your questions. And we share with -- the grave importance of this BRAC planning process for the future of our nation and the world.

Thank you very much.

Senator Sarbanes: Thank you, Aris.

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, as we draw to a close I would like to make a few final points.

In conclusion, first of all, let me say that the other members of the congressional delegation were not able to be with us today. Some have submitted letters for the record, and we will submit those to the Commission. I particularly want to note that Congressman Hoyer, who has taken such a keen interest in the BRAC process and very much wanted to be with us, has written about the Indian Head -- the Naval Surface Warfare Center at Indian Head and the Patuxent River Naval Air Station. And all I want to say is that the BRAC proposals this year recognize, it seems to me, the success of the consolidation that took place at those two facilities in past BRAC rounds. In fact, Patuxent River is a dramatic example of the ability of our state to adjust to and to absorb consolidation, both in terms of the supported infrastructure -- and, of course, the military realized very significant benefits from that. And Congressman Cardin has written extensively about Fort Meade, and I want to address Fort Meade in a moment.

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, we think, as this presentation has unfolded, you've seen the strengths of Maryland, in terms of responding to the DOD's proposals for this BRAC round. We think that the Aberdeen Proving Ground case is very strong. We would establish a Life-Cycle

Management Command for command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance functions. APG would provide a beginning-to-an-end sequence. It has the possibility of fully meeting that charge, in terms of its available space for carrying out this function -- 35,000 acres, as was pointed out in the presentation, over 5,000 acres for further development. The DOD projects that the cost savings over a six-year period will fully recover the cost of bringing about this consolidation, which brings in from four different sites elsewhere in the country.

It's critical that we move forward with this capability. The new center, from beginning to end, will enable technology to reach our servicemen and -women in the most efficient and effective manner, ensuring that they have the state-of-the-art equipment. At Fort Meade -- and, in addition, at APG -- there is a consolidation with respect to chemical and biological defense activities. APG is recognized as the most robust infrastructure in that regard in the country, and we do think the Army Test and Evaluation Command Headquarters can make sense to move it to APG to allow more efficient command structure.

On all these points, let me just say one thing. It's the Aberdeen Proving Ground. Proving Ground. That's what goes on there. You prove these things out for use in the

field. And we think APG can meet that challenge, and meet it extremely effectively. And the DOD has obviously perceived the military value of this installation.

At Fort Meade, we've been working hard to develop, as it were, a military campus. It's in a perfect position for the consolidation in of these activities that have been suggested in the BRAC round, including, if the Commission chooses to do that, the National Geospatial Intelligence Agency, which -- there's a lot of good sense to co-locate it with the National Security Agency. Fort Meade is one of the largest joint-service intelligence center in the world. The colonel who just left has developed a very imaginative and innovative, comprehensive expansion master plan, and we think that Fort Meade offers tremendous opportunities, in terms of developing these joint-service activities.

I support the statement of General Tuxill. We worked so hard to get those C-130Js here to begin with, and they've done such an effective job, and he's really raised them to a very high -- as he noted in his presentation, they're the only one where they're 100 percent ready to go. I mean, they're at a high level of efficiency and readiness.

And, finally, let me just note that we're very proud of Fort Detrick. These are not sharply impacted, but we want to register for the Commission attention to Fort Detrick and the Bethesda Naval Medical Center, which is, of course,

located adjacent to the Uniform University Service of the Health Services. It's right next door to it. And across the street is the NIH. So, a tremendous concentration and synergy of a medical complex there, which, of course, goes to the question of consolidated medical activities at that facility.

Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, we thank you for this opportunity to meet with you this morning. We very much appreciate your courtesy in that regard. And that concludes our presentation. And hopefully we're in on time.

Chairman Principi: Yes, thank you, Senator Sarbanes. And thanks to all the witnesses for your testimony this morning.

I will ask my fellow commissioners if they have any questions.

Commissioner Coyle?

Commissioner Coyle: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A question for General Tuxill. I understand that you and the other adjutant generals were not consulted, nor were the governors, about these Air Guard changes during the BRAC process. But, since then, have you -- do you have any insight as to why they proposed the changes at Martin State?

For example, did the Air Force -- I mean, the C-130J has had its share of troubles -- did they propose moving the C-130Js out because they were having difficulty as a

development program, or did they have some more efficient scheme in mind for how to provide airlift For Maryland and the governor? Since the BRAC process has become more public, have you developed any insights as to why they proposed the changes at Martin State that they did?

General Tuxill: It appears that changes were -- number one, we were not conferred with prior to the BRAC coming out, on the 13th of May of this year. Secondly, the changes that they made are purely to form 18 primarily assigned aircraft units -- or, excuse me, 16 primarily assigned aircraft units, or 12 primarily assigned aircraft units, for, quote/unquote, "efficiency." I don't think they took a look at the human-capital loss that's going to be incurred; nor do I think they took a look at the strategic value of the airlift community, which is the tactical community, which is truly the state's ability that gives governors and states the ability to readily respond with airlift.

Commissioner Coyle: But if the -- just to follow up -- if this is a question of efficiency, they must have had some other idea. I mean, how would Governor Ehrlich get airlift if he needed it to put out a fire or to support the National Capitol Region? How was that going to be done without these aircraft?

General Tuxill: Sir, I don't think they took homeland defense into their strategy in assembling the BRAC.

Commissioner Coyle: Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Thank you for your answer to that important issue.

Senator Mikulski, I just have one question. As a member of the Select Committee on Intelligence, would you be concerned about the security risk of consolidating the National Geospatial Agency with the National Security Agency at one location, at Fort Meade? Do you think that risk would be any different if it went to Fort Belvoir?

Senator Mikulski: No, I would not. Essentially, the whole BRAC -- the whole BRAC exercise is one of co-location of national assets. There are those who raise the issue about putting all of our eggs in one basket, but the campus at the -- at Fort Meade is the -- probably one of the most secure military campuses in the world. And I would believe that BRAC's further evaluation, with the Commission's part.

But what I want to bring to the Commission's attention is two things. Number one, the need for a synergistic approach to a -- national technical collections, and then to have them in one state, to be able to do -- to be able to function with this synergy, would be important. Second, the Fort Belvoir thing is going to be a nightmare, to be able to move that NGA out of Bethesda to Fort Belvoir, where there are already 20,000 people going -- it's already a transportation nightmare. And then what is at Fort Belvoir?

And will they be safer at Fort Belvoir than they will be at Fort Meade? I think they'll be safer at Fort Meade.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, Senator.

Senator Mikulski: And I think the country will be safer having them together.

General Newton: Yes, for -- General, you mentioned the other services collaborating with you during the process. During that collaboration, was there discussion on homeland security by the other services?

General Tuxill: Yes, sir, there was, especially with the Army and the Army National Guard, and that was to make sure that we arrayed forces in the Army National Guard and missions throughout the states that would be complementary to the homeland defense mission.

General Newton: Very good. Thank you.

Chairman Principi: Well, again, I wish to thank everyone -- Governor Ehrlich, Senator Sarbanes, Senator Mikulski, Congressman -- for your testimony. Senator Sarbanes, thank you, as the senior Senator, for making all of the arrangements, and to all of you for your warm welcome to Maryland.

And I also received a call from some -- from Congressman Hoyer, who expressed these same sentiments. And he regretted he couldn't be here. And I just wanted to note that for the record, that we had a conversation.

Again, our sincere thanks to all of you.

[Applause.]

[Pause.]

STATE TESTIMONY - DELAWARE

Chairman Principi: Good morning, ladies and gentleman. I will begin. Can I have your attention, please? Good morning. We'll begin our second round.

I'm Anthony Principi, Chairman of the BRAC Commission. I'm accompanied by General Lloyd Newton, United States Air Force, General Sue Turner, the Honorable Philip Coyle.

It's a great pleasure to welcome the Delaware delegation -- Governor Ruth Ann Minner, Senator Biden, Senator Carper, and Congressman Castle.

It's -- I will, please, ask you to rise. The Base Realignment and Closure Statute requires that all witnesses be sworn in.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Chairman Principi: Good morning, Governor. You may proceed.

TESTIMONY OF HON. RUTH ANN MINNER, GOVERNOR OF DELAWARE

Governor Minner: Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much for allowing us to join you today and present our side of the story for the BRAC Commission. To you and to the commissioners, good morning.

I'm Ruth Ann Minner, Governor of the State of Delaware.

Thank you for convening the hearing today to discuss the Department of Defense BRAC recommendations to realign the New Castle County Air Guard Station, in New Castle County, Delaware.

Before I begin, I hope you will accept a report which goes into great detail regarding the problems with the recommendations to realign the Delaware Air National Guard.

Delaware's congressional delegation and I present some of the highlights of this report, including the negative impact on homeland security discrepancies with methods and models, dissatisfaction with the enclave concept, and the negative impacts on personnel and mission capabilities.

Before I speak about specific impacts on Delaware state militia and the state's economy, I would like to recognize first Delaware's adjutant general, General Frank Vavala; our assistant adjutant general, General Hugh Boomall, and our New Castle county executive, Chris Coons. There are many other Delawareans who have traveled with us on this rainy morning to support our efforts, as well.

I am testifying today, not only as the governor, but also as the commander-in-chief of the Delaware National Guard. The Delaware National Guard is, by design of our forefathers, a federal/state organization. In addition to the authority provided by the Congress -- by the Constitution, Congress established laws to protect this dual

role. Both Title 10 and Title 32 of the U.S. Code require that the states be provided with a reliable state militia, including personnel and equipment, to respond to the state's needs.

In my recent letter to you, Mr. Chairman, and within the report, I provide details regarding the sections of the law and the Supreme Court precedents that apply to both. These laws also mandate the Department of Defense consult with the governor about alternatives to the National Guard.

But, in fact, the Air Force did not consult with me, nor my adjutant general, throughout their process, or about the final DOD recommendations.

If the Air Force had consulted, we would have explained the geography of our state, the critical dual mission of the National Guard, its contributions to the economies of Delaware and New Castle County, and its key homeland security functions.

If they had consulted, I would tell them what I say to you now. As the commander-in-chief of the Delaware National Guard, I do not consent to the realignment of Delaware's Air National Guard. The personnel, the equipment, the training, the expertise of the Delaware National Guard are just too critical in fighting the war on terror and protecting our region.

Yesterday's terror bombings in London further

emphasized the need to maintain a robust, coordinated emergency response system. The increase of the national threat level to code orange for mass transit systems meant that in Delaware we deployed police to the state bus system and Amtrak and the SEPTA regional train system. If our transit system had similarly been affected, Delaware's homeland security response would be crippled without the resources provided by the New Castle County Air Guard Station.

This is a theme that you will hear repeatedly throughout our presentation today, because it is a real concern for us as we work to protect the citizens of Delaware and our region.

In addition to my legal disapproval and concerns about emergency response, I would like to point out the Commission's shortcomings in the Air Force analysts and the way they did their final selection criteria, number six, and the economic impact on the local community.

As governor, I'm responsible for the economic well-being of our state, and am concerned that while DOD was charged with studying the local economic impacts, the Air Force model did not capture critical impacts to job and to revenues.

While the number of factors led to their miscalculations, the two that are of the most concern to me

are the utilization of an inconsistent metropolitan statistical area and the omission of traditional Guard personnel from the calculations. The Air Force chose to calculate our indirect job losses by using the Dover Air Force MSA, which breaks with the DOD's longstanding and more appropriate practice of using Philadelphia MSA. The result was a much lower indirect job loss than will really occur.

The Air Force also miscalculated our direct job losses, most notably the traditional National Guard, those who also work for civilian companies in our community. Since these personnel are technically part time, the Air Force model did not account for any of those job losses. These traditional Guard personnel train with the full-time personnel, and are deployed with the full-time personnel. To not include these lost positions in the assessment of economic impact is both a flaw in the Air Force model and a disappointment to our very proud National Guard.

By running a complete analysis on the total job loss using the correct MSA, Delaware would see a reduction of 685 direct and indirect employees, not the 250 the Department of Defense reported.

Finally, I'll leave you with a few statistics about the revenue generator that the New Castle County Air Base is. Delaware's National Guard and their families are an integral part of our communities, giving of their time to the

betterment of their hometowns and communities, our state, but also our nation. Each year, New Castle County Air Guard Base brings New Castle County \$27.8 million in federal funds for salaries and maintenance costs. Based on the job-loss estimates, the current proposal would yield a reduction of \$15.2 million for salaries alone.

The Air Guard also spends a considerable amount of money in the local economy by patronizing our local businesses for further services, and by contracting. During the course of the past three years, the Guard issued \$13.5 million in outside contracts. That kind of spending will be dramatically reduced if the C-130s, the aeromedic evacuation squadron, the aerial port squadron, the firefighters, and the accompanying personnel are realigned.

Thank you, again, for convening this hearing and affording us the time to present both data and discuss our concerns with the models and the process. We hope you take that into consideration and show that the miscalculations by the Air Force and prove the need for Delaware's Air National Guard.

I'd be happy to take any questions, if there are any.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, Governor.

Governor Minner: If there are no questions, then let me introduce a former governor and our congressman now, Congressman Mike Castle.

TESTIMONY OF HON. MICHAEL CASTLE, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM  
DELAWARE

Rep. Castle: Good morning. Chairman Principi, Dr. Coyle, Generals Turner and Newton, thank you for making time for us.

Governor Minner has touched on some of the serious legal flaws in the Air Force's recommendations. I would like to briefly highlight some of the significant mistakes and data inaccuracies our team discovered in the Air Force's assessment of this base's military value. When corrected, these mistakes lead to a dramatic change in New Castle's Mission Compatibility Index ranking, taking us from a ranking of 120 out of 154 to number 26.

Let me start by making it very clear that Joe and Tom -- Senator Biden and Senator Carper and I have consistently supported BRAC. I think it is a good process, and that it can work. I know you will agree that an important part of this process is the opportunity for those local officials and military personnel who know the bases best to analyze the data. Your staff is doing a good job of investigating the Department's recommendations, and we hope to provide additional assistance.

Our staff has given the Air Force's metrics a good scrubbing. We've had military specialists, engineers, and an MBNA -- a large bank in Delaware -- computer systems

architect going over these numbers for the last two months.

Let me be very clear. We have gone out of our way to work within the process, and to use the Department's own methodology. The Assistant Adjutant General for Air, Brigadier General Hugh Broomall, as a state official, has verified that the calculations and analysis utilized in our report used Department of Defense models where applicable, and has certified that the data presented is factual and accurate.

The Air Force based much of their decision-making on a quantitative series of metrics called the Mission Compatibility Index, MCI, for each of the eight mission areas. In reviewing the airlift assessment for New Castle County, significant mistakes and out-of-date data were discovered in three of the eight criteria, leading to a dramatic change in New Castle's ranking.

I would like to quickly highlight three of the most glaring examples of where the Air Force failed to use accurate data in considering our base's capabilities.

First, one of the most obvious inaccuracies in the Department's recommendations is found in its evaluation of our ramp and parking apron. Here, the Department's closing date for collecting data on pavement quality was September 30th, 2003. At that time, New Castle County's ramp and parking apron were undergoing significant construction. By

September 2004, after the completion of extensive \$17.2 million renovation projects, major improvements have been made to our runways and military ramp, significantly improving their condition and weight-bearing capabilities.

This is what the runway and parking apron looked like when the Air Force collected its data, preconstruction, in September of 2003. And here are two slides depicting what it looks like today, following the extensive \$17.2 million renovations. As you can see, the condition of the runway and parking apron has drastically improved since 2003.

New Castle is unique, in that ours is the only Guard C-130 base that has put in a new runway and parking apron since the Air Force collected its information. Unfortunately, the Air Force collected its data before this \$17 million project was complete; and, thus, its evaluation is flawed and entirely out of date. Our analysis indicates the new runway and parking apron increase our score to 75 points, which leads to an airlift MCI increase of 4.48 points.

Second, in calculating our base's proximity to landing zones, the Air Force gave New Castle zero credit. In reality, New Castle claims two landing zones, incorporated at our very base, which have long been used by the Air Force and Air National Guard units from both Delaware and Maryland for air-crew training. Again, this miscalculation is likely

the result of the Air Force's failure to properly analyze the base since completion of extensive renovations.

This diagram of the New Castle airfield indicates the location of the two landing zones. Our newest landing zone was completed as part of a joint runway repair project between the FAA and the Air National Guard. It is a 3500-foot-by-60-foot zone, and has a flush-mounted lighting system that can be configured to simulate a variety of landing scenarios in daytime or evening. It is utilized for night assault landing and night-vision-goggle assault landing training. Both landing zones are regional assets that have been utilized by both Maryland and Delaware Air National Guard C-130 units. Including this important information would increase our score by 27.42 points, leading to an MCI score increase of 4.03.

The last clear example of how the Air Force miscalculated New Castle's military value is in its assessment of the base's ability to support transient C-17s and C-5s. As this picture demonstrates, the base can support six C-17 aircraft on the military ramp. New Castle should have received credit for being able to accommodate six C-17s, but this information was apparently overlooked. Despite New Castle County's regular support of both C-5 and C-17 aircraft for various missions, the base received zero points in this category.

As you can see, over the past three years New Castle County has afforded a C-5 or C-17 aircraft on numerous occasions. New Castle's ability to handle larger aircraft should have scored 100 points, leading to an overall MCI increase of 2.2.

As shown in these comprehensive charts -- the details of which have been provided to your staff -- when combined with several other miscalculations we have been able to identify, New Castle would move to an airlift rank of 26 out of 154 bases evaluated.

I would also be remiss if I didn't mention how unconvinced I am of the new enclave concept. In order to consolidate squadrons, the Air Force has proposed removing the flying unit from New Castle County Air Guard Base, but leaving the engineers, security forces, and communications people in place, creating something called an enclave base.

Twenty-two other Air Guard bases are also becoming enclaves, yet it is not clear that an enclave base can even support military or civilian combat units, and there is no evidence that the Air Force has provided any budgeting adjustments to sustain these uncertain bases. As Governor Minner already mentioned, this proposal dramatically impedes our state's ability to respond to natural disasters and terrorist threats. As the former governor of Delaware, I have a hard time understanding how an Air Guard enclave base

without air capabilities can be effectively utilized in meeting our homeland security needs.

Moving the eight C-130s out of New Castle County Airport would leave the state of Delaware and four other states without an Air Guard flying unit. In addition, without the expertise of the Air Guard firefighters, New Castle County Airport would no longer be available to accommodate larger aircraft or to continue to serve as a critical emergency landing site for five of the nation's busiest airports. This proposal would eventually strip our state of the extremely experienced and talented guardsmen who have, for years, made our base among the best in the nation. It is not at all clear that enclaved personnel will stay in Air Guard units that do not have airplanes or regular contact with air operations. By disconnecting the Air Guard personnel from aircraft, the entire nature of the organization will be changed. With military recruitment and retention already under tremendous stress, I strongly believe we should question any proposal that would shift personnel out of the highly population density area and replace them with such an ambiguous solution.

I'm also very concerned that the enclave concept appears to be an effort to close bases while circumventing the BRAC process. We have seen no evidence that the Air Force has made any adjustments to its budgeting policies to

accommodate the enclave concept. For a base without a mission and greatly reduced personnel, it appears the current system would provide minimal funds.

Air Force documents indicate that the enclaves were an afterthought proposed with little research or analysis. This is an idea that was poorly contrived, and there is no evidence that enclaves will actually serve the needs of states. As a former member of the House Select Committee on Intelligence, I can tell you that stripping this densely populated high-threat region of all tactical airlift and replacing it with a vague and missionless enclave unit is an enormous step backwards in our efforts to enhance national security.

The Department's recommendations deviate significantly from the BRAC military-value criteria, and the miscalculations and inaccuracies we have identified deserve a closer look. I have been to Iraq, and I understand the tremendous service this base and the brave men and women who volunteer their time are providing in our country. New Castle is very important to the citizens of our state and to the entire region.

Again, thank you for coming here today, and please let us know what we can do to assist you in this very difficult task.

I now will turn it over to Senator Carper for a more

thorough discussion of New Castle's homeland security mission.

Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF HON. THOMAS R. CARPER, U.S. SENATOR FROM  
DELAWARE

Senator Carper: Thank you, Congressman Castle. And to Secretary Principi, to our members of the Commission, to our staff that are together here today, just thank you very much for providing all of us from Delaware with this opportunity to share our perspectives with you this morning.

Thanks even more for your willingness to set aside your personal lives, and, in some cases, your personal careers, in order to undertake these responsibilities, which are daunting and, I know, enormously time consuming. The work that you are doing is important. Important to our nation. We have too many bases. We have a budget deficit that's far too large. We need to better align those bases and our military assets with the threats that we face in the 21st-century world in which we live.

By way of introduction, I have been privileged to serve as a naval flight officer for five years, flew active duty during the Vietnam War, for another 18 years as a naval flight officer reservist up at Willow Grove, Pennsylvania, with BP-66. I preceded Mike Castle, serving in the U.S. House with two members of the Commission with whom you

serve. I have been privileged to be the governor and commander-in-chief of the Delaware National Guard for eight years, and now serve as Joe Biden's junior Senator in the U.S. -- United States Senate.

What I'd like to do is focus, for the next few minutes, on the issue of homeland security. And if we could get a slide up here that actually shows -- and I am going to read, in part, something that deals with the military-value final selection criteria two. I'm not going to read it all, but I'm going to read part of it. It says, "Military-value final selection criteria two calls on us to consider this: the availability and condition of land, facilities, and associated airspace, including staging areas for the use of the Armed Forces in homeland defense missions at both existing and potential receiving locations."

The recommendations for the Delaware Air National Guard deviate substantially from this second military-value criterion. These recommendations fail to meet the needs of our nation and, we believe, of our state.

Military-value criteria two makes specific mention of the need to provide staging areas for homeland defense missions. The analysis supporting the New Castle Air Guard recommendation did not consider that need. The proposed realignment would, in my view, harm the security of our region and my state, and let me take a minute or two and

explain why.

First, DOD's recommendations result in no tactical airlift in the mid-Atlantic region. You'll see from this map -- the map shows that the recommendations for C-130 squadron realignment would result in no C-130 squadrons from Rhode Island, in the north, to North Carolina, in the south. That's no Active Duty, no Reserve, and no Guard squadrons. This leaves vulnerable over 800 miles of our nation's densely populated Northeast Corridor, where some 20 percent of our population -- that's about 60 million people -- live, where many of our largest cities, including this one, Baltimore, New York, Philadelphia, are located, along with our nation's capital. The Department of Defense's recommendations fail to consider the value of tactical airlift capabilities for homeland security.

Two, Delaware is the designated reception site for the Center for Disease Control's pharmaceutical stockpile for region three -- FEMA region three. Delaware is responsible for getting medicine and first-responders into crisis situations here in Baltimore, in Washington, D.C., and in New York City quickly and safely. Even the Army Guard Weapons of Mass Destruction Civil Support Teams plan to travel on C-130s. Why? Because C-130s can literally land on local roads or highways close to where they're needed, while larger planes oftentimes cannot.

When I was privileged to serve as governor of our state, I knew that I had some 300 trained and organized personnel who support the C-130s available immediately to assist our state in the event of an emergency, manmade or natural. This proposed realignment would take away half of that capability. In fact, it would take away half of the entire capability of the Delaware Air National Guard to deal with disasters of all kinds, including flooding, like today, Nor'easters, hurricanes, ice storms, and blizzards, all of which we experienced during my time as governor. This means the Delaware emergency management agencies' evacuation plans for floods and coastal storms would become moot. Without the C-130s, the ability to quickly transport supplies and personnel is diminished.

Port of Wilmington handles over 400 ships a day. Scores of ships move up and down the Delaware River and Bay every day, many carrying hazardous cargoes. We have nuclear power plants that dot our landscape around here, along with chemical plants. The Northeastern Corridor moves hundreds of thousands of people up along its rails during the course of the day. CSX, Norfolk Southern, move large amounts -- quantities of hazardous materials throughout this region. Our ability to respond to emergencies involving any of those is diminished by virtue of this recommendation.

And unlike the time when Mike Castle and I were serving

as governor of Delaware, Governor Minner won't have the C-130s or any of their personnel to assist her if the occasion arises and if this recommendation stands. Instead, she may have to wait up to 72 hours to initiate a response to her emergencies. Today, she can respond within four hours.

Now, DOD calls for the removal of our firefighters, also, from New Castle County Airport. Let me just be clear.

Without these firefighters, the airport cannot be used for larger airplanes or for most military aircraft in a surge or an emergency situation without first providing rated firefighters.

And, third -- and this one really gets me -- the recommendations send our aeromedical evacuation squadron to McGuire. With all due respect, doing so makes no sense. The two Air Reserve aeromedical evaluation squadrons currently at McGuire come to New Castle to do their C-130 training. They need that training to stay current, but they can't do it at McGuire. Why would we send another unit, our unit, to a place, McGuire, where they can't train their own units?

In closing, let me just reiterate that Delaware's second -- the DOD's second military-value criteria, the need for homeland defense, that is -- the BRAC recommendation for the New Castle County Air Base role in regional and homeland defense, does not account either for the impact of the loss

of tactical airlift in our region or the impact on emergency response operations within our region and our state. These recommendations not only deviate substantially from the criteria, but also from a lot of other -- and leave -- but also leave me, and, frankly, a lot of other Delawareans, feeling not more secure, but less secure about the security of our homeland and state.

Closing. You have a lot to consider as you review these recommendations and the appeals of states like our own. I would ask that you keep in mind these questions as you do so.

First of all, Is it legal to strip away all the aircraft without consulting first with the governor and with the Guard leaders of our state or other states similarly affected?

Two, Are the recommendations consistent with BRAC, or is the creation of these enclaves that Congressman Castle spoke to really base closures by another name?

Three, Do these recommendations enhance our readiness in times of war or in time of peace?

Four, Do these recommendations reflect the major investments that Congressman Castle has referred to in runways, in parking lands, in cargo handling facilities, in other operations just in the last year or two?

Five, Are these recommendations likely to save taxpayer

money, or are the savings largely illusory?

And sixth, With the tragic images of the bombings and the murder, the mayhem in London of the last few days, how does this DOD recommendations, and those similar to it -- how do they affect the security of our homeland and the security of our state and our ability to respond to disasters of that kind?

We appreciate very much the opportunity of being here today and thank you for your consideration of our comments and for your service to our country.

It's my pleasure now -- you only get to be a junior Senator if there is a senior Senator, and in the state of Delaware, we're lucky to have one of the best --

Chairman Principi: He was not a governor, is that correct?

Senator Carper: Pardon?

Chairman Principi: He was not a governor? He's the only --

[Laughter.]

Senator Carper: He was not a governor. His name is Joe Biden. He's a stranger to none of you. I'm happy to introduce him at this time.

Joe?

TESTIMONY OF HON. JOSEPH R. BIDEN, U.S. SENATOR FROM  
DELAWARE

Senator Biden: Mr. Chairman, it's true, I was never a governor. I plead guilty. That's why they give me a little more time. Senators take longer to say the same thing.

[Laughter.]

Senator Biden: I -- it's good to see you, Dr. Coyle. Thank you for your help in the past on another very critical issue to us.

I want to begin my statement by diverting slightly in answering the question you asked in the National Guard of Maryland. I think it was you. What, really, did they have in mind? This is just Joe Biden speaking. I know everybody's going to have heart failure here. I think what the Air Force had in mind is, the F-22 is breaking the budget. They can't afford to build any more C-130s. That's what this is all about. I don't think there's any other real reason for it, as I looked at it, in terms of C-130s. That's as honest as I can be. You know me, you know I'm not reluctant to say what I think. I can't prove that. But based on what I'm about to say and what you've heard, I find no good reason for the decision being made here.

And as my mother would say, were she here, to all of you, who signed on to this responsibility, "No purgatory for you. Straight to heaven."

[Laughter.]

Senator Biden: You deserve it. You agreed to do it.

I wouldn't take your job on a bet. But you have a very, very tough job, but obviously very important. And I mean this sincerely, we all mean it, I want to thank you, not only for your service in other capacities, but for your willingness to take on this responsibility. We owe you a debt of gratitude, for real.

As Mike said, we all supported BRAC. I've supported the BRAC round every time it's been around. I think it's necessary. And I think this is necessary, to be able to point out, if appropriate, where they may have made mistakes. And, obviously, you're listening.

I want to point out, first of all, as you've heard, when we went back with our staffs and took a look at the way in which the Air Force came up with the recommendation, we found some very serious flaws.

First, as has been pointed out by the last delegation I caught the tail end of, Maryland's, as well as our governor, the governor wasn't even consulted. After 9/11, we realized that it was critical to improve communications between federal, state, and local governments so that we could enhance our security. And for the Department of Defense to completely disregard the need and the views of the state when making recommendations, quite frankly, is troubling, beyond -- beyond BRAC. It worries me, beyond BRAC. It worries me about the whole homeland security operation,

which is above all of our paygrades right now. In the case of Delaware, Governor Minner is not willing to accept this infringement on her authority as commander-in-chief of the National Guard, as she stated.

Second, the economic impact on the local community was not properly evaluated, as has been pointed out, by using a different metropolitan statistical area than normally used for New Castle County in every other criteria, as our New Castle county executive can tell you ad nauseam, if need be, this is -- has impact, an impact upon the rating. And I don't think it was accidental, quite frankly. The Department deviated from six -- the sixth of the final selection criteria.

And, thirdly, the Air Force did not consider the most accurate and up-to-date data when evaluating New Castle County. I'm not suggesting that was deliberate, but the facts are, as Governor and now Congressman Castle, pointed out, new ramp, new parking apron and runway were under construction when the data was collected. And there were also other mistakes in the use of the data and in the application of the formulas for New Castle County that are detailed in our written report.

But based on all the inaccuracies we discovered in the Airlift Mission Capability Index, New Castle County, as has been pointed out, should have been ranked 26th, not 120 --

26th, not 120 -- using BRAC Commission's criteria. And it goes from the bottom third to the top third. Given the magnitude of the miscalculations, we believe there were substantial deviations from the final selection criteria dealing with military value.

We are also concerned with this enclave concept, as the governor and congressman have pointed out, and we're pleased that you had a hearing last week with the leadership of the Guard to explore this issue more thoroughly, not just as it relates to us, but across the board. A great deal more analysis is needed of how an Air Guard Base with no airplanes can meet the governor's needs, or the Air Force's needs, for that matter. To leave the state of Delaware without an Air Guard flying unit contradicts over 50 years of congressional action and represents the -- a tremendous shift in the concept of the Air Guard. The idea would redesign the Air Guard with -- that we did -- are redesigning the Air Guard with so little consideration or discussion is, quite frankly, incredible, and I think it's unacceptable.

Fourth, as Senator Carper explained just how detrimental realigning New Castle County Air Base would be for regional/state security, I'm just not sure how it makes sense to pull all the tactical airlift out of one region of the country, the only region that's actually been attacked.

I don't get this. The only region that's been attacked, the one region most often referenced as likely to be attacked, and we're going to pull out the only -- all of the tactical airlift capability in that region? I find that mind-boggling.

I was reminded that the Navy Research Lab, at the request of some of us, actually did an analysis. What would happen if one of the 90-ton rail tankers that carry chlorine exploded or leaked? One hundred thousand dead. One hundred thousand dead. There are more chlorine tank cars rolling through this neck of the woods than anyplace in the United States of America. We're going to have no tactical airlift in that entire region representing states that include 20 million people -- I mean, 60 million people? I find it absolutely amazing. To leave the state of Delaware without a flying unit is just beyond my understanding.

But, to be more precise, it makes no sense to pull all tactical airlift out of one region. It's critical that the region be able to field trained response teams with their equipment as quickly as possible. Despite the clear mention in the final military-value criteria two of homeland defense, these recommendations do not -- "do not," emphasize -- do not address homeland security needs. As 9/11 and yesterday's attacks in London show -- and I might add, I'm not now revealing anything secret -- you all know, the CIA

has been telling us for the last two years, the likely attack that's going to come in the United States again will be on rail. We have more people on Amtrak every day than every single airport that flies into the Northeast from Boston to Richmond. And we're going to have no tactical capability in the region?

I think, quite frankly, that we can't afford to treat homeland security like the military stepchild. The people of this country, as you know, expect a lot more.

Fifth, I want to draw your attention to two final areas where failures to meet the final selection criteria -- where, in fact, they failed to meet them -- the final selection criteria. The analysis of manpower implications and savings is one, and the analysis of current and future mission capability.

Now, first let me highlight the failures of the COBRA model in dealing with manpower efficiencies of realignment and the lack of savings. As you all know, savings were largely determined using the COBRA model. I want to be honest with you, when I first looked at this model, it didn't make a lot of sense to me. But we have a great guy, a National Guard member, who is a computer systems architect for the -- now the largest credit-card bank in the world, and he took a look at this and helped us all understand what was really going on in this model. And what we found was

surprising.

One, one of the critical concerns we have with COBRA is that the model appears to base much of its savings on eliminating personnel. This is a very important point. It's based on eliminating personnel. In New Castle, 9.82 million of the 29 million in anticipated savings over five years would come from cutting 26 full-time military positions. In addition, according to a footnote in COBRA, screen five, another 1.4 million comes from eliminating 104 traditional drill positions. So, over 38 percent of the savings, \$11.28 million, is supposed to occur by eliminating personnel or reducing the Guard's end strength.

As you all know, can't do that. Not allowed to do that. It's the law, as they say. The chief of staff of the Air Force and the acting secretary of the Air Force both said publicly, including to this Commission on May 17th, that they were committed to no end-strength changes in the Reserve or Guard. Now, how can there be savings in personnel losses if it publicly keeps the personnel number at the same number, overall? I don't get that.

In addition, section 115 of Title 10 makes it clear -- this is the bad news -- Congress -- Congress -- Congress sets the end strength for the Reserve and the services. As my grandfather would say, "Who died and left them boss?" I don't get it.

In the case of the Guard, we have also made it clear that when we set end strength, it's a minimum level of the force that is supposed to exist. So, in each of the five fiscal years of BRAC, it's unclear how the savings derived from personnel reductions will occur, given that the legally-mandated end strength has not been reduced. Now, maybe they know something I don't know. Maybe they know how my guys and women are going to vote. I don't think so. I don't think so.

GAO has also pointed out, in the July 1 report, saying, on page 124, and I claim -- "Claiming such personnel as BRAC savings without reducing end strength does not provide dollar savings that can be reapplied outside personnel accounts." I'd call that a conundrum. There's a problem here. So, I have a big question about whether COBRA results in real savings or imaginary savings.

Another concern I have about the COBRA model is that it completely failed to calculate the large number of Guard personnel who will not move. The model does a great job in anticipating the cost of moving Active Duty personnel from place to place, but it fails to capture how National Guards work. As all of you know, members of the Guards are also members of the community. Most of them get only 20 percent of their salary from Guard work. These folks are not going to pick up and move 305 miles away to New Orleans, or 518

miles away to North Carolina.

To get a better appreciation of this impact, the Guard leadership at Delaware did a survey after the announcement of the BRAC recommendations. I think this slide will show it. The slide shows the result of that survey. Fifty-eight percent of the operations squadron, 80 percent of the maintenance squadrons, 70 percent of the aeromedical squadron, 21 percent of the firefighters, 80 percent of the aerial port squadron would not stay. That's an average of 75 percent of the personnel impacted choosing to leave the Guard, or 392 personnel with an average of 15 years of experience.

I thought we were having trouble meeting the end strength of the Guard. I thought we were having trouble maintaining the Guard. What are we doing here? It makes sense if you're going to move, quote, "full-time military." They get up and pack. They pack their families and leave. That's what the COBRA model is about. But the COBRA model does not -- does not accurately reflect -- not only in my state, but I respect any Guard unit.

These experienced personnel will be lost to the Air Force and the nation, which means there will be a cost to train and replace those personnel, which is not considered in any of this.

This next slide shows a conservative estimate of those

training costs. The cost per position was determined by using Air Force specialty-code training cost, salary cost, travel/per-diem cost, and basic military training cost. It does not include cost associated with recruiting, upgrade training, or other personnel expenses. And if you'll notice in our -- I don't have time to go into it, but if you see our total proposal, the bases to which these units are going are not at full strength themselves, so they're below 90 percent. They're going to have to go out and find folks to fill these positions. That costs money.

As you can see, instead of saving \$29 million when basic assessments of the need to train replacement personnel are calculated, the realignment of New Castle County ends up costing the nation -- costing the nation -- over 5.4 million. Not saving. Costing.

So, when I look at this analysis and this recommendation, it seems to me that it completely fails to account for the way in which community-based Guard operates.

And it appears to generate savings from end-strength reductions that aren't supposed to exist. These failures in the COBRA model mean that there will -- there will not be -- emphasize "will not be" -- any savings from this recommendation. Instead, it's like to cost the Federal Government \$5 million. These problems are serious and substantial deviations from the fourth and fifth of the

final selection criteria.

I also want to draw your attention to a more basic deviation from the selection criteria. At no point in this analysis was there any consideration of the very real capabilities of New Castle County Air Guard Base in providing today's missions.

I won't read the next two slides. I'll just give you a minute to take a look at what's happened since September 11th in the Delaware National Guard and its Active Duty part of the fight. We've deployed over 1,600 people to 59 locations, we've flown 8,000 hours, with the 92 mission -- 92 percent mission-capable rate in theater. And one that I'm very proud of, as of May 31, 2004, 19 percent of the Delaware's Air Guard had volunteered or been mobilized for service. That's third highest in the United States of America. Not only have we been part of the fight all along over the past four years, the 166th Airlift Wing has been recognized for its excellence and receiving awards, as is shown on this slide. Suffice it to say, ladies and gentlemen, this indicates a level of experience that is not accounted for in Air Force evaluations.

So, I look at these facts and what the 166th has been doing, and I know that they're vital, and they're vital to the current mission. I do not understand how that can be ignored when considering the first military-value criteria.

As an initial survey result chart showed, the average years of service for all categories is over 15 years. That means something. The -- that experience is why the 166th Airlift Wing's safety and reliability records exceeds the Active Duty and Air National Guard averages for all C-130s.

For example, for every 100,000 hours flown, the Active Duty is 16 times more likely than the Air Guard to have a class-A flying accident. That's an accident that leads to over a million dollars' worth of damage. In Delaware, New Castle County air crews have managed an astounding 155,000 accident-free hours over the past 43 years. That's a real savings, ladies and gentlemen, real capabilities that have not been measured. But it means something very real today.

I've been in and out of Iraq five times now, and I can tell you that it's getting harder and harder to drive supplies from one area to another, as many of you well know.

C-130 missions are literally -- are literally savings lives today by reducing the number of truck convoys. And having experienced air crews and maintainers makes that more probable that it will be done well.

If we lose all these experienced personnel, it will have a negative impact on the mission-capable rates, crew availability for at least the next five years, as new personnel are trained. And, even then, you cannot produce an airman with 15 years experience in five years. By not

considering any of this, the Department of Defense recommendations deviate substantially, in my view, from the first military-value criteria.

Let me conclude. The recommendations for New Castle County will not save money. It will cost the Air Force money, because personnel are not being let go and new people will need to be trained to replace those in the receiving bases. In addition, the recommendations fail to consider the impact on current and future mission capability of losing experienced personnel with a record of excellent performance.

When we look at the first six of the final eight selection criteria, we believe that there were substantial deviations from the analysis of New Castle County Air Base, and we hope that you will reverse this recommendation.

I want to point out one other thing that was not originally in my presentation. And I'm trying to find it here. It's in our -- it's in our report, on page 31. It says "questionable shifts in data." And I'm reading from our report, "In the Air Force Base Closure Executive Group meeting March 10, '05, the review of scenario showed New Castle County in category five," meaning no savings would be generated. In Acting Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisitions, Technology, and Logistics Michael Wayne's data update, on April 14th, 2005, New Castle County is shown as

having a negative net present value, or no savings, and a payback of over 100 years. A mere month later, however, the Department of Defense recommended the realignment, and stated that there would be a 20-year net savings of \$120 million.

After two years of work and analysis, something changed in the very last month of DOD and the BRAC process. As I said, I suspect it's figuring out, How do you pay for the F-22s? I don't know, I may be wrong about that. But something happened on the way to the forum. Something happened on the way to the forum.

You know, we tried to show you today that the Delaware Air National Guard lives up to one of our state's nicknames, Small Wonder. They are a small unit, but they provide a tremendous amount of military value at a time when our nation needs experienced and dedicated defenders.

On behalf of myself and my colleagues here today, I want to thank you again for hearing our case. And I sincerely mean it, I want to thank you for your service on this Commission. And, as you might say, may the facts guide you.

I thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Chairman Principi: Thank you very -- thank you very much.

Governor, Senator Biden, Senator Carper, Congressman Castle, we very, very much appreciate your testimony. Very, very insightful, very, very helpful in our deliberations. Thank you.

No questions.

[Pause.]

STATE TESTIMONY -- NEW JERSEY

Chairman Principi: Good morning. We'll begin momentarily.

It's a pleasure to welcome Senator Corzine, Senator Lautenberg, members of the congressional delegation to this morning's hearing on the Base Realignment and Closure recommendations.

In accordance with the Base Realignment and Closure Statute, I would ask the representatives from the state of New Jersey to please stand for the administration of the oath.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

The State of New Jersey has been allotted two hours, and I will turn it over to Senator Corzine to begin.

TESTIMONY OF HON. JON S. CORZINE, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY

Senator Corzine: Thank you, Chairman Principi and to the other commissioners -- Coyle, Turner -- and staff. Let

me thank you for your service to our nation, not only in what you're doing today, which is a Herculean task in running the BRAC Commission, but also for your lifetime of service to our nation and the nation's defense. On behalf of the people of the state of the New Jersey, we share your dedication to that security, to the defense of our nation, and, most importantly, and most intensely.

At this moment, the war on terrorism, the defense of our nation is a priority second to none. And this moment in time, I think, makes the decisions that were taken in this context more important than almost anyone can imagine. And I will remind you that New Jersey lost 700 of its citizens during the 9/11 attack. We've lost 58 men and women in the defense of this country, in Iraq and Afghanistan missions.

As recently as six weeks ago, 65 percent of New Jersey's National Guard was on Active Duty -- a high percentage of those, in Iraq. We take this seriously. And we think and understand the importance of the decisions that will be taken by the BRAC Commission.

And as citizens of the nation, we accept that critical call to optimize fulfilling our military mission through effective and productive allocation of resources. We take that deeply seriously. We also want that considered in the context of how we protect our warfighters on the ground, day in and day out.

My colleagues who will testify today in New Jersey's congressional delegation in a bipartisan perspective, a common perspective, believe the case for sustainment of New Jersey's military roles and missions is critical for the nation's security and defense. We applaud the Department of Defense's decision and recommendations with respect to continuing growing a number of our missions out at Picatinny Arsenal, at our megabase in Fort Dix, McGuire Air Force Base, Lakehurst Naval Air Station. I'm pleased with the recognition of the role of 177 Fighter Wing in Atlantic City and the strategic needs of our own naval weapons station. These are all important things.

And I do want to add that our governor, who had a conflict, was not able to be here today, has submitted an extensive commentary and written form, which I will submit to you, I think all of you have, but -- have a copy of. I want to make sure you have that.

As you can well understand, though, while we feel good about the positive decisions, we uniformly, all of us, across all regional lines, political lines, and others, do reject the analysis and recommendation to close Fort Monmouth. We believe this decision is inconsistent with the criteria laid out for the Commission to examine. We believe it's inconsistent with the safety and security of our men in the field, for our warfighters today.

We believe Fort Monmouth is a home to a center of excellence in R&D, cutting-edge efforts on that C4ISR technology mission. And, in fact, we believe this is a realtime mistake, particularly in the context of the men and women who are on the ground who need the equipment today to avoid the tragedy of roadside bombs. We believe that this undermines our nation's long-term security by putting at risk the intellectual capital that drives tomorrow's technologically focused military and homeland defense. A lot of that work is done at Fort Monmouth.

My colleagues will be much more detailed, much more specific about some of those elements, but New Jersey has the most highly educated and developed science and technology community in the nation. We have a comparative advantage, and we would hope that that will be emphasized as we go forward today.

I think I'll turn it over to my colleague, Senator Frank Lautenberg. We believe we have a strong case to make to you on the quality of the technological skills of people who work every day at Fort Monmouth.

TESTIMONY OF HON. FRANK R. LAUTENBERG, U.S. SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY

Senator Lautenberg: Thanks very -- thanks very much, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. I'm pleased to be here with my colleagues in government, particularly my friend and

colleague from the Senate, Jon Corzine. And I think Jon has laid out for us what -- the parameters of the situation, really saying, "If it ain't broke, why fix it?"

Now, I so much appreciate the opportunity to explain why we need to keep Fort Monmouth open as a vital military installation, but look at the opportune moment that we're meeting. We've just seen a tragedy in London that reminds us about the vulnerability of the civilian side of this fight that we're in. We recently lost a helicopter to a weapon that Fort Monmouth has worked on for some time, and that is to avoid, or at least warn, that a missile or a weapon is -- has been fired at an airplane.

And, for me, in some ways, a personal issue, very quickly, I served at Fort Monmouth during -- enlisted at Fort Monmouth in World War II, and it's changed a lot. And one thing is -- remains the same; it's still critical to our national security. The scientists, the researchers at Fort Monmouth have a central mission; they devise solutions that save lives. And if we put ourselves for a moment in the shoes of a soldier in Iraq, and you're riding in a Humvee, and on the road from Baghdad to the airport we see a concrete cinder block -- when I was there, I saw, believe it or not, a dead dog that had wires protruding from its body alongside the road; it was an explosive device.

And you all know that IEDs are the deadliest weapons

being used against our soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan. They're responsible for more than half of all the combat casualties this year. Since May 1st, 2003, IEDs have killed nearly 440 American soldiers, including 14 from the state of New Jersey. Our soldiers face this threat every hour of every day. So, Fort Monmouth developed a high-profile system called the Warlock Jammer, which thwarts radio signals to detonate IEDs.

There are currently 80 engineers at Fort Monmouth working to develop and hone in on the technologies that will enable our troops to neutralize and defeat IEDs. So, when a soldier is riding down the road in Iraq, he isn't riding alone. And that's one example of how Fort Monmouth is finding solutions that save lives.

Another is that if you're in the middle of a firefight in an urban environment, there's a situation where there are no trenches, no clear lines, no easy way to keep track of who's a friend and who's an enemy. That situation can be confusing and terrifying. But, fortunately for our soldiers, the scientists at Fort Monmouth have developed a system to prevent friendly fire from occurring. Blue Force Tracking uses satellite links to show, on computer screens inside vehicles and command posts, where friendly and enemy positions are located. And this information has saved countless lives by enabling our soldiers to fight on the

move, to know where members of their own unit are, and to react quicker than opposing forces.

And a final example is riding in a helicopter, like the one that went down in Afghanistan last week with 17 aboard.

And you know the enemy wants to shoot you down. But, fortunately, Fort Monmouth is developing technology that automatically alerts helicopter pilots when they have been targeted by enemy radar, and instantly releases flares to confuse heat-seeking missiles.

Now, all of these things come in to tell you that this is a fight that we have to continue to wage as ardously as we can. New Jersey has one of the highest concentrations of scientific brainpower in the United States. And if we close this facility, even if it's transferred elsewhere, you lose the momentum of this valuable resource.

So, I think that closing this facility is inopportune, at the least. Don't close it now. Leave an -- we can discuss it later. Saving money is important, but we don't save money when we spend it on the necessary things to keep our troops protected in Iraq and Afghanistan. We don't think about saving money there, and we shouldn't think about it here. Please, don't disrupt the development of these crucial items of protection for all Americans, in uniform and out of uniform. The time is terrible. And I hope that you won't take this precipitous move and permit it to

continue.

TESTIMONY OF HON. GERALD TARANTOLO, MAYOR OF EATONTOWN, NEW  
JERSEY

Mayor Tarantolo: Chairman Principi, members of the BRAC Commission, I recognize the Commission has a difficult job in evaluating the Secretary's proposed list of base closures, and I want to personally thank you for the work you're doing on behalf of our country.

Thank you for affording me the opportunity to address the Commission on behalf of the Fort Monmouth host communities of Eatontown, Oceanport, Tinton Falls, Shrewsbury Borough, and Little Silver.

I am here as spokesperson for the mayors of each of these communities, and naturally we're deeply concerned for the adverse impact that the closing of Fort Monmouth will have on our municipalities. And my presence here today is to express that concern and present data supporting that concern.

Each of the mayors are active members of the Save Our Fort Committee, and our presentation focuses on item six of the final selection criteria -- namely, the economic impact of existing communities in the vicinity of military installations.

Our counterparts on the Save the Fort Committee, the Patriots Alliance, will address the military-value component

of the final selection criteria in a few minutes.

First, it's appropriate that I define for you what I mean by "host community." The five host communities either immediately border Fort Monmouth, such as Little Silver and Shrewsbury, which make up the northern border of Fort Monmouth's main post, or have portions of Fort Monmouth within our geographic boundaries, such as Eatontown and Oceanport, which each have about 500 acres, and Tinton Falls, which has about 200 acres.

The presence of Fort Monmouth has played an integral part of our community's historical, cultural, and economical makeup. Time prevents me from addressing the historical and cultural aspects of our relationships. Over the past 80-plus years, I assume that that relation was extremely positive and an integral element in our community fabric.

Again, the time element prevents me from articulating the economic details that I would like the BRAC Commission to consider as criteria for removing Fort Monmouth from the closure list. This detail is outlined in the report commissioned by the five host communities which was prepared by Jeffrey Donohoe Associates.

Recognizing that the time element might prevent us from presenting the study details, we arranged in advance to discuss our report with BRAC Commission staff members earlier this week. Our thanks to Gary Dinsick, Army team

leader, and members of his staff, Wesley Wood and Elizabeth Bieri, for taking the time to allow us to provide the economic data that clearly shows closing Fort Monmouth would have a devastating impact on our communities, our county and state.

The analysis of the data presented in the report indicates loss of jobs to our residents. Thirteen-hundred-and-twenty-five Fort Monmouth employees live in five host communities. Estimates indicate that Fort Monmouth employees pump \$260 million annually into the local, county, and state economy. Residential and nonresidential tax revenues are at risk. Taxes will increase. Unemployment in the host communities could increase by up to nine and a half percent. And loss of military contracts is obviously a major factor.

These are some of the highlights noted in the report, and we will continue to pursue our data gathering and provide the Commission with our findings if they are germane to our case.

Mr. Dinsick suggested this at our meeting on Tuesday, when he described our effort as an extension of the BRAC Commission's analysis. We accept that responsibility and will be diligent in that effort.

In closing, we feel that some aspects of DOD's BRAC evaluation were blatantly flawed, and we should -- they

should be reviewed by the Commission's analyst. Some of these areas are: the Secretary deviated on criteria one, where Fort Monmouth was rated significantly higher than Aberdeen Proving Ground on four of the benchmark five issues.

We're confident that the Commission will evaluate the data that clearly supports removing Fort Monmouth from the closure list. That conclusion was reached on two prior occasions, and we hope the Commission will maintain their 1,000 batting average by going three for three.

On behalf of the five Fort Monmouth host communities, thank you for this opportunity to present our case.

TESTIMONY OF HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE  
FROM NEW JERSEY

Rep. Smith: Mr. Secretary -- Chairman and Members of the Commission, my name is Chris Smith. I am the dean of the delegation and a 13 member of the House -- 13-term member.

Ten years ago, Mr. Secretary, the Pentagon recommended that Navy Lakehurst be closed -- radically realigned "to almost nothing" was the euphemism that was employed at the time. However, citing deep concern over the brain drain in the niche realm of aircraft launch and recovery, as well as the erroneous cost savings that melted like butter under scrutiny, BRAC '95 agreed with us, by a vote of seven to

one, that Navy Lakehurst was of high military value and that its closure would be catastrophic to naval aviation.

Today, with more than 3,000 highly skilled employees, artisans, engineers, and the like, and with more than 82 million in MILCON and warfighting enhancing projects that we've put into the base over the last decade, Navy Lakehurst stands out as a world-class, one-of-a-kind facility.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, as you know, aircraft carriers exist for one essential purpose, to safely and effectively launch and recover mission aircraft in order to project power, in order to win battles and wars, and to assist in humanitarian crises, as we saw in the tsunami-ravaged Aceh, when action by the sailors aboard the USS Abraham Lincoln saved countless lives.

One of my older brothers was an A-7 carrier pilot on the USS Enterprise. Every time the steam catapult launched his jet, every time the tail hook on his Corsair snagged the wire rope on deck instantly stopping tons of steel and fuel at high speed, Navy Lakehurst was responsible for the complicated engineering feat that ensured that all of this got done safely for him and for thousands of our pilots.

Navy Lakehurst clearly is on the cutting edge of new products and designs, like the Electromagnetic Aircraft Launching System, or EMALS, the successor to steam catapults, and the advance arresting gear that will reduce

airframe stress, lengthen aircraft service life, and improve safety. EMALS and the AAG are critical components of the CVN-21 next-generation carrier program.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, DOD's recommendations to merge Navy Lakehurst with two other contiguous installations, Fort Dix and McGuire, is enthusiastically welcomed and embraced, and reflects the concept of jointness some of us have been aggressively pursuing for years. With your imprimatur, New Jersey's new megabase is poised to become the first and only tri-service joint base in the United States, and I believe you can make it even stronger.

The next panel will be making a compelling case as to why a modestly-scaled-down, almost contiguous Fort Monmouth would attach neatly and, we believe, seamlessly to the proposed new joint base. Fort Monmouth and its unique mission, if moved to Aberdeen, however, is likely to experience serious brain drain and an experience factor that cannot be replicated overnight. And this is not unlike the case we made ten years ago to avert the shutdown of Lakehurst.

Fort Monmouth is already using the joint facilities of the megabase on its ranges at Fort Dix, and has been doing so for over 30 years as an aviation C4ISR tenant at Lakehurst. Here, you have a chance to do something good, really good, to save Fort Monmouth and to promote jointness.

Moving Fort Monmouth to Aberdeen, on the other hand, could undo a going joint concern.

Mr. Chairman, for the record, the 42,000 New Jersey-proposed megabase will be an un-encroached facility surrounded by over 60,000 acres of protected land that has the further advantage built-in of either restricted or controlled airspace. For homeland security purposes, the joint base is within 300 miles of 25 percent of the U.S. population and provides a venue for co-location of assets to defend against attacks. Today, 25 cost-reducing tenants, including the National Guard, DOJ, and Coast Guard, all call Lakehurst or Fort Monmouth -- or Fort Dix, I should say, or McGuire home. I believe -- we believe that this base will be an incubator for best joint practices.

Finally, let me say a brief word concerning the DOD recommendation to retire two flying squadrons of the 108th Air Refueling Wing from McGuire, which we believe is a patently absurd suggestion that flies in the face of good management and military value. My friend and colleague, Jim Saxton, will elaborate on this later, but the New Jersey megabase again offers far more, not less, operational and training synergies. Moreover, the recommendation fails to appreciate the \$70 million Tanker Wing infrastructure that would be abandoned and the difficulty receiving stations will have in recruiting the personnel to support the

mission.

I thank you for your kind attention.

Chairman Principi: I'll leave it up to you how you want to proceed.

TESTIMONY OF HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR., U.S. REPRESENTATIVE  
FROM NEW JERSEY

Rep. Pallone: Oh, yeah, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. I'm Congressman Frank Pallone, and I think I'm next. And this will be the Fort Monmouth presentation --

Chairman Principi: Okay.

Rep. Pallone: -- specifically.

Commissioners, I've been a member of Congress for 17 years, and during every round of BRAC the Department of Defense always fails to understand the significance of R&D facilities. This is not just moving troops from one base to another; we're talking about a highly advance-degreed civilian workforce. And these people have worked to create a synergy in their field that is second to none. Most will simply not move, and the cost of reconstructing lab facilities and reconstituting a high-tech workforce will be tremendous.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Pentagon violated the BRAC criteria in recommending that Fort Monmouth be closed.

They ignored the brain drain that would make it impossible to perform the Fort's functions. They paid no attention to

jointness, which cannot be accomplished by moving the Fort's land C4ISR capability to another base, Aberdeen, while similar communication and electronic functions for the Navy and Air Force remain at other locations. They severely underestimated cost and the inability of accomplishing their goal in the six-year period. Their testing rationale is completely flawed, because it ignores the specialized training or testing that cannot be performed at Aberdeen.

And let me talk about the brain drain. I believe that Pentagon's assumption that a substantial number of Fort Monmouth's workforce will move to a new location is simply wrong. A serious loss of intellectual capital will constitute a brain drain that will negatively affect the U.S. Armed Forces. Secretary of Army, Dr. Francis Harvey, at the BRAC hearing in Washington right after the Pentagon's announcement, voiced his concern at that hearing on May 18th in which he stated, and I quote, "There is a concern and a risk in moving Fort Monmouth to Aberdeen, Maryland."

Now, it seems to me that the risk is simply too great for the Department of Defense to take at a time when terrorists in Iraq are adopting and their improvised explosive device, IED, technology to get around U.S. jammer systems. We can't afford an interruption in the services the Fort provides to today's warfighters. We estimate the Army would lose a significant majority of the current

workforce at Fort Monmouth and would, therefore, be unable to complete its missions, leading to a substantial deviation from the military-value criteria.

Now, I listened to the Maryland delegation earlier, Commissioners, and I heard Mr. Thomas Sadowski say that people may retire at Fort Monmouth, and Maryland has young people who can take their place. Well, I don't agree with that, but, even if it were true, who would train them if all the senior military people that worked at Fort Monmouth left and retired? They wouldn't be able to function.

Now, let me talk about the centers of excellence. One of the Department of Defense's goals during the BRAC round is to create centers of excellence. The Army already has a land C4ISR center at Fort Monmouth. The Pentagon's recommendation would destroy an already very effective center of excellence.

I listened to Senator Mikulski this morning. She said that Fort Monmouth is a center of excellence and performs its work outstandingly in the C4ISR area. Well, then, why move? There's no need to. The Department of Defense never considered jointness in this case. Moreover, they did not consider the joint access my colleague Chris Smith mentioned that Fort Monmouth already has at the nearby megabase at Dix, Lakehurst, and McGuire.

Now, I went to Aberdeen last Friday, Chairman, and I

saw that there was no synergy that would result by moving the Fort Monmouth mission to Aberdeen Proving Ground. They don't do R&D or testing that is related to the C4ISR mission.

Let me talk about the cost, briefly, and the time frame. The Defense Department cost-analysis numbers are wrong, because they're expecting a majority of the current workforce will move to Aberdeen. The Defense Department does not assume the recruitment of all civilian employees and training of new employees. That would add a significant amount to the cost. One should also add in costs in lost time while a new employee is being trained.

The Defense Department also underestimated the cost to reconstruct the lab facilities. Again, I visited Aberdeen last Friday, and I asked point blank, "Do you have any available lab facilities to house Fort Monmouth-type missions?" And the response was, "No." Since there's no lab space available, Aberdeen will have to refurbish existing facilities or completely build from scratch.

And, again, if you listen to what Mr. Wyett Colclasure said, he mentions that they have a lot of buildable area at Aberdeen, but that suggests that they have to build everything from scratch, which is exactly the case. Why in the world, if they don't have the infrastructure now, or if they don't have the facilities now, would we pay the cost of

having to build everything from scratch and put all that infrastructure in place? You know, Maryland made the case this morning that they could do all these things, but they also said they'd have to do -- build everything, almost from scratch. Why should the Pentagon waste this money?

And let me just give you one more example of how difficult it would be to reconstitute the facilities at Aberdeen Proving Ground. When we toured Fort Monmouth last week with Commissioner Coyle, we were at the Satellite Command Center, SATCOM, and the program manager explained to us that her facility would -- could not be rebuilt. It's not replaceable, and, therefore, would have to be moved piece by piece to Aberdeen. Now, that could take years and cost millions, not to mention the risk you take in damaging essential functions. And none of that cost was included in the Pentagon's estimate.

The last thing I want to say, because I want you to understand that I believe very strongly that the six-year BRAC timetable cannot be met. According to the BRAC criteria, the closure and movement have to be completed within six years, from start to finish. Since no facilities are currently at Aberdeen to receive Fort Monmouth now, highly specialized labs, R&D facilities would have to be constructed. And you combine that with the brain drain and the inability to recruit and train new employees quickly,

and there's no possibility of accomplishing that move within the six-year BRAC reference.

Thank you, again. I really appreciate the fact that you're taking the time to listen to us today.

TESTIMONY OF VICE ADMIRAL (RET.) PAUL GAFFNEY AND ROBERT GIORDANO, ARDEC DIRECTOR (RET.)

Admiral Gaffney: Mr. Chairman, I'm Paul Gaffney. I'm here with Bob Giordano. I'm going to give you a presentation, for about 30 minutes, on the military value and other aspects of Fort Monmouth.

I'm a naval -- I'm a former naval officer, and I've been in New Jersey for two years and one day. Bob Giordano's been in New Jersey his whole life, and he is the former research, engineer -- research, development, and engineering director at Fort Monmouth. We're representing the Patriots Alliance and the New Jersey Commission to Support and Enhance our Military Installations.

Let me start with the last slide first. This is the end. Secretary of Defense, we believe, substantially deviated from five selection criteria. For a cost of 1.5 billion, savings of only \$74 million in recurring costs each year, a payback period now estimated to be 15 years longer than originally presented in COBRA, at a risk of 80 percent of the technical workforce, or 3,000 people, with a substantial and unprecedented risk to the technical mission

and to our warfighters today in improved programs for tomorrow for no apparent improvement. Therefore, we recommend that you overturn the DOD BRAC recommendation and, instead, retain the C4ISR programs at Fort Monmouth and at Fort Belvoir that are there now, that you assign Fort Monmouth to the joint base, the megabase at Dix, Lakehurst, McGuire, that they be a single organizational entity with enclave in the Eatontown area, and all of that for reduced cost.

Next?

These are the selection criteria. I'll talk about these almost in order, the impact on what's going on with the war fight today and on future approved programs, lack of attention to joint readiness availability of various kinds of maneuver space. I won't talk about number three, because that really does not apply to us. It has something to do with capacity of training and operational bases to expand. But number four and five relate to cost. We'll go into that in some detail. We'll give you a bit more information on manpower implications. Economic impact has already been covered by Mayor Tarantolo, but, let me tell you, \$3 billion to the New Jersey gross domestic product and 20,000 lives will be affected, one way or another. Criteria number seven talks about whether the receiving base is able to support the mission and people. We have grave concerns there. And

the last one is environmental impact, and it's really aimed at a base that would be significantly realigned or closed. That doesn't really affect Fort Monmouth, because we don't have environmental problem here. But we're going to a place that does have environmental history that's not pleasant, and we're a little bit concerned about that.

The first four criterion are called military-value criteria, and I want to talk about four kinds of military-value criterion.

The first one is the one that allows you to get your mission done, the technical scores done by the technical joint cross-service group and presented by the Army in their decision package. You can see that Fort Monmouth scores, if you add them up across the yellow bar at the top, are twice as high as everybody else, and the receiving site would have the lowest score.

Next, please?

The Army did their own version of military value, which they call installation military value. It had 40 attributes. Those attributes are very interesting to someone who's trying to be the manager of the base -- the landlord, if you will -- but have less to do with the actual technical accomplishment of individual missions. If you look at the 40 criteria, really only two of them directly relate to an R&D or a C4ISR base.

Now, here's a picture of our neighbors about 20 miles to the south of us, the new joint base that you heard Congressman Smith speaking about.

Next, please?

If you combine the two of us together -- in fact, if you just look at Fort Dix and Fort Monmouth together as an entity -- and they've been working together, as you've heard, for years -- you use the same scoring criteria, one finds that 25 of the 40 criterion are in the top third of the Army's score or are equal to, or better than, Aberdeen Proving Ground. We think now by combining organizationally this high-tech installation with a strong operational and training installation, we'll set a new national leadership standard for installations. The fill-up on that is that you have the Army -- excuse me, you have the Air Force and the Navy also sharing the same base.

Next?

The third way that one calculates military value is by the customer. Now, certain people can make all kinds of calculations about military values in various algorithms, but the true test is, Does the customer voluntarily send money to the base? And you see what's happened here just in the last four years. It's grown significantly. No one is directed to send their money to Fort Monmouth. These are volunteer funds that go there. These are Amy funds, funds

from the State Department, the Navy, the Air Force, the intelligence community. And all the trends are upward. This is also an indication of the value that Fort Monmouth has in this current war fight.

And, finally, the final way to look at military value has something to do with gravitas or volume or mass. And if you look at the C4ISR work being done at Aberdeen today, its military-value score is about 40 percent of what Fort Monmouth has in military value, as far as mission accomplishment, but Fort Monmouth is more than 500 times bigger in the amount of work that it does with a \$5 billion Army mission funding.

Now, let me go to the criteria, one by one.

We are concerned about the substantial deviation in the area of current and future mission. There was not -- there was no discussion, no consideration, no calculation of the disruption to the current force, to the current mission, support to the war that goes on today, the hundreds of Fort Monmouth engineers that have been in Iraq and in Afghanistan updating equipment that they've built, the software that is sent daily, maybe minute by minute, into the war zone by satellite to update software in the field, or the amount of money that's been added to Fort Monmouth to deal with the evolving threat in that war fight.

We would also say that, for future missions, at the end

of this decade there are a number of approved schedule milestones or approved acquisition programs that require Monmouth to be there. We're worried about the disruption there, because we believe that less than 50 percent of the workforce will be in place, capable of carrying out that mission.

Bob?

Mr. Giordano: Sir, I'd just call your attention to the last column in this chart, which are statistical samples from four previous moves from 1980 through 1995. And if you look at the percentages, they're either to or from Fort Monmouth -- 16 percent in the last BRAC, in 1995, for the ones that moved.

Next?

Why I wanted to show that is because I want to show what I think is going to be the impact in the loss of people, not only in the current programs that Admiral Gaffney mentioned, but on the future programs which are setting the direction for the Army transformation in the future. If you start at the red line, that would be Fort Monmouth capability, which stands at 100 percent, and the blue line would be the growth in capability at Aberdeen, and the green line would be the sum of the two capabilities over time. We would predict -- and this is based on historical perspectives -- that the key senior managers would begin to

leave when the BRAC decision has been finalized, and you would lose on the order of 20 percent of your leadership in both the top and the middle management. If you then follow down that line, you would lose another 30 percent, in our prediction, as the BRAC window became closer. You'd begin to lose both the middle management, and you would lose your junior engineers, of which Fort Monmouth has just paid a very significant investment to get their master's degrees. And, in talking to some of the workforce, a lot of the junior people are just waiting until they complete their master's program and then decide where their future would go.

So, Fort Monmouth, then, would drive to zero. Aberdeen would begin to grow, but it would grow with a junior workforce, a workforce that would be hired from academia or from recent graduates. But we doubt very much whether you could get any experienced individuals coming across, certainly from industry, because the differential in salary between what industry is paying people and the government is on the order of \$30,000, at a more experienced level. We know the growth capability would go up over time. In our prediction, it would take almost ten years to get back to where you were when you set up this process.

Next?

Let's look at the impact on four very significant

transformational programs, all of which, in the window of BRAC, are in excess of \$1 billion, some getting up to five- or six-billion dollars.

The first program is a Department of Defense initiative to completely integrate seamlessly all of the intelligence processing systems that exist throughout the three services.

And the Army's piece of that is the distributed common ground station Army, which is a seamless architecture that will use components from each of the services to allow the forces to go anywhere in the battlefield and ask an intelligence question and draw the information from a database. There are over 100 to 150 government people working in the lab to do what we call best-of-breed software.

The second program is putting the Army into the jet age, if you will, for their intelligence system. It's the aerial common center, which is using a regional jet that will allow the Army to project over 2,000 miles and stay on station for a very high amount of time using multiple intelligence sensors on the same platform. That platform would then pass its information to this preceding program that I mentioned.

The warfighter information network is the next program, and that is the AT&T system on the tactical battlefield. Very innovative and aggressive program that would allow our

tactical forces to maneuver with high degree of speed while staying intelligently connected either on a threshold basis or on a satellite basis.

And the last program is the one that's bringing the future combat systems and the platforms, all of which then would allow the Army to operate in very small units, very well-prepared units. And the glue that ties that together is the C4ISR.

I show them because they're all related to each other -- the ground processing system for the airborne platform, the ground processing software that would sit in the embedded platforms, and the warfighter information network is the system that provides the communications and the glue that ties it together.

If you look at abilities, there is a significant amount of limited user test production decisions, operational testing, and concept development and evaluations. So, they are linked. Unfortunately, they're linked to 90 other acquisition programs that are in process at Fort Monmouth and a large number of other technology programs, as well, all driving to where we go in the future.

So, if you follow the path that I showed before with the path up and the decline in the workforce, we believe the impact on the Army future of transformation would be catastrophic in this window.

Admiral Gaffney: Criterion four and criterion five have to do with cost and the timing of those costs and savings. Again, I'll say that you have with you, and your staff has, a stack of paper, some five- or six-hundred pages long, that provide the backup, the data, and the logic, and a number of COBRA reruns to back up these numbers. Again, 1.5 billion now, instead of 822 million, as originally projected by the Defense Department, 20-year payback. That does not include the cost to reconstitute the workforce that Senator Biden actually mentioned in the last presentation. We calculate that to be 300 million.

Also, to constitute the contract award force, they eventually will -- whether they grow or move, there will be a cost to the government, we think, of 152, in the billions of program disruption that just came from Bob Giordano's presentation, we don't cost at all.

Next?

So, here's the tally. And each one of these has a five- or six-minute presentation. But you can see that we have a great deal of detail here.

But let me just try one on you here, the military construction issue. We think that there were miscalculations in the number of square feet, the kinds of facilities that had to be reconstructed, and the ratio of refurbishment to new construction, based on our own visits

and discussions with facilities experts from Aberdeen who visited Fort Monmouth.

The most glaring example of the credibility here is the military academy prep school. When you visited Fort Monmouth before, we were agnostic on the issue of the military prep school, academy prep school, and whether it should leave. The cost in the DOD recommendation was \$20 million to move that facility from New Jersey to West Point.

We have, since then, seen a DD form 1391, a form that is used to calculate real military construction costs, prepared by people at West Point. That cost is now well over \$200 million. There's a \$200-plus million discrepancy in one part of that \$822 million cost.

I could do the same thing for each of those. You should note that there's a minus-74 up here. While there are some additional costs for relocating people not included in the BRAC run -- in the COBRA run, we also only calculated that 20 percent of the people would go. So, that number actually comes down in the favor of the Defense Department.

Here's a summary. Again -- you've probably figured this out now -- 1.574, only, is the savings, and 21-year payback. And if you added in, then, the cost to reconstitute a workforce and reconstitute a contractor force, these are not allowed in BRAC, so you can't actually do a COBRA run -- they're not allowed -- not part of the

COBRA algorithm -- the numbers are getting up to \$2 billion.

The other part of criterion number four has to do with manpower implications. And manpower implications, in our reading of thousands of pages, did not discuss, consider, or calculate the loss of the technical workforce. That feeds the disruption argument and ties directly into criterion one's violation.

This move of about 5,000 civilian technical people is the most unique of its kind, of any kind of intellectual-capital loss in this BRAC, and one of the biggest ever. COBRA uses a standard calculation of 75 percent for every base as a standard calculation. The Secretary of the Army said maybe only 26 would go. History shows -- we've already seen that -- even moving to Maryland and other experiments, that less than 20 percent go. And a recent Harris poll says 19 percent will go, and less than 10 percent of the contractors would move.

I've already mentioned the cost to reconstitute the workforce is significant, and this is interesting that it's going on just when the director of Defense Research and Engineering is lecturing and testifying around Washington about the crisis in the supply of scientists and engineers from whom -- from which one would have to draw to reconstitute the workforce.

Bob?

Mr. Giordano: I'd like to amplify a little bit on the -- give some insight into how the people would move.

In BRAC '95, we were moving our signal warfare people, communications intercept experts, up to Fort Monmouth. And, in that context, we at least had a base of people in which they could fall in on, but they were not of the same technical discipline. I went down and interviewed families and tried to find the reason, because we were trying to encourage as many people as possible to move. Most would not move, because they had two-income families, they had kids in school. These are the same reasons that we're seeing when we surveyed the workforce at Fort Monmouth. Less than 20 percent. Major reason? Two-income families, children, would not move.

I'd like to call your attention to the second BRAC, in '93, because we've talked about the significant impact and disruption on programs. They moved the physical sciences division, a very highly skilled, high Ph.D. group of people, from Fort Monmouth to Adelphi, Virginia. Thirteen percent moved in that time period. We saw a 90 percent loss of patent applications as a result of that move. And that's disruption in the basic research area. And we would suggest that the same kind of disruption would occur in the much more expansive systems-development program areas, which are the forte of what is done at Fort Monmouth.

Thank you.

Admiral Gaffney: We do know that Adelphi is in Maryland, by the way.

This is a algorithm that was used to cost out the reconstitution of the workforce. It's based on a number of studies that we look at. And we also discussed this with another R&D center who used a similar -- this algorithm, different factors. And that algorithm was validated by the audit service of that service. And what it actually is, is a factor times a salary, an annual salary, to cost out what it would cost to hire somebody -- advertise, recruit, hire, clear, and relocate somebody. And then a factor, applied over three years, times the salary to calculate what the training impact was. You multiply all that times the workforce, which is just under 3,000, and you come out with a number.

There are a number of different factors that one used. You have different scores. And whether you're a high-ranking or low -- highly-rated or lowly- -- low-graded person, whether you're a scientists, an engineer, or whether you're an acquisition person, when you look at all the combinations and permutations, the range goes from 200 to 400 million. We picked 300. You could pick any number -- 225, 375, 400.

Next?

Dr. Sega -- I think I've already really covered this -- there is a shrinking pool of engineers in the United States, by any standard. Within that pool, there's a large number of people that are not clearable for Defense work. And the demand is going up, just as there will be some large retirements across the Defense Department. This is not the time to be trying to reconstitute the workforce, no matter where one is moving.

Next?

On the workforce, let me just finish off with saying something about why New Jersey is so great. There are terrific partnerships between Fort Monmouth and both academia and industry in the area. You can see from the diagram what kinds of people are in our neighborhood. These are about one-hour to one-hour-and-15-minute drive, 34 CRADAs. We've hired 1600 people from this community in the last few years, the highest concentration of scientists and engineers in the country, more than a million scientists and engineers between Philadelphia and New York City, cutting straight across New Jersey -- 130,000 science and engineering firms. And just in our area, in the area of computers, in our two counties, Monmouth and Ocean County, over 800 firms are working in that business.

Next?

Now, let me get to -- back to criterion number one. We

talk about jointness. And it's really a little bit connected with criterion two that asked about maneuver -- various kinds of maneuver space.

We are not aware -- we are pretty sure that nobody from the BRAC deliberative bodies visited the Dix, Lakehurst, McGuire joint base, nor was it ever discussed or considered in any calculation, any minutes, any decision, any words. Also never mentioned in any document that we were able to see was the consideration that there's no joint C4ISR work being done, or planned to be done. Never was that mentioned in their deliberations. Nor did anyone consider the existing excellent record we have over 30 years of -- in the airspace and the instrumented ranges, access to a military warning area just 45 miles away. Never was that mentioned in any of this.

Here's a picture of the Dix, Lakehurst, McGuire joint base just now codified by DOD BRAC recommendations. Besides Fort Monmouth instrumented ranges for C4ISR, what one has there every day are troops training on Fort Dix, getting ready to mobilize human beings with their equipment that can be used as surrogates in the certain kinds of testing that one might do, like for future combat system.

Air C4ISR has been at Lakehurst for over 30 years. Monmouth is 23 miles away. The width of that installation up there is 20 miles, not so big. And Whiskey 107, the

military operating area, supersonic, as high as you can go, and naval operations just 45 miles off the coast, which is incredibly important for certain missions -- Guard Rail, for one.

We believe that the deliberators in the BRAC throughout the process over the last couple of years, lost their way, if you read all the documents that leads up to this. A stated goal, even at the end of the BRAC process, when the recommendations were made for the Army, was to take research plus development and acquisition and put it together with T&E to make a land C4ISR center. The technical joint cross-service group had a slightly less ambitious goal, and that was to put research together with development and acquisition. The result? None of that happened.

The "R," which got a very high score, about half of the research and of their calculation, is at Adelphi, Maryland, and it doesn't move. They claim that there would be a synergy in -- perhaps in -- of putting RD&A and T&E together at Aberdeen. There is no C4ISR at Aberdeen -- C4ISR T&E capability at Aberdeen. The Army C4ISR T&E Center is at Fort Huachuca, and it's Yuma Proving Group, and it's Bliss and Fort Hood and Irwin and other places like that. That's where the formal T&E is done.

So what they did was, they took a big D&A, development and acquisition, and they moved it to a place that's a small

one, for a cost of \$1.5 million, an unprecedented risk.

I wasn't going to add this, but -- talk about this, this time, but, in view of events yesterday, we have to mention it. It was not mentioned in any documentation that we could find, even though there's a policy that says one should. It's particularly interesting, in that Secretary John Lehman, the 9/11 commissioner, when he testified before the House on the 9th of April specifically mentioned that Fort Monmouth, only 30 miles from New York City, was best positioned to help with the interoperability problem in the highest-priority homeland-security area in the country. In that same month, on the 19th, the National Research Council issued a report that said the work that the Army is doing in C4ISR is the most relevant to solving the most critical problem in homeland security, and that's interoperability. Also not mentioned are ongoing programs with the state of New Jersey, with New York City, with the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey, with the continuity of operations point that FEMA has used during the Republican Convention, during the New York City blackout, nor does it mention that Fort Monmouth has, on Fort Dix, an installation up and manned that's dealing with homeland security technology on Fort Dix.

Next?

The final criterion that I would address is number

seven, and that is, How is the receiving base able to take care of the mission and the people that are coming? Well, we have some concerns. There is no joint access now in C4ISR. There is -- we are concerned of what we've heard about ready access to the instrumented ranges, getting time in those ranges, and having the troops and their equipment there to carry out C4ISR tests, the conditions of the facilities through several visits -- Congressman Pallone just mentioned -- and on connection between buildings, among buildings, in a C4ISR center requires some pretty robust capability. That exists today at Fort Monmouth, but it doesn't exist at Aberdeen. And we don't believe that that's costed. We're not so sure about the product pollution issue there and what effect it will have on our people, but we hear about it.

And, finally, there's the famous science and engineering workforce comparison. We believe there's great connection with industry and academia right outside the gate, with the highest concentration of scientists and engineers in the country -- not in every single place in New Jersey, but in this part of New Jersey, in Central New Jersey is where this is concentrated.

And just look at a comparison. These are the two -- the two counties used in the BRAC calculation were Monmouth and Ocean County, which cover most of Lakehurst, Dix, and

all of Fort Monmouth. And for Aberdeen, Harford, and Cecil.

And look at the difference. Over 1300 companies are in the business that are -- is allied to our mission. About 400 in Harford and Cecil Counties.

Briefly, there are the three tenants, an FBI regional data center that we don't -- that's quietly tucked away on the base. I mentioned FEMA and the Army Corps of Engineers continuity of operations. We also have a VA Health Center that's treating 10,000 people a day. And I'll tell you, the amount of mail -- I get more mail from those 10,000 people than anybody else around. And they're wondering why the hell am I not bringing this up in these briefings. And, of course, I am now, for the record. There is a cost -- there may not be a cost to the Defense Department by disrupting these people or adding extra costs, but there is certainly a cost to the taxpayer.

Here's the recommendation. Again, we're back to where we started. The Secretary of Defense significantly deviated from the BRAC selection criteria. We recommend that you approve retention of all the C4ISR activities in their current place, that you make Fort Monmouth an enclave of the joint base by realigning, deactivating, or closing Fort Monmouth with enclave. And we know that there's precedent, in the last several BRAC rounds, to use exactly those kinds of words -- "close, reactivate, or realign with enclave."

We would take the whole garrison of facilities experts at Fort Monmouth and assign them organizationally to the joint base so there could be greater efficiencies there, just like they are being reassigned at Lakehurst to Dix to McGuire today. We believe when you do that you can reduce cost and get rid of excess land and facilities. And we also recommend not moving Fort Belvoir, for the same reason that we've talked about here over and over again, to retain the intellectual capital there. And while we were agnostic on West Point before, the new numbers that we've seen make us -- we can't avoid, let's say it probably should stay there.

This is a conceptual picture, this big purple ellipse. You've really got a 20-by-20-mile cube here, square, which is smaller than many Army bases in this country. And we think they have a great synergy with one another.

Thank you very much.

TESTIMONY OF MAJOR GENERAL (RET.) WILLIAM RUSS

General Russ: Jehooa. Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, Jehooa is a joint battle cry that I used in my last job.

My name is Bill Russ, and I happen to be the former commander of the Communications and Electronics Life Cycle Management Command, and I commanded that unit from 2001 through my retirement, in June of 2004. Prior to that time frame, I also served as the commander of Army Signal

Command, which is now called NETCOM. The key point of that is, that prior command was the command that provided all of the Army's portion of the global information grid, in addition to supporting all of the combatant commanders around the world with the signal brigades. CECOM Fort Monmouth was the enabler for both of those missions through its engineering and through its logistics support.

Now, in my role as the commander of CECOM at Fort Monmouth, I was the one that certified two-thirds of the data that was provided to pass-through. And I'm reviewing -- being retired, I'm reviewing the recommendations and the rationale that was available through the public media, I must admit that I was really troubled by the rationale and the recommendations. It is, in my judgment, if you will, based on my 32 years of experience and service, that I am certain that a relocation of this magnitude that is being contemplated in this particular case will have a direct and immediate and a catastrophic impact on Team C4IRS, as well as the warfighters that are being supported.

Now, throughout my career I've had the opportunity to both work with Fort Monmouth and CECOM, if you will, and receive C4 support from the many assignments that I had. Great support from the military and civilian personnel there. But, again, I also found, during those earlier years, that they provided intelligence support, ISR. This

became apparent as I was in my role as commander of the Army CENT Command, traveling around with my brigade at night, crossing paths with my counterpart, who was the Intelligence Command commander, two-star command at the time, and we were talking, and I found that he was dependent upon CECOM and Fort Monmouth for his critical support for his units that were around the world, because many of our sites were co-located. But yet it was not until I was assigned as the commander of Fort Monmouth and CECOM that I actually began to realize the true synergy and integration that was occurring at that installation in support of our entire Army, as well as many of our joint forces, because not only was the communications support, not only was the intelligence support, but, also, there was tremendous support being provided for other warfighters.

And, in the essence of time, as I've gotten my note here, let me just quickly move to a couple of points.

You've heard about the center of excellence. I won't belabor that point. It is happening today, in terms of this -- actually meeting the challenges of the network-centric warfare requirements in transforming our forces, if you will, while simultaneously meeting the requirements to support the troops in Iraq. You've heard about the many cases and the things that are being provided to support -- the IEDs, et cetera.

Let me begin to close by just saying two other points.

One, we think that the enemy today is unlike one that we've ever faced today -- in the past. Now is not the time, if you will, to disrupt this critical capability that is making a tremendous difference. As I look at why these recommendations were done, the -- smart people made these recommendations -- the only thing that I have come up with is, many times we don't know what we don't know. I certainly did not know the integrated capability that was existing at Fort Monmouth, until I was there. So, sometimes we don't know what we don't know.

Finally, I close by saying, I have no personal stake in this BRAC decision. None at all. I come here as a private citizen, as a former military officer. I am here only because I want to make sure that all the facts are thoroughly evaluated to ensure that the best decisions are made to ensure the continued security of this great nation.

I trust, if you will, that the Commission will rectify the situation that is at hand, because, truly, I believe that countless warfighters' lives depend on it, and, in many cases, the security of this nation.

[Applause.]

TESTIMONY OF HON. RUSH HOLT, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW  
JERSEY

Rep. Holt: Well, good morning, Chairman,

Commissioners, and thank you for your patriotic work and for your personal commitment.

I'm Rush Holt. I represent the 12th -- the people of the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey, which includes Fort Monmouth. I also sit on the House Committee on Intelligence.

Well, as is the -- I guess, the textbook method of presentation, you have heard from Representative Pallone what you would hear, you have heard from Admiral Gaffney and Bob Giordano and General Russ, and now I will repeat what you have heard.

[Laughter.]

Rep. Holt: Simply put, moving Fort Monmouth's work would diminish the U.S. capability, and military command, control, communications, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, C4ISR. It would place an unacceptable risk to soldiers in the field, and, hence, to national security.

And to move to Aberdeen would cost far more than the Pentagon estimated.

You've heard how the recommendation to close Fort Monmouth deviates substantially from BRAC criteria. The DOD did not recognize, and did not evaluate, the fact that an RDATE installation's military value is its intellectual capital. This is different from submarine bases and airfields. The experienced, highly-trained excellent

civilian workforce of about 6,000 people is central to the RDATE mission, and cannot easily be moved or recreated. This is larger than any other disruption that you are considering this year in the BRAC recommendations.

In the categories relevant to Fort Monmouth, you've heard how excellent the work is and how much people in the field depend on it. The past history and recent polling indicates that only about a fifth of Fort Monmouth's employees would move, and those who would, would be the less experienced. They'd be moving to a place with no preexisting C4ISR capability.

The BRAC Commission, I state, must address specifically how much capability in C4ISR, in the short term and in the long term, they are -- they will say, you will say, that the country can sustain, because there will -- there would be a reduction in capability, a reduction that would require about a decade to reconstitute. I doubt that you would consider moving an air base if it meant losing 80 percent of the planes, or moving to a naval base where the piers could only accommodate 20 percent of ships. And yet, for land-based C4ISR it's the people that we're talking about.

And it's worse than that. You could fly in planes and money to buy piers, but you could not, for love or money, reconstitute the workforce at Fort Monmouth in less than a decade, considering recruitment, training, security

clearances, and building experience -- nearly 400 command-and-control engineers, nearly 400 intelligence and electronic warfare engineers, nearly 500 space and terrestrial communications engineers, 240 computer scientists who support 215 million lines of programs, and support it in the field today, tomorrow, next year in Iraq.

Serving the C4ISR equipment in the field would take longer. Reacting to the next generation of IEDs would take months instead of weeks. And on and on, as you've heard. The soldiers would experience more danger and higher casualties.

You've heard that when the electronic technology was moved from Fort Monmouth to Maryland -- now, we can argue about which is a better state, and who has more engineers and scientists, and who has a better style of life -- the fact is, a decade ago 300 jobs were relocated, only 40 people moved. The result was palpable, a two-third reduction in the number of patents. That's just one measure. Even if qualified workers were immediately available in and around Aberdeen, reconstitution of a Fort Monmouth-caliber workforce would take about a decade.

As to the costs, the potential costs used by DOD simply are not credible. The testing and evaluation issue highlighted by the DOD is a red herring. Pentagon's failure to consider that Fort Monmouth already does most T&E in the

labs, computers, chambers, Fort Monmouth already does land and air T&E at Dix, Lakehurst, McGuire. In fact, testing at Aberdeen would require recreating facilities.

Representative Saxton, Pallone, and I were there. We asked the people at Aberdeen, Do they have what it takes? "No, but they can do it," they said. Some T&E cannot be done at Monmouth, cannot be done at Dix, Lakehurst, or Aberdeen. It will continue to be done at Yuma, at Fort Huachuca, Fort Hood, and so forth.

And it's worth noting, and repeating again, that the Pentagon's recommendations do nothing to enhance jointness.

We propose that you maintain an enhanced C4ISR capability and capacity by keeping the highly trained expert workforce at Fort Monmouth. We recommend that you formally make Fort Monmouth a sub-installation of the joint megabase.

We recommend that this would institutionalize opportunities for greater joint C4ISR programs and would prevent establishment of a joint C4ISR command for improved battlefield cross-service operability. And we recommend that Fort Monmouth be allowed, or instructed, to cede some excess portions from federal jurisdiction. This would provide some financial savings, and would permit the non-DOD activities present at Fort Monmouth, such as the VA, that -- what we call the Principi Clinic --

[Laughter.]

Rep. Holt: -- the FEMA activities, and the very important FBI and intelligence activities, about which you have not been briefed, and probably won't be, to continue.

So, here's what you're faced with. It's quite a deal. The DOD recommends spending \$2 billion, which is twice -- more than twice what they thought it would cost, to produce serious reduction in capability. That is a bad bargain for the country.

[Applause.]

Chairman Principi: If I might -- before the panel departs, I'd like to see if there are any questions.

Commissioner Coyle?

Commissioner Coyle: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have two questions I'd like to ask.

Admiral Gaffney, in our travels we've seen a number of examples where savings are counted, the salaries of people who would be departing a base proposed for closure are counted as savings, but the new salaries for the new people at the new location are not counted as a cost. To me, this seems a little like counting as a savings the airfare for my flight from Newark that was canceled last week, but not counting as a cost the new flight that I had to take from LaGuardia to get home. If you counted the new salaries for the new people at the receiving location, wouldn't your over-20-year payback period be over 400 years, or some very

large number?

Admiral Gaffney: I think -- of course, we didn't come up with a 400-year payback period, but I think we found enough issue in the ability -- or the calculations made for base operation support for moving there, moving to Aberdeen, that it reduced the annual savings for us by almost \$70 million a year. There were several components. You mentioned one. We made the calculation on that. There were some additional costs that were never considered, and there were some outright entry argument errors that added to that.

I would hope the detail that we gave you, the several hundred -- three or four hundred pages, can get exactly to your answer. You can actually see some numbers that apply to your example.

Commissioner Coyle: Okay. And one other question that you or perhaps General Russ might address. At our -- one of our first hearings in Washington, in early May, I noted that this was the first BRAC round to be conducted during a time of sustained warfighting. And I asked Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld if this fact -- how this fact had changed or made a difference in their BRAC recommendations. His answer had to do with jointness, which we would all agree is important, but didn't address the fact that some of our bases are supporting warfighters overseas, minute by minute, every day in Iraq. Would you or General Russ like to comment further

about that?

Admiral Gaffney: Yes. As I did mention, a couple of ways -- I could give you some examples. One is, there's a great deal of money coming in to solve some of these problems. Specifically, the evolving threat, the IED threat -- we make a counter, they have another idea, we make a counter, they have another idea. So, it's a constant catching-up process that goes on that costs a great deal of money, a great deal of time, and a great deal of focus. I think that Fort Monmouth's record, just in that one particular area, is terrific.

The fact that -- the last number I saw was, in excess of 125 people, engineers from the Fort, had been on the ground in the war zone updating equipment. And then you -- several of the Commissioners saw the joint SATCOM Center, which is able to send realtime upgrades to software as threats change, whether that be a Guard Rail airplane or some other kind of fusion center on the ground where there needs to be some upgrade in capability.

So, I'm getting a note here. Twenty quick-result systems were expedited and delivered to Iraq in the last couple of years.

Commissioner Coyle: Thank you.

Admiral Gaffney: I think it could go on longer and longer. Maybe Bill would like to add something.

Commissioner Coyle: Thank you very much.

General Russ: Just quickly, in the essence of time. There are numerous examples where the actual Dix/Lakehurst examples that were mentioned here were used to actually test out and do some quick adaptations and modifications for systems that were employed over in Iraq. If that information is not available to you, we can certainly get that to you, in the essence of time, sir. Jointness is exactly what we're doing.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Congressman Saxton? Congressman, have you been sworn in?

Rep. Saxton: Yes, sir.

Chairman Principi: You have?

Rep. Saxton: Yes, sir.

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF HON. JIM SAXTON, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW JERSEY

Rep. Saxton: Let me just begin by thanking you for giving us the opportunity to talk about items that are very important to our national security.

I might add that this is my fifth BRAC, and I always find them interesting, and I always find them unique and different. This BRAC is no different, in terms of being unique, because it certainly is. As the threat changes, the

needs change for basing, and the -- and that creates a uniqueness each time.

So, while my friends are setting up these charts, let me just say that I want to do four things this morning -- or this afternoon, I guess it is by now. It is. First, I'd like to give you a little bit of background, if I may, on the Fort Dix, McGuire, Lakehurst complex. Second, I would like -- and I hope you smile about this -- I agree with four of the BRAC recommendations. Third, I would like to say that I have a strong disagreement with just one. And, fourth, I would like to tell you why I believe that the recommendation that Fort Monmouth be made part of this joint basing complex be given strong consideration by the Commission.

First, a little background on Fort Dix, McGuire, and Lakehurst, if I may. I know Chairman Principi knows this background, because he's been at Fort Dix. I know that, because he was there with me several years ago, talking to some veterans. The entire complex is comprised of about 42,000 acres, making it a big piece of land, which gives it the capabilities to do many missions.

At Fort Dix, the need has changed when the threat changed. When the Soviet Union went away, we discovered that we did not need the size of a basic training capacity that we had before then. And so, basic training was -- got

smaller when the Army got smaller. But, at the same time, we knew that we were going to rely on the Reserve Component more than we had in the past. And so, Fort Dix transitioned from a basic training center to a training center of excellence for Reserve Component troops.

Today, Fort Dix trains, mobilizes, and deploys troops in both of the recent conflicts. As a matter of fact, during the effort to support operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, Fort Dix has deployed and redeployed more than 60,000 Reserve soldiers, making it the biggest deployment/redeployment center in the country.

McGuire Air Force Base has a -- obviously, a different mission. It is an airlift and tanker base. It -- we enjoy, as of the day before yesterday, 13 C-17 aircraft -- our 13th one arrived just the day before yesterday -- as well as 32 KC-10 Stratolifter tankers, which are used for refueling purposes.

The 108th, which I'm going to talk about at some length this morning, also flies 16 KC-135 E-model tankers, which are the older ones. And, of course, the recommendation has been made by the Department of Defense to retire those airplanes, and I -- that is the recommendation that I disagree with.

So, we have a -- we have three bases. And, of course, Congressman Smith talked about the mission at Lakehurst,

which is important. But the fact of the matter is that there have been synergies developed, and cooperative relations developed, between these three bases.

For example, when McGuire Air Force Base became the Joint Tanker Airlift Base in 1993, as a result of that BRAC, it was decided that an Air Mobility Warfare Center would be stood up on Fort Dix. And so, Fort Dix assets became useful to the Air Force. By the same token, missions that are carried out at the Air Mobility Warfare Center are trained on Lakehurst, as well as on the ranges at Fort Dix. And so, there is a lot of synergy, in terms of those kinds of things.

In addition, security for the three bases, which are now closed bases -- Fort Dix used to be an open base, but, subsequent to 9/11, became a closed base -- and the security for the three bases is handled on a cooperative basis.

There were enough of these synergies of cooperation that occurred that about a year ago the three bases -- the commanders of the three bases signed a memorandum of understanding to help -- to work to find other ways to cooperate to create efficiencies and save dollars.

I guess this would be a good point for me to say this, that I have thought for a long time that these bases would be a good joint base. And the first recommendation that I would like to support is the recommendation of DOD to your

Commission that this relationship be formalized. The recommendation is that the Air Force be the lead agency. I'm not sure whether you will agree with that or not. I think that ought to be given some thought, to determine whether or not that's right. But, certainly, it makes a lot of -- it is a logical conclusion to come to that these three bases can work together jointly.

And let me just add at this point, the base 20 miles away, Monmouth, could easily be added to this mix. I think that makes a great deal of sense, especially in terms of -- and I didn't intend to say this here, but let me say it anyway -- I'm a member of the Armed Services Committee, as is Mr. LoBiondo. Mr. LoBiondo and I work every week in Washington trying to address the issues of the shortages of scientists and engineers that are available to help the U.S. military develop the weapons systems that we need. I think all of you will agree that, over the past -- well, since World War II, in particular -- science and technology has given us the edge in every conflict we've been in, and that's because we've had the scientific base and the engineering base to develop weapons systems that have been so important to our future.

And I have got to say that I was at Aberdeen the other day, and I know the history of how people move when missions move, and I would agree with the presenters at Monmouth that

it makes a lot more sense to move this mission 20 miles than it does to move it to a different state. And I'll just leave it at that.

The second recommendation -- the second thing I would like to talk about is the location of McGuire and Fort Dix.

And these -- this location is important when it comes to understanding the missions that are currently in place at -- particularly at McGuire and Fort Dix. We are located just 37 miles from Philadelphia, 70 miles from New York City, and 150 miles from Washington, D.C. One of the issues that I think is often misunderstood about New Jersey, when it relates to McGuire and Fort Dix and Lakehurst, is, of course, we are the most densely populated -- that is, New Jersey is the most densely populated state in the country; and, therefore, people oftentimes come to the conclusion, particularly people who are going to be stationed at Fort Dix and McGuire, that it must be in the middle of a city somewhere. Well, nothing further from the truth could -- is true.

Actually, the city of Trenton is halfway up New Jersey. There are eight million people who live in New Jersey. And of the eight million people who live in New Jersey, six million of them are north of Trenton, and just two million are south of Trenton. In addition to that -- the areas marked in green, abutting Fort Dix, are state-owned lands;

no development is possible -- in addition to that, McGuire, Fort Dix, and Lakehurst are located in the New Jersey National Pinelands Reserve, which means that development does not take place there. Those areas which are not in the Pinelands area -- that would be to the west and to the north, that light green area, which is farmland -- the Burlington County Freeholders have undertaken a program to retire development rights on those lands to further protect the military bases from any encroachment that might take place.

I mentioned the New Jersey Pinelands just a minute ago, and I'd just like to give you a better concept of what that means. In the early '70s, the Federal Government passed a law which created the National Pinelands Reserve. The State of New Jersey then followed up, as the manager of the Pinelands Reserve, to pass a set of laws which protect this area from environmental degradation from over-development or, better said, from almost any development, which has been a crow that some of the folks that have lived in that area have had for a while, because it diminished the value of their land. On the good side -- that is the area inside the red line on the map -- on the good side, however, is the fact that it does protect McGuire Air Force Base and Navy Lakehurst and Fort Dix from any real encroachment.

So, we have a base that is set up and ready to go.

And, as I mentioned a minute ago, the bases are ideally situated, being the only three Army, Air Force, and Navy bases in the country to have this kind of a contiguous location. And so, we are in strong support of the joint base command. As a matter of fact, the former commander of Fort Dix, Mike Warner, and I traveled to the Pentagon about a year and a half ago meet with a fellow by the name of Phil Grone, who you all know. And we pointed out to him the synergies that exist between these three bases, and suggested that this would be a great opportunity to explore the possibilities of a joint-base structure of some type. That recommendation has come through, and we support it.

We also support -- I also support the recommendation that establishes a joint -- establishes a regional joint mobilization site and a regional Reserve Headquarters at Fort Dix. This is a little map that shows the location of Fort Dix, relative to the northeastern population centers. This chart points out that 24 percent of the Army National Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve live within 200 miles of Fort Dix. And so, the establishment of a regional joint mobilization site and a regional Reserve Headquarters makes perfect sense to us, inasmuch as this is the real mission of Fort Dix.

We also support a recommendation that includes aviation consolidation that complements McGuire. This is Army

aviation. This would move nine C-12s onto Fort Dix, onto, I might add, a ramp which is currently being built cooperatively by the Air Force and the Army to support deployment missions from Fort Dix from a ramp on Fort Dix, which these airplanes would be parked on or near.

We also support a recommendation that moves Navy aviation personnel and assets onto McGuire Air Force Base. And at the end of my presentation I will show you how those Navy assets can be accommodated with 12 KC-135 aircraft.

Now, let me just move to the -- let me just move to the recommendation with which we disagree, and that is the retirement of 16 KC-135Es from the 108th Air Refueling Wing.

I might just point out that the ladies and gentlemen who are sitting in the front row in uniform are all members of the 108th, and I want to thank them for coming here today. They are great folks, and they have done a great job in supporting our efforts to get over -- to move overseas to carry out military operations.

Let me just give a tiny bit of background about the establishment and why the 108th is there. Prior to 1990, the 108th flew F-4 fighters. And I was teasing the former commander of the 108th last night. I can remember -- he was a fighter pilot, his name is General Craig Cosgrave. And I was out at Fort McGuire Air Force Base one day with him when he told me the F-4s were going to go away and that we were

going to have to fly these big old tankers. And he kind of kicked the dirt, because he was a fighter pilot, and sucked it up, and we started the KC-135 mission. It has been a great success. But I want to say why it's been a great success and why it's needed in the Northeast.

Prior to 1990, when the threat changed, the Soviet Union went away and a new threat began to emerge, we realized that we were going to have to go someplace other than Europe, with most of our flights emanating from the United States. And so, we did away with the strategy or the tactic of flying to an airbase in Europe, refueling, and then going on to wherever we needed to go. We established a process that called an "air bridge," which means we used tankers so that an airplane could take off for someplace in the U.S., get out over the North Atlantic, refuel, and go on to its destination, perhaps refueling two or three times on the way. That is called an "air bridge." To do that, we needed tankers from the Northeast.

And in the 1980s, we had a number of tankers in the Northeast, which, by the 1990s, became too few. The Air Force concluded that the Northeast was tanker-lean. And so, in BRAC 1993, 32 KC-10 aircraft were moved to the active service at McGuire. And in 1991 and '92 we acquired 16 KC-135E models to be flown by the New Jersey National Guard. The Northeast was no longer tanker lean. That problem has

been fixed.

The retirement of these 16 airplanes rolls back that tanker-lean fix. We still have the same missions going east, we still have the same tracks to fill in, in the -- over the North Atlantic, and we also deployed the 108th to the Azores and to Maron, Spain, to carry out this mission. It is a necessary mission, and one that we believe should be continued. That's objection number one.

Number two is that recruiting and retention are going to be -- are likely to be a problem. This map, which looks -- this chart, which looks similar to the other chart I had up, shows something that's quite different. Yes, we can recruit numbers of people in the Northeast, and we can also recruit the right kinds of people in the Northeast. This chart shows that, within that, actually, 150-mile radius, we have three major airports with expert -- with people with expertise in New York City -- in the New York City area. We have three in the Washington, D.C., area, one in the Philadelphia area, and, of course, McGuire, Dover, are located there, with the capabilities of using the expertise that exists in these areas.

So, recruiting is important. We have had our recruit -- our spaces filled, to the point of about 94 percent, 95 percent. It has been a problem in other places.

One of the recommendations that the DOD makes closes

Niagara, eight airplanes, sends four of those airplanes to Bangor Air Force Base, in Maine -- not a big population center -- and four of those airplanes to Pease Air Force Base, in New Hampshire.

I would just like to -- I would just like to read a quote from the adjutant general from New Hampshire, Major General Kenneth Clark, who said, a week or so ago, "I don't believe the New Hampshire gain" -- meaning those four airplanes -- "is in the best interest of the Air Force." He said that because he -- at the same time -- I don't have it here in writing, but he also said, "I don't believe that I can recruit the necessary personnel to take care of those extra four airplanes." That is not a problem in our area, inasmuch as we are within 200 miles of 25 percent of the Reserve population in our country.

Let me, finally, turn to the third reason why I think it's not logical to close -- to retire these airplanes. Beginning in 1991 and 1992, we had to transition from an F-4 mission to a KC-135 mission. We began to study how to do that, and there was a role for everybody to play, including the appropriators in Congress, who followed through and appropriated the necessary funds, \$75 million, to build the only tanker base in the northeastern part of the country. The mission at Bangor is flown from a municipal airport. The mission at Pease is similar. The mission at Pittsburgh

is flown from a municipal airport. We invested \$75 million in the appropriate concrete on the ground, the appropriate fueling system, the appropriate hangars, and the appropriate alert system to make us the only true tanker base in the northeastern part of the country. I think this is important.

The chart on the left shows the exact expenditures that we made. The chart on the right shows some of the buildings that were built to make this the only tanker base that we have.

Finally, I would like to talk -- I see the lady in the pink sweater over here coming with the hook, so I've got to get off the stage here -- I would just like to, finally, conclude by showing you how we can lay down 12 KC-135s, perhaps not 16, at McGuire Air Force Base, so that we can continue to do what I think is a vital mission, to make sure that we do not put ourselves back in a tanker-lean situation in the northeastern part of the United States.

These are charts that were developed by people who know how to put airplanes on the ground. We show here how we can put the current assets of the 108th on the ground, minus four airplanes, together with four C-130s, together with four C-9s, and together with 16 helicopters. The shaded areas are concrete areas that would have to be built, but this shows that we can certainly easily do that. And if we

want to do it even more on the cheap, if you look at the middle chart, the ramp over on the right side, which Elise is going to point to, is a ramp on the active side of McGuire Air Force Base which is not currently being used. So, we've got lots of options to avoid doing the damage that standing down the aircraft of the 108th would do.

So, let me just conclude by saying, this is a unique joint-basing opportunity. It is a unique opportunity for -- to make sure that we continue the tanker -- to use the tanker assets that have been so successful in making sure that our air bridge to get to the fight works. The movement of missions and assets onto Dix and McGuire makes perfect logical sense. And the 108th provides -- and the location -- provides the necessary flexibility to accept Navy assets and keep at least 12 KC-135 refueling aircraft.

Thank you very much. I appreciate this opportunity.

[Applause.]

Chairman Principi: Congressman LoBiondo?

TESTIMONY OF HON. FRANK A. LOBIONDO, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE  
FROM NEW JERSEY

Rep. LoBiondo: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I thank you, Chairman Principi and Commissioners, for the opportunity to be here today.

I'm a very strong supporter of the recommendation of the 177th Fighter Wing, and I would like to take a couple of

minutes to tell you why.

The 177th Fighter Wing's strategic location is one that I refer to as probably the most strategically placed homeland security base in the entire nation. It makes it a vital part of our national security homeland defense for the long and proud history of almost 30 years of excellence and air sovereignty covering the East Coast of the United States. The strong air-defense tradition, coupled with Atlantic City's unique -- very unique geographic location, which you'll be able to see with the charts, makes the 177th a key military and community asset.

As we're all aware of the horrific events of September 11th of '01, it brought home the importance of our nation's air defense. And with the end of the Cold War, air sovereignty alert had been made a lower national security priority. And so, in 1998, the 177th Fighter Wing and many other units were taken off the NORAD home station alert. Had the 177th been on the 24-hour alert on September 11th -- we don't know for sure, but I certainly think it's possible that our fighters, from their strategic location from Atlantic City, might have been able to reach the second plane.

Since that horrible day, the Wing has, again, been designated as a NORAD 24-hour alert site and has flown in excess of 1800 sorties, 6,000 flying hours, protecting our

skies. The 177th currently has 15 primary assigned aircraft, and maintains six F-16s on 24-hour alert, seven days a week, 365 days a year. These alert aircraft can literally be in the air in a matter of minutes and are an essential weapon in our country's continued fight on the global war on terrorism.

Once again, I want to stress -- and, again, with the charts -- we're the most strategically based location in the country for homeland security. The 177th Fighter Wing, the Jersey Devils, are within only a few minutes of a number of major U.S. cities. If we look at what's in a 20-minute radius, we know we have -- we have -- far out, we have Boston, and a couple of other far-out cities. When we come down to the chart, though, it is, I think, the most telling that within time of takeoff -- within takeoff within seven minutes, our jets are over New York City, and just slightly more than that, over Washington, D.C. This is an enormous asset that I think has been recognized by the recommendations for -- from the BRAC Commission.

Atlantic City also affords an excellent training opportunity in the form of nearby, very-close, over-water ranges that permit supersonic flight. Within two minutes after takeoff, 177th fighters can be in an area that allows them to train at the maximum performance of the aircraft.

Additionally, the Wing has its own air-to-ground

training range at Warren Grove, enabling it to maintain a very high proficiency in the air-to-ground weapons delivery.

The infrastructure at the 177th is modern and more than sufficient for current and future missions. In the past few years, our military construction program has resulted in the improvements to the base facilities, including the opening of a new communications complex in '04 and groundbreaking on a brand-new almost-\$13 million alert facility later this year. The 177th has ample ramp space and can accommodate additional fighter and other aircraft, should surge-capacity needs dictate that in the future, along with the capability to accept additional missions and people.

Located at the Atlantic City International Airport, the base has a very, very low yearly operating cost and yearly lease, and an excellent working relationship with the landlord, the South Jersey Transportation Authority. An outstanding record of environmental stewardship, and no encroachment are also primary factors to underscore its military value.

The men and women of the 177th Fighter are key players in the global war on terror, and their excellence, enthusiasm, and dedication are without equal. The 177th Wing has a superior end-strength level, at 98.9 percent. Morale and retention are extremely high. And a very high fully mission-capable rate is maintained. Future

recruitment at Atlantic City can be easily accommodated.

The 177th Fighter Wing's role in our national security underscores the importance of why newer fighters and new additional aircraft should be flowing to Atlantic City.

I know you are currently reviewing the Air Force's future total force plan, especially as it relates to the Air Guard, and I would encourage you to, again, consider the strong strategic location of the 177th.

And thank you for the work that you're doing.

Chairman Principi: Thank you, Congressman.

Congressman Frelinghuysen?

TESTIMONY OF HON. RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE  
FROM NEW JERSEY

Rep. Frelinghuysen: Chairman Principi, I want to thank you and your fellow Commissioners for your service to our nation on this panel and in our prior positions, both military and civilian, on behalf of our nation. Your work is hugely important, that you're doing.

As a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I've had the opportunity to visit countless U.S. military bases around the world. I understand how critical it is for the Department of Defense and this Commission to get it right when it comes to our force structure, our posture, and our joint military basing strategy. I appreciate the dedication you've brought to this vital task.

I'm pleased to join with other members of our New Jersey congressional delegation. We are very concerned about the Department's recommendation to close Fort Monmouth and to retire all of the KC-135 aircraft now assigned to the 108th Air Force Refueling Wing at McGuire Air Force Base.

I agree with Congressman Saxton, it is that refueling wing that allowed us to win the war in Afghanistan. Many Americans don't know about it, but it wouldn't have happened without their success and bravery.

Because my colleagues have elaborated on these two recommendations, I would like to bring to your attention one other DOD recommendation. Mr. Chairman, on page 19 of the report of the technical joint cross-service group, the Secretary of Defense recommends the creation of an -- and I quote, "integrated weapons and armament specialty site for guns and ammunition," at Picatinny Arsenal, in Morris County, New Jersey. I strongly support this recommendation.

It is well founded on facts, advances the DOD's transformation; more importantly, it's executable. Picatinny Arsenal is already home to the single manager for conventional ammunition for Department of Defense, an armament and engineering organization which provides a fully integrated life-cycle systems, engineering for weapons and munitions -- 70 unique mission facilities, with 16 state-of-the-art laboratories, staffed by an adaptable, highly

specialized workforce.

The DOD BRAC analysis found the arsenal to be the center of mass for the Department of Defense guns and ammunition, particularly as it has to do with research, development, and acquisition. It has a workload of more than -- an order of magnitude greater than any other DOD facility in the country. It is, in fact, the greatest concentration of military value for guns and ammo.

The DOD recommendation is transformation. It builds on the joint single manager for conventional ammo to create a robust guns and ammo joint center. It will provide for a greater synergy and more efficient operations, all to the benefit of the warfighter.

Mr. Chairman, the recommendation is something that can be executed. Picatinny has the necessary experience with joint acquisition management to properly integrate, as they will be doing, the Navy organizations into a true joint center for guns and ammo.

Most important, like Fort Monmouth, Picatinny has a dedicated and talented workforce. You've heard a lot of earlier testimony about the potential brain drain. Such would be true if the Fort Monmouth recommendation were to be acted upon. I certainly hope it will not.

As you've heard, New Jersey's educational infrastructure maintains a robust pipeline for the future

scientific and engineering workers. As a result, Picatinny Arsenal, in my neck of the woods, has had no trouble attracting top-flight talent. More than 500 engineers and scientists have been hired in recent years. And I'm sure that's the case at Fort Monmouth. Most of them are young, energetic, creative, and dedicated to providing all possible support to our warfighters in the global war on terrorism.

Mr. Chairman, New Jersey is home to many national military assets. The Picatinny Arsenal is just one -- Fort Monmouth, McGuire, and our other military installations are others. We support the -- I support the Defense Secretary's recommendation on the arsenal, and I ask that you reconsider the Secretary's advice with respect to Fort Monmouth.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Chairman Principi: Thank you.

Senator Corzine: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. And I want to thank my colleagues who have made the presentations today, both for their discipline in staying on time and the articulateness with which they made the case.

I want to reiterate that there is much that we approve of in the Department of Defense recommendations, but we most certainly do not with regard to Fort Monmouth and the 108th Refueling Wing. We think these are decisions that are wrong

for the country at this point in time. We think they're wrong for the defense of the nation.

I wanted to add one additional point with regard to the 108th Refueling Wing decision, the fact that the governor had actually not been consulted, or the adjutant general, with regard to those needs as they fit within the National Guard mission of homeland security.

But I will give emphasis to this Fort Monmouth decision, which we believe, and on a united front across our state, that we are not serving our nation's defense well, we're not serving the continuity or the efficacy of our C4ISR capabilities. For warfighters today on the ground -- on the ground, people who are putting their lives at risk -- this is a bad decision. For their brothers and sisters who will serve in the future, based on the planning and the long-term production of new R&D elements, and for the homeland security of this country, where the applications of many of the elements that are devised will be applied, we think this is a high-risk decision. It's not just an issue of money. When you talk about the most important intangible in developing strong new techniques to apply in our warfighting and homeland defense, the most intangible, but most the important, ingredient is people, and the most important element to that success is making sure we keep those quality people, who are a scarce resource, operating

and working. And there is much competition for great people, smart people, innovative people.

We have 1300 contractors in the region. We have -- we are -- we have the most heavy concentration -- Bell Labs, Sarnoff, telecommunications efforts -- these people can go elsewhere. This is not the only place that they could apply those skills. This brain drain is real. It is not a good risk for our nation.

I don't need to go through the one and a half billion cost, \$74 million savings per year, 21-year payback. The context of this risk do not make sense. We've made the case on jointness. We've made the case on homeland security. We think it would be the wrong decision at the wrong time to close Fort Monmouth. I hope you will make the recommendation to the Department of Defense to reverse that decision.

[Applause.]

Chairman Principi: Thank you very much. Thank you.

This concludes the Baltimore Regional Hearing of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

I want to thank you, Senator Sarbanes, and all the members of the delegation from New Jersey, Maryland, and Delaware, for your very thoughtful and for your very, very valuable information.

I also want to thank all the elected officials and

community members who have assisted us during our base visits and in preparation for this hearing, and, of course, the wonderful folks here at Goucher College for hosting us in this beautiful facility.

Finally, I want to thank you, the citizens of the communities represented here today that have supported the members of our Armed Services for so many years, making them feel welcome and valued in your towns. It is truly that spirit that makes America great.

This hearing is closed. Thank you, again.

[Whereupon, at 12:45 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

UNCERTIFIED

UNCERTIFIED