

2005 BRAC COMMISSION REGIONAL HEARING

FINAL DOCUMENT

FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 2005

MARSHALL JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL AUDITORIUM

CLOVIS, NEW MEXICO

STATES TESTIFYING:

NEW MEXICO, ARIZONA AND NEVADA

COMMISSIONERS PRESIDING:

The Honorable James V. Hansen, Chair

General Lloyd W. Newton

General James T. Hill

Brigadier General Sue E. Turner

The Honorable Philip Coyle

The Honorable James H. Bilbray

Brigadier General David Hague, General Counsel

COMMISSIONER CHAIRING THIS HEARING:

THE HONORABLE JAMES V. HANSEN

APPEARANCES:

The Honorable James V. Hansen, Chair

General Lloyd W. Newton

General James T. Hill

Brigadier General Sue E. Turner

The Honorable Philip Coyle

The Honorable James H. Bilbray

Brigadier General David Hague, General Counsel

UNCERTIFIED

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: The hearing will come to order. Good morning, folks. We appreciate everyone coming today. I'm Commissioner Jim Hansen. And I will be the chairperson for the regional hearing on the Defense Base Closure Realignment Commission. I'm also pleased to be joined by my fellow Commissioners, Turner, Hill, Coyle, Bilbray, and Newton.

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

The Congress entrusts our Armed Forces with vast but not unlimited resources. We have a responsibility to our nation and to the men and women who bring the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to life to demand the best possible use of these 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 of providing an independent, fair, and equitable assessment and evaluation of the Department of Defense proposals and the data and methodology used to develop that proposal.

We committed to the Congress, to the President, and 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 statute.

We continue to examine the proposed recommendations set forth by the Secretary on May 13 and measure it against the criteria for military values 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 to life.

We are also committed that our

deliberations and decisions will 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.

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. Unfortunately the volume of correspondence we have received makes it impossible for us to respond to each and every piece of information we receive.

But we want everyone to know the public inputs we receive are appreciated and taken into consideration as a part of our review process. And, while everyone in this room will not have an opportunity to speak, every piece of correspondence received by the Commission will be made part of our permanent public record as appropriate.

Today we will hear testimony from the states of New Mexico, Arizona, and Nevada. Each state's elected delegation has been allotted a block of time determined by the overall impact of the

Department of Defense's closure and realignment recommendation for that particular state.

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

Let me say for you folks here that I think we have more Commissioners at this hearing than we've had at any other hearing thus far. It shows the importance we have placed on this area.

I now request that our witnesses for the state of New Mexico stand for the administration of the oath required by the Base Closure and Realignment Statute. The oath will be administered by Brigadier General David Hague, the Commission's designated federal officer.

(Witnesses sworn.)

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: The procedure has been to turn to the senior senator. And so at this time, Senator Domenici, if you're ready to proceed, welcome to the podium.

SENATOR DOMENICI: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners. It's a pleasure to

be here with you today. I would like to first say that, on behalf of the entire Congressional delegation, governor, and lieutenant governor, the people of these two counties that are most directly affected, and the people of the state of New Mexico, we are grateful that you have come to our state to listen to us about a matter that is of great significance to all of us.

I hope you understand by our presence that we consider this to be one of the most important events that any of us serving our people or that our people will have during their lifetimes.

I come before you understanding that you have a very big and onerous job. And I think that we are in good hands. I feel very comfortable that you are going to make the right decision. You are fair-minded, you are practical, and you will understand why we are here in such numbers.

Cannon is the lifeblood of this community. And with us today, whether we like it or not, are the spirits of thousands of men and women who have served our nation admirably here at this base in harm's way in many, many military conflicts of our nation.

We think they were served well by this base. And we think this base will continue to serve

military men and women of the future and this great United States for the future.

For some, for some Commissioners, it might be thought that this BRAC activity is something that we feel very bad about. But let me say to each of you, it has furnished us with a rare opportunity, a rare opportunity to examine this magnificent base, to look at its history, to look at its current status, to look at the men and women that are here, to look at its potential, and to evaluate it.

So in that respect, Commissioners, it has served a very useful purpose because now, as we have done that, we are more convinced than ever that the service of this air base has been not only, not only good for our nation, right for our military men and women that are here, but this oversight, this insistence that we review it so that we can present it to you has made us ever more committed to urge that you listen carefully.

And I know most of you. Now, I don't believe that you will say the Defense Department of the United States is right all the time. I know some of you. I would think sometimes you have challenged the Defense Department yourselves.

And we are not asking nor are we alleging

that the Defense Department is anything but the best. However, we feel that they too can make mistakes. And in this case we think, before the day is out and with your magnificent staff looking at what we will present and what they gather, that you will conclude as we have concluded that a mistake was made and that the past should be continued and this base should remain open. I thank you very much for listening.

Fellow citizens, I very much appreciate your applause. And I'm not going to try to run the meeting, that's his job, the chairman's job. But we are on a short time, they're going to have to hear all of us. We don't want to overburden you. We are going to stick to our time frame I guess, unless I have violated it, and they can't do anything about that.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: You don't know how much we appreciate that statement.

SENATOR DOMENICI: I did say, Mr. Chairman, I am permitted to violate it. We have as I already indicated all the members of the delegation, the governor and lieutenant governor, right here with us. And we're going to proceed in a manner that's very orderly and quick.

We're going to ask the U.S. Representative

that is from this district, that he speak now. He's been allotted -- excuse me. We're going to ask my fellow senator who represents the state at large like I do, who served on the Armed Services Committee for a number of years. And he's going to speak first followed by the congressman from this district. So would you please join me in welcoming Senator Jeff Bingaman.

SENATOR BINGAMAN: Commissioners, I join Senator Domenici in welcoming you and thanking you for taking on this very important activity for our country.

The issue I wanted to address relates to one of the criteria that Chairman Hansen referred to in his opening statement that the statute calls upon you to consider, and that is the issue of what would be the direct effect on the local communities, the communities of Clovis and Portales and surrounding communities, if you went ahead with the recommendations of the Pentagon and closed Cannon Air Force Base.

As you will hear in much greater detail in a few minutes, the Defense Department significantly underestimated the adverse impact on this community and on this part of our state we strongly believe.

The Defense Department said that they believe one out of five jobs would be lost in this area. As the in-depth analysis will demonstrate, we believe it's much closer to one out of three jobs that will be lost if their recommendation were to be implemented.

The very factors that make Cannon Air Force Base a superb place to train our Air Force are the factors that make it difficult for the community to adjust to the closure or potential closure of this base.

As you all know, this community is two hours away from the nearest metropolitan area. It is virtually impossible for people who are displaced by a closure to expect to find comparable opportunities in this community as they could a large metropolitan area.

Four decades ago, in Eastern New Mexico, we did have an air base close. That was Walker Air Force Base in Roswell, New Mexico, 100 miles from here. Within three years of that closure, that was 1967, within three years of that, Roswell's population had gone from 48,000 to about two-thirds of that size.

And you could argue that 40 years later Roswell still has not recovered totally from the

closure of Walker Air Force Base. So the record I think demonstrates that what has been proposed here would have a devastating effect on this part of our state, on these communities. We think that is a critical factor to be put into your decision-making about what you recommend to the President.

And we strongly believe that the resourceful people in Clovis and Portales and Eastern New Mexico, although they can suffer a lot, we believe that the closure of this air base would have a devastating impact on these communities and on the lives of many, many people here. We urge you to reject the recommendation of the Pentagon and instead to vote to keep this air base open. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR DOMENICI: Chairman, now I have Representative Tom Udall that represents this district.

CONGRESSMAN UDALL: Governor Richardson, Senators Domenici and Bingaman, I would like to first join my colleagues in the community in welcoming you, Commissioners, to Clovis. We have spoken with many of you already about the importance of Cannon, but we greatly appreciate your willingness to hold a

regional hearing here and, as you have said, Chairman Hansen, for so many of you to attend.

Cannon Air Force Base has made history. This base began in the late 1920s, when a civilian passenger facility, the port airfield, was established. In 1942, after the United States entered World War II, the Army Air Corps took control of the civilian airfield. It was then known as the Clovis Army Air Base.

The base was reassigned to tactical air command in July 1951. Six years later the base was renamed Cannon Air Force Base after the late General John K. Cannon, a former commander of the Tactical Air Command. The Air Force has operated F-86s, F-100s, T-33s, F-111s, and F-16s out of Cannon. There have always been several thousand military personnel associated with Cannon. The wing and its personnel have received numerous awards and recognition over the years.

The superb performance exhibited during Operation Iraqi Freedom was a result of the realistic training the pilots received at Cannon. New Mexico has always welcome military personnel and their families. And Clovis, Portales, and surrounding communities are no exception.

As you have witnessed today, there is truly outstanding community support for the base and the men and women who serve here. I will never forget the story of an Air Force retiree he told a town hall meeting when we were here two weeks ago.

He said I have served all over the nation in my long career. Most communities want airmen to spend their money in town but go back to the base. He said he never felt that in Clovis. The community was warm, welcoming, and couldn't have been nicer. This airman, when he finished his career, thought about all the places he had been. And he came back to Clovis to retire. That, my friends, says it all.

You will hear very soon from some outstanding community leaders. I am confident their comments will convince you of two things. Number one, just how valuable the base is to the Air Force and to our nation's defense. And, number two, how valuable the bond is between the base and the local area here.

Again thank you for your attendance today. I am hopeful that you will honor our respectful request and that you overturn DoD's recommendation to close Cannon. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you,

Congressman.

SENATOR DOMENICI: Chairman and fellow Commissioners, New Mexico is rather fortunate to have a U.S. Representative as a graduate of the United States Air Force Academy. And she isn't one of the recent ones so you understand that, when she was there, there weren't very many. Representative Heather Wilson is not from this district, but she's from a district just up the road. And she thought she would come here and share a few thoughts.

CONGRESSWOMAN WILSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thanks also to the Commissioners who have come here to Clovis, New Mexico. I wanted to take the time that I have to talk about the military value of this base and the associated airspace with it.

Several years ago the wing commander of the 27th Wing came to the Congressional Delegation and said that the mission at Cannon had changed and they needed more supersonic airspace in which to train. They weren't flying at low level the F-111s any more trying to penetrate Soviet airspace, they needed to be able to stand off with precision weapons at high altitude flying very fast to put bombs on a target on the ground.

Our Congressional Delegation has worked with them. In the Defense Authorization Bill of 2003, we authorized the Air Force to move forward with an initiative called the New Mexico Training Range Initiative. You will hear more about that today from one of my colleagues.

There are some bases that have been rated more highly by the Air Force because they have training ranges over the oceans. I would argue that those training areas over the oceans may be larger, but they have less real military value than what we have here in the Southwest, where you have the opportunity to fly over land, to search for targets, to drop ordnance on targets, and to integrate air and ground operations.

You don't get this over water. And I think, in your notebooks that you have, there are several testimonies to that fact from fighter pilots and people who have been stationed here at Cannon about the value of the training space here in New Mexico.

Now, I know that the Air Force seems to assume in its BRAC recommendation that the ranges here in New Mexico, particularly the range directly controlled by Cannon, would continue to be available

even if Cannon closes. I do not believe that over the long term that is a reasonable assumption.

Many of you have served in public life in various capacities. People accept training ranges when they are associated with bases in their communities. But without the base the support for the ranges will erode. Closing the Cannon ranges without the base will have a substantial negative impact on the ability of the United States Air Force to train as we fight.

You must take this into account when you look at the importance of Cannon. Reality matters more than formings. You will hear more today about inaccuracies in the data that was submitted about Cannon and the problems and how they disadvantage a high quality base like Cannon.

I hope, by the end of today, you will have a richer understanding of the real military value of Cannon and agree with all of us that it is far too valuable to the defense of this nation to close. Thank you.

SENATOR DOMENICI: Now, Commissioners, as you know what you saw here yesterday and you saw here this morning is a fantastic citizenry and vast community of interest. And from that comes a storage

of knowledge, a storehouse of knowledge.

We have put together under the leadership of our state with the help of our governor getting us resources a very fine team. That team is going to testify next about their expertise that they have garnered as they prepared for this hearing.

That team will be led by Randy Harris who is here. He will have with him Chad Lydick, Hanson Scott, and John Mervin. I will not introduce each of them, I will let them do that themselves.

I will start by introducing Randy Harris to you. Thank you very much.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Commissioner and Commission members, if I may, what we would like to do at this moment is call on the chairman of our New Mexico Base Realignment Commission for just a few words.

LT. GOVERNOR DENISH: Thank you. Good morning Commissioners, Governor, members of the delegation, Senator Domenici. It's my honor to be here today with my colleagues from the Base Planning Commission to speak to you about Cannon Air Force Base and what it means to and for New Mexico.

I grew up on the east side of New Mexico just down the road from here in a community called

Hobbs, New Mexico. I was a young girl when Walker Air Force Base closed. And I still remember the devastating effects not just on the Roswell community but on the regional community of Eastern New Mexico.

Now we're faced with another base closing in our state's heartland. But you will see today, if you have not already, that the level of support for Cannon in this community is unequalled by not only our delegation, but the people of the community, the governor, my office.

At the state level, the Military Base Planning Commission has been squarely in Cannon's corner. And we have been a partner advocating and making vital investments in the area and in the base supporting the Supersonic Training Range Initiative which you will hear much more about as Congresswoman Wilson said. And we have focused squarely on the efforts for preventing encroachment on both land and air.

We are a small and very rural state. And our bases and their personnel are vital to us, but more importantly they are members of our New Mexico family. We have a story to tell. It's a story about military value, it's a story about human resources, it's a story about community.

We are very appreciative of you being here today to hear our story and to listen carefully and make the right decision about Cannon Air Force Base.

Now, I'd like to turn the microphone back over to Randy Harris who is a native of New Mexico. He's worked side by side with our Commission, the Committee of 50, for years, not just in the last few months. And he will address the military value of Cannon. Thank you.

MR. HARRIS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, special guests, I am Randy Harris. And, as the lieutenant governor said, I have volunteered for the Committee of 50 that supports Cannon Air Force Base for the last 17 years of my life and 50 years all over total.

And I want to take the opportunity to thank the Congressional delegation, the New Mexico delegation, all of our friends from all the surrounding cities and states that have joined us here today for showing their support. We really appreciate that.

But I also want to thank you, the individual Commissioners, for taking your time in the job that you're doing, for taking time to see for yourself how the DoD, Department of Defense,

recommendation to close Cannon is simply wrong. And it should be overturned.

The wrong thing for the Air Force, the wrong thing for our country, and the wrong thing for the future of the men and women.

Yesterday several of you -- and I wish you all could have gotten to see the base. But yesterday several of you got to see the base. You got to see a superior aviation facility not only for just F-16s, but all kinds of missions because we have lots of different planes.

But you also got to hear about many of the performances of the great history earlier that was mentioned by Congressman Udall. One of the things you got to see was some of the performance records of Cannon. I just want to point out a couple of them for you, if I could.

There's one on the slide that it's in your book, either way that works for you. Number one in the Air Force for the best Operation Iraqi Freedom F-16 mission capability rate. Our deployment rate over there was 85 percent, 10 percent better than the Air Force standards.

In addition to that, our F-16s were the first in the theater to drop Joint Defense Attack

Munitions at supersonic speeds. First, first, and I could go on all day telling you the firsts that are accomplished by the men and women at Cannon.

They were also the leader of the mission support group in establishing the Expeditionary Mission Support Group in Balad. They built an entire city to house 68,000 troops. And they were doing that under combat.

And so I submit this to you, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, that you don't get those kind of results unless you have a great base that is helping support those men and women. The Air Force has said to you that Block 16s, Block 30s, Block 40s, Block 50s are not efficient, they should be sent away from Cannon. How did we get to be first under combat. The best, better than Air Force standards in three different blocks at one base. It's just a question I don't understand.

I share with you that, if the Air Force recommendation to close Cannon goes forward, it will destroy an active combat base full of experience and full of readiness. It is not in our country's interest nor is it in the interest of this community or of the men and women of the Air Force to get rid of a base that produces these kinds of readiness and

capability.

Mr. Chairman, I apologize up front. This book we have given you is voluminous. And it is a lot of material. And we have a lot of slides for you and the audience to see. And this is so important and this is our only chance to talk to you.

So we will move as quickly as we can because our plan and our road map for the day is for me to speak for a few minutes, I'm going to speak about military value. General Hanson Scott is going to speak about force retention and quality of life, he's going to speak about transformation. Mr. Chad Lydick from our community is going to talk about economic impact, specific results. And then we're going to ask the governor to close, Mr. Chairman.

Today it is my intention to share with you how the Department of Defense significantly deviated from the BRAC criteria. I would like to discuss how the Air Force determined military value by using a system, a scoring system, a numerical scoring system that no other service used and relied upon a quantitative analysis ignoring realistic nonreplaceable assets.

The Air Force military value weighted analytical process failed to properly evaluate the

highest military value for the next 20 years. I thought BRAC was supposed to look out and beyond. The data that we see in our analysis is incorrect, inconsistent, outdated, misleading, and did not apparently consider things that we feel are really important. And we hope that you do too.

Encroachment, New Mexico Training Retention Initiative, retention and quality of life, economic impact, alternative scenarios besides just closing Cannon, surely there are some alternative scenarios that could be considered, and future missions.

This must be considered and corrected or Cannon will close for the wrong reasons. And I would like to take a minute and look at the first four military value criteria and their components and see how Cannon was not provided a fair military review.

This military value matrix is in your book, it's on the slide. It was provided so it shows clearly I think, and I ask you and your staff, please look at this closely and then tell us if your findings are the same as ours or the same as the Air Force.

And what we have done here, Commissioners, is we have taken a matrix of not all of the military

value questions, but we have tried to give you a representative of military value one through four. And that's what's in the left-hand column. And there's individual components and questions that were asked. And the maximum points is what is in the green column.

And then there's the Air Force's score and what we believe is a realistic score of true military value. The deviation is the red column. And then the final column is what we're asking you to say, is this right, whose number is right, who has true military value. We ask you to look at that closely.

The first item that I'd like to start with is military value one which is current and future mission capability. The way that this component has come about was 18 restrictions, air traffic control restrictions, it's a computerized maintenance program.

And those of you on the site visit yesterday, one of things that you saw at the site was they corrected it. That's right. They should have corrected it, because it's not a -- it's a maintenance program, not an air traffic control. And the number was wrong.

Cannon controls its own departures, its

own arrivals, its own airspace. We saw that clearly from the tower yesterday. We have no restrictions and should have received the highest score, but we didn't. Bases that we all know that you fly in and out of, with all the travels that you're making across the country, we see bases that have significant commercial air traffic congestion. And they scored higher than we did. I do not understand.

Weather was another part of this component. And I'll just mention to you, there were bases that scored maximum points just like we did for weather. But I ask you, you've traveled the country. We have 329 days of flying weather here at Cannon, Clovis, New Mexico, Portales. And, in places on the East Coast like Shaw, do they have that good a weather? And they scored the same as we did? The data and the analysis is flawed.

Military value one, proximity to airspace supporting mission, that is a big factor. Twenty-two points out of 100. It was scored by -- airspace volume gave it 15 percent. When we looked at the data, we only saw Bronco and Pecos reported. But I'll show you maps in a little bit that show you that Talon, Mt. Dora, and Beak were not considered actively in our opinion.

If you consider those others, it doubles the size of our airspace. Those places that we use. We may not have control of them, but that we use.

Another component of this scoring system was the operating hours. How many times yesterday on your site visit did they tell you we're 24 hours seven days a week. It was reported 12. And that counts 15 percent of our score. Today was verification. We're 24/7.

We can only fly 12 hours just because, as an example, a pilot leaves Cannon Air Force Base runway, he goes out over the range, does all of his maneuvers for his entire training period, he's back landed safe in 24 minutes. We don't need 12 hours, we don't need that. But we have it available and we weren't scored.

Military value one is the next one, proximity to air space supporting mission. Again I want to talk about the second slide because all other attributes like laser use, low angle strafe, flare, chafe, we have full capability at Melrose bombing range. And so I ask you, Commissioners, how we just got six points in this category out of 22, it doesn't make sense to me. The information is incorrect and the analysis is flawed.

Military value one, proximity to low level routes. Cannon should have received the maximum points here because we have four low level routes that are entries and eight low level routes that are exits all within 50 miles. That's the scoring system that the Air Force used.

And it said, if you have one, you get maximum points. We didn't get maximum points. We've got three. The Air Force did not apply its own formula here. The data is incorrect, the analysis is flawed.

Military value one, suitable auxiliary airfields. It says, if you were greater than 50 nautical miles, that you couldn't be counted. Cannon got zero points here. When we look at it, our impression of this is the data did not consider Clovis Municipal Airport is less than 20 miles away. It has a 6,200 foot runway. It takes 7,000 feet to land the F-16, I understand that clearly.

But we have for FY 06 an approved plan to link that to 8,600 feet. We didn't start that on May 13, we didn't do that. We've been working on this. This community and our mayors and our city commissioners and country commissioners have been working for that for a long time. Those things don't

happen overnight. And we have an exhibit for you to see that as well.

Again, on suitability auxiliary airfields, something I think is really critically important, we have two fully equipped runways. One that has got two ILS approaches from either end. You saw that yesterday. We have a crosswind runway that the ILS system will be completed this fall. Didn't go into the scoring system.

So bases that had one got as good a score as we did or better. It doesn't make sense to me. When you're talking about auxiliary airfields, you in the military know this better than I do. When Cannon diverts only 20 flights each year, that's before we get the crosswind ILS which is going to happen this fall.

And we don't do a lot of diversions because our weather is so great out here. How many places have you been that have 329 days of flying weather every year. I mean, if you look at it by month to month, that's a 30-year history. I guess I need somebody to guide me. Since when did less than 50 miles to an auxiliary airfield become important?

We've been flying at Cannon for 50 years. And our auxiliary airfields that are considered by

this score over 50 miles, Amarillo, Lubbock, Roswell, they're 100 miles away. We've been landing here fine for 50 years because you don't have the encroachment issues, you don't have the population, you don't have the weather issues. The question is is 50 miles the right measurement.

Military value two, I'll move on because there are several of these and I'm just hitting the highlights. Condition of infrastructure, ramp and runway condition. You know what, Cannon Air Force Base received the maximum. But what was so interesting to me was we received the maximum on data, Mr. Chairman, that was submitted for 2000. You saw that yesterday. They showed you that here is the current data as to what's been happening since.

I just want to point out we got a brand-new runway rekeeled in 2001, a crosswind survey resurfaced in 2003. And, when it comes to hangars and runways, those of you that were there yesterday, you can't get more ramp space than we have. And why? Because we have F-111s, we had 100 of them, more than twice, almost twice as many F-16s as we have today. And the infrastructure was prepared for those and it is ready for new missions.

Military value two, access to supersonic

airspace. The reason this is important for us to discuss is because it is measured with some of the same statistics that proximity to airspace was measured. Number one, operating hours, 50 percent of your score here is based upon operating hours. You reported 12. You saw yesterday, we have 24/7. We took half of the points knocked off right there. I don't understand that.

We also have as I mentioned this 50 percent of this score is based upon your supersonic airspace and military operating areas within 100 miles. If you look at the map that's on the slide or in your book, I just want to give you a quick frame of reference.

Right in the middle is the Pecos MOA which is where our bombing range is. And just 20 miles to the east is Cannon and Clovis. And, if you look to the right, another 20 miles, you have the Bronco Military Operating Area, a huge amount of operating space, supersonic.

If you go to the top of the page and you look at the next area, it's Mt. Dora, supersonic. And you come down along the left side, there's a piece called Beak. We've used it, but we don't use it a lot. But the entry is going to combine them

together. And I'll talk about that later. And then you go on down to Talon. We don't use it a lot. But the point is it's available and we did not see it included in the data.

If you look at what we currently use, we exceed and meet the needs of the JSF. So I don't understand. Because an entry was not considered, we know that all it does is enhance what I just mentioned to you already. And I think this is an interesting note.

When we talked about proximity to airspace in our question component, we said how far is it. If it's over 150 nautical miles, it doesn't matter, don't count, you get zero. That's interesting. When we get to supersonic, it doesn't matter how far it is, if it's 500 miles to supersonic, it's just going to be measured by volume. That's what these statistics are doing to us which I think is wrong.

Military value two, range complex supports mission. This question also has a number of operating hours and airspace volume, those two same that we've talked about, proximity to airspace and access to supersonic airspace. They're still scoring us with incorrect data.

The second one is something that

Congresswoman Heather Wilson mentioned. And that's that this process seemed to favor large over water airspace. Not whether it was restricted, not whether it was encroached or hard to get to, but it had big size.

You have in your document, and I won't go to it today, but we have a document in there from Retired Lieutenant General Don LaMontagne who is the DO at Air Combat Command that specifically clearly shows you the difference between training over ground, realistic training versus training over water.

I won't go through of rest of these, but there are a lot of them there. The bottom line on this slide and this page 3 is our range is unencroached, unrestricted, and only 20 miles away. You saw it yesterday from the tower. And I ask you where in the world can you go and do that.

Military value three, contingency mobilization future forces, buildable acres for industrial growth and operations. Yesterday verified the first bullet point we have here for you. The first bullet point was that we believe it was 368, I think they told you yesterday it was 365 or something like that. That's what we found. That's what we

believe.

How did we find that? Because we've lived here for 30 years and we've worked with the men and women of Cannon and it didn't make sense. The numbers were wrong. And we verified them.

If you look at the next page which happens to be a map, I just want to show you, when you're talking about expandable space, when you were in the tower yesterday, you looked 360 degrees around. And what did you see? Farmland. No high-rises, no churches, no schools, nobody encroaching the bases.

And, just based upon an average of \$1,500 an acre, where could you go with a 3,700 acre base for 5 million. Nowhere but here. You know why? Because this community has been committed to this space, we are dedicated to this space.

Military value three, mobility and surge. You mentioned that, Mr. Chairman, in your opening remarks. And I believe Cannon Air Force Base has a great potential for mobility and surge. We already scored really high on our fuel efficiency. And we are planning for the FY 06 and have authorized another 13.2 million which will increase it even better.

I want to point out our water well

systems, our wastewater systems which Commissioner Hill talked about, we have the best. So we have the ability to take care of contingency and surge operations.

We are a secure inland year-round base for many type of contingency operations, border security. When you went to the base, you went over a railroad right next to the base. We have four-lane highways that connect us to the metropolitan areas. They're not interstates, but they're just as good and in some cases better.

Military value four, cost of operations and manpower. Cannon Air Force Base has the lowest cost per flying hour of any ACC base. We have a letter in here from Retired General Rick Goddard who was in charge of maintenance at ACC. He states that fact. F-16s to be moved to bases with much higher costs.

Basic operating support, sustainment, per diem, basic allowance for housing. To me I don't understand that. I don't understand how we can suggest that it's better to move weapons systems to places where it's going to cost more to keep them. It doesn't make sense.

And the factors not appropriately

considered, and I'm going to move on quickly here. We believe that the Air Force weighting inaccurately represents Cannon's military value in specific areas. And I want to talk about encroachment and I want to talk about the New Mexico training range initiatives.

In regards to encroachment, the Air Force weightings and the BRAC process do not adequately emphasize the impact of encroachment on existing and future operations. You see that it's 2.28 percent. So what does that mean?

What that means is that there's a base fully encroached that you can't even utilize because it's restricted severely. They get the same points we do and did in many cases. Is that right? I don't see it.

I want to point out that the Department of Defense stated goal has been to position activities away from unfriendly environments, densely populated, noise sensitive, ATC restrictive, unsupported operations and has been ignored I believe in this BRAC process.

For the last five years, the DoD has warned communities to solve those encroachment problems. Do what you need to condemn. There's been U.S. Government money that has been funded for buffer

zones. So what happened, what changed, why is that only 2.28 percent? It doesn't make sense to me.

Encroachment of base facilities, I just want to talk about it. Several years ago this community and the state of New Mexico Curry County folks got together and purchased airspace easements to meet AICUZ requirements. And they donated those to the Air Force.

I don't understand why our goal to take care of the base, to make sure it's not encroached, why are we not closing those bases where the communities want the base to leave or they restrict operations. It just doesn't make sense.

Encroachment on the range. Just real quickly. There are several kinds of encroachment issues impacting other ranges such as community development, endangered species, cultural resources. Airspace is only as valuable as it is usable. The measurement system said, if it's really big, we don't care how far it's away if it's a supersonic. But it didn't address these issues.

If you look at the next map, what that map is is an overlay that we did months ago, not since May 15. But what we did is we had a group that worked with the New Mexico Military Base Planning

Commission.

And they said, okay, let's take a map of the United States, let's put all the dots there where the military installations are. Let's overlay all the commercial air traffic, let's overlay all the private air traffic on top of it, and then let's put in where it's too cold to fly, where it's too hot to fly, where there are immense populations.

And what do you have left? You have left this circle. It's called Cannon, that's nonencroached, that is the place where we ought to be.

Let's go to the next slide. I'm not trying to point fingers, I'm trying to give you an example here.

This is Luke Air Force Base. And those red dots, they represent near midair occurrences. So I asked him, how can Luke score the same points on encroachment that Cannon did or how can it score better ATC restrictions than Cannon did. And the Air Force is misleading and I believe the process is flawed.

New Mexico Training Range Initiative. I'm wrapping up here. The New Mexico Training Range Initiative is not included as you know in the data.

And your staff worked very closely with the people back there.

They clearly understand now and are able to report to you and I'd like to report to all of us today and those people that weren't here yesterday. We have an agreement, an understanding. It's not written, it's not formal yet, but we've got our work done.

When you have the FAA over two years working with the wing and Air Combat Command who finally said let's shake hands and agree and let's go write up a formal proposal and get this done. We're looking at BRAC for the future.

You already know that Cannon is unencumbered and this doubles us in size. And what I mean by doubles us in size is because it enhances our ability to go up with other ranges and connect with them.

What I want to share with you is the bullet point that where do you find other states that have been working for years to get you more airspace. Clovis, New Mexico, Taos, New Mexico, Cannon Air Force Base.

Yesterday there was a discussion about this airspace. And I want to talk about how I feel

the space is. First of all, if you look at the very middle and you look at the walls, what it does is it simply makes it wider, it makes it taller, but it also makes it supersonic with 50,000 feet down. And that's a unique operation.

So, when you look at the entire state of New Mexico, you're looking at all of that airspace together that's contingent upon Cannon Air Force Base being here; because, if they're not here, by the military's own formula, it's more than 150 miles, you get no points. You can't have it both ways.

You're absolutely right. If you're going to score us low on military value and with the closest you could be to airspace, then you can't keep the air space and fly 150 miles further away. It doesn't make sense. It doesn't make sense.

In summary, Mr. Chairman and Commissioners, there is simply no other base that can offer the same combination of protected airspace, access to unrestricted range, excellent flying conditions, unencroached base facility. It is an ideal base for today and for future missions.

Don't take my word for it. Read the exhibits of General Joe Ashy, General Jim Knight, Rick Goddard, Tom Hickey, Colonel Phillip Frazee,

Arnold Franklin, Dave Richards. They're attached.

You've got a lot more.

But please, I ask you, take time because they speak the knowledge of realistic military value, not the scoring system. Thank you for your time. And I would like now to introduce Retired Brigadier General Hanson Scott.

RET. BRIG. GENERAL SCOTT: Thank you, Randy. Members of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission, I'll quickly cover a few points on force structure, BRAC data analysis, and transformation.

As the Department of Defense commenced this current base realignment and closure round, one of the stated objectives of the process was to ensure that after military utility quality of life for members of the Armed Forces would be addressed.

In our opinion the Department of Defense recommendation pertaining to Cannon Air Force Base adversely impacts the quality of life for members of the F-16 force. This recommendation, if carried out, will eventually have a serious impact on the retention of the Air Force members associated with flying and supporting F-16s.

As described in the chart, over 40 percent of the Air Force's F-16 squadrons will be based

overseas. Inactivation of five CONUS squadrons including the three at Cannon will result in overseas commitments over 50 percent of the time including operational deployments and not including combat tours, but including and requiring sequential three-year overseas assignments or three-year overseas assignments followed by remote tours.

An unintended consequence of the proposed action will be that young men and women leave the Air Force. And, assuming that overseas tours generally require a more experienced force, this will also negatively impact readiness.

Cannon Air Force Base is an ideal location for 20-year force structure requirements and would certainly be the perfect location for resolving encroachment issues at other locations for all services. And Cannon would be an outstanding receiver base for return of Air Force units from overseas including other systems such as the F-15 or the A-10.

My next two charts pertain to our comments thus far on BRAC data. The Air Force's research for BRAC 2005 for the most part reflected a deliberate decision not to evaluate specific missions for most Air Force bases. Yet Cannon was specifically

identified as an F-16 Block 50 base. There is no evidence that Cannon was considered for additional missions other than F-16s.

Air Force comments stated that Cannon did not rank as high as other Block 50 installations. This approach was criticized by the Department of Defense red team in a white paper at your tab M. Further, the red team pointed out inconsistencies in the manner in which military value and military judgment were considered by the Air Force. In some cases military value influenced military judgment. And in others military judgments influenced military value.

As has been pointed out by Mr. Harris, Cannon Air Force Base has outstanding military value which would be appropriate for other air to ground missions as well as air to air missions. We have identified several alternative scenarios which will be provided to the Commission and their staff at a later time.

As we reviewed the Air Force BRAC data which has been released during the last few weeks, we discovered that net present value savings of closing Cannon increased dramatically from \$1.3 billion dated the last few days of April to \$2.7 million two weeks

later.

Further, Air Force cost savings resulted from eliminating personnel associated with the inactivated units, and there were no personnel costs associated with the aircraft at the receiving location. We understand the Commission and your staff has identified this issue. But the manner in which the data has been described does not result in a closure in other instances.

At your tab N is a spreadsheet which notes that the cost savings of closing Cannon do not exist. We will be providing a more detailed analysis when the DoD releases additional information.

We have specifically addressed the important factors pertaining to the Department of Defense recommendation to close Cannon Air Force Base. Now, I would like to turn to broader implications of national security in which Cannon plays a significant role.

A stated objective of the current base realignment closure round, as described frequently by senior DoD officials during the last few years, was to accomplish transformation. We closely reviewed the transformation guidance published by the Secretary of Defense which is described in this

chart. And New Mexico stepped out in support.

This chart is an overview of the various Air Force and Army activities in New Mexico or close proximity. You have been briefed earlier on the airspace available if Cannon closes. We also have other capabilities in this state, White Sands Missile Range, the Fort Bliss Complex, 85 percent of which is in New Mexico; Kirtland Air Force Base and Holloman Air Force Base, both installations with a wide variety of capabilities.

New Mexico's concept is to focus on the specific elements of Pillar Three, using the wide variety of military capabilities in our state, including the Distributed Mission Operations Center at Kirtland and our two national laboratories, Sandia and Los Alamos.

Our purpose was to take full advantage of the contiguous air and surface maneuver space to support joint experimentation both in the state and throughout the region and to use our widely disbursed military installations to stage responding military forces.

Overall our objective is to take full advantage of a wide range of virtual and constructive DoD assets that enable use of the unequalled joint

training opportunities in the Southwest. Roving Sands is just one excellent example.

Cannon Air Force Base plays a key role in our transformation concept. Regarding transformation, the Secretary of Defense directed, New Mexico responded, and the Air Force ignored us.

Our concept was initially presented informally to Joint Forces Command and more recently briefed to the director of the joint staff. Joint Forces Command has been asked to evaluate our concept. And we are expecting a session with the Joint Forces Command staff at the flag level in the near future.

The proposed closure of Cannon will have an adverse impact on the quality of life, readiness, and retention. We have found serious flaws in the BRAC data available to members of our team. And Cannon plays a key role in our transformation concept.

And now I would like to turn the podium over to Chad Lydick.

MR. LYDICK: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, I appreciate the opportunity to be with you today to talk to you about the economic impact the closure of Cannon would have on the local

communities.

While military value criteria are overriding factors in dictating BRAC recommendations, there is a very human contention as well. And it's painful. This area has already experienced significant base closure action. Walker Air Force Base in Roswell, New Mexico was closed in 1967. Amarillo Air Force Base in Amarillo, Texas, was also closed in 1967. And Reese Air Force Base in Lubbock, Texas, was closed in the 1995 round of BRAC.

All three of these locations are within a 100-mile radius of the Cannon community. Cannon remains as the only military installation in the Texas Panhandle of the Eastern New Mexico region. An example of the adverse impact of the base closure on a rural community can be provided by the analysis of the Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico, closure.

In 1967 the population of Roswell was 48,000 people. Three years later it was 34,000. 6,000 of 18,000 homes were left vacant. As of the 2000 census, the Roswell population had increased to 45,293 people. It has taken this community approximately 40 years to recover to where it once was.

The 2000 U.S. census showed that the Curry and Roosevelt County region experienced a basically flat two to 3 percent growth rate in past decades. An economic impact of the projected levels created by the closure of Cannon would constitute one of the most economically damaging decisions in the entire history of the state of New Mexico.

The state of New Mexico conducted a study to respond to a recommendation by the U.S. Department of Defense to close Cannon under the 2005 BRAC process. This study shows a much greater potential job loss than the 20.5 percent provided by the Department of Defense.

The DoD changed the impact from 28.2 percent in January to 20.5 percent in the last few months prior to the BRAC release. Our analysis shows that 28.5 percent job loss in Curry County alone.

Additional impacts in the Portales and Melrose communities and Roosevelt County as a whole will only add to the regional impact. The Walker Air Force Base closure economic impact numbers match up with these projected numbers and provide an historical precedent. I'm here to tell you that these numbers are real.

Directly and indirectly Cannon is

responsible for one in every 3.5 jobs in Curry County. And Cannon is responsible for one dollar out of every \$3.40 paid to the workers in Curry County. You need to only look around this room to visualize the impact on this community. One-third of those seats will be empty.

Cannon is responsible for an estimated 6,756 jobs regionally producing an annual payroll of 343 million. The overall impact of the direct, indirect, and induced activity from base operations and procurement would exceed \$435 million annually.

In terms of impact to state government, Cannon contributes more than 900,000 annually in Federal Impact Aid to education and an estimated \$590,000 in gross receipts taxes from direct payment by Cannon contractors.

To the extent that Plains Regional Medical Center which is located within the city of Clovis provides services to other communities in Eastern New Mexico as well as four counties in West Texas, any declines in their ability to provide care will affect a much larger area than that anticipated by the Department of Defense.

I would like to present a few specific examples of the projected impact to the Clovis/Curry

County community. Plains Regional Medical Center is the largest acute care hospital in the area bounded by the cities of Albuquerque, New Mexico, Roswell, New Mexico, Amarillo, Texas, and Lubbock, Texas, an area of approximately 34,000 square miles. The hospital receives approximately 11 percent of its total annual revenue from Cannon personnel.

The hospital delivers over one baby and admits one pediatric patient each day from Cannon personnel and their dependents. Tri-West which the Tri-Care organization for this area currently contributes \$17 million in gross revenue per year.

The closure of Cannon would significantly impact the hospital's ability to provide healthcare services for Clovis and surrounding communities and severely constrain the planned expansion of the women's units and the neonatal intensive care unit.

Closure of Cannon will result in a significant loss of medical and support staff. A few examples. An immediate employee reduction of 60 for a payroll reduction of \$3.5 million. Sixteen newly recruited physicians of various specialties within the last 18 months benefiting our entire region will be affected.

The hospital is projected to lose \$12

million per year in net revenue, increase charity care, and bad debts. The Home Health Care Service which covers the previously mentioned service area would have to be reevaluated. Can the services be continued?

The total projected economic impact to the hospital from the closure of Cannon is expected to approach \$84.8 million over the next five-year period. This figure is defined as the five-year net revenues lost to the hospital, plus the extra charity care and bad debts, plus the cost of construction projects currently planned that will be curtailed or eliminated.

As many of you are aware, the housing industry is a driving force in our nation's economy. This industry within Curry County alone contributes \$1.1 million annually in gross receipts and permit fee revenues to the city of Clovis. The Clovis Board of Realtors has provided data on the local housing market which would be greatly impacted by the closure of Cannon.

2,000 homes within the local market are directly controlled by the military or military personnel. By having this number of homes entering the market over a two-year period, it is estimated

that the local new housing starts will be flatlined over the next 26 years. This does not consider the compounding problem caused by a declining population.

Military members or civilian workers at the base account for 25 percent of the total annual housing sales. The associated effect could approach 40 percent of the market. A survey conducted by the Building Contractors Association of Curry County on their membership shows a projected loss of 410 jobs in the housing construction industry here locally.

In addition, 38 percent of the area construction businesses are projected to fail and 42 percent of the members will not be able to repay their existing debt. This single industry impact will ripple exponentially across the region in ways that are unknown and cannot be accurately measured.

In fact, Chairman Principi has already predicted that these military base closings will be a tsunami in the communities that they hit.

The Cannon contribution to the Clovis Municipal Schools is 15 percent. That is 1,247 students out of a total population of 8,147 students.

The closure of Cannon will entail the following adverse effects: An immediate staff reduction of 15 percent which is 163 staff members

including 82 teachers.

An immediate loss in state and federal funding of over \$8 million. Closure would require the probable closing of three elementary schools within this district.

The Eastern New Mexico Rehabilitative Services for the Handicapped has 105 employees currently working at Cannon in the dining hall, the commissary, and the switchboard. Seventy-five of these people have severe disabilities. These 105 jobs with a \$2.5 million payroll account for 25 percent of the total jobs for the handicapped created for all federal agencies within the entire state of New Mexico.

If Cannon were to close, all of these jobs would be lost and many of these citizens would be without work and will require state support. Currently we have 47 military dependents and ten military retirees working for ENMRSH in this community.

The minority and ethnic groups comprise approximately 54 percent of the Curry County population and 60 percent of the Roosevelt County population. The loss of jobs covered by the closure of Cannon will have a disproportionate impact on the

minority community. The Clovis schools report that the number of students on a free or reduced rate food program makes up 62.6 percent of the total student usage.

The Cannon communities of Clovis and Portales are already significantly above the U.S. average for populations living on poverty. The closure of Cannon will have a significant impact on the quality of life experience within the minority and ethnic communities.

The adverse impact on the Cannon communities of Clovis and Portales is more than double that of any other BRAC community even by the Department of Defense's accounts. The state of New Mexico study shows that the impact of the Clovis community could be as high as three times the impact to other affected communities.

Ladies and gentlemen, I assert to you that this price is too high. And I do not believe that this action is appropriate for these local communities that have unselfishly supported our Armed Forces in all facets for over 50 years. An economic impact of this magnitude will be unrecoverable for the people here in their lifetime and possibly that of their children.

I have described some of the factors and scope of the potential economic impact on the communities surrounding Cannon if the recommendation of the Department of Defense to close Cannon is approved.

You have also heard today about substantial flaws and omissions in the analysis of Cannon's military value. Since economic impact is an evaluation criteria under the BRAC process and the projected impact to the Cannon communities would be the destruction of almost 30 percent of their economy, I would urge this Commission to be absolutely sure that the recommendation to close Cannon is the proper one.

I would like to conclude my remarks today with two quotes from Mr. Will Rogers. First, and I quote, good judgment comes from experience and a whole lot of that comes from bad judgment.

We feel that the Cannon experience has been a good experience for our military family and we need Cannon to continue as an irreplaceable asset for our nation's security.

The second quote is never miss a good opportunity to shut up. Thank you.

SENATOR DOMENICI: Well, I was sitting

there listening as you all have been and I was thinking how wonderful it is to have nonpoliticians address you. They have been terrific.

The next one is our state leader. He will do as good a job as the citizens, if not better. We work together regardless of party affiliation in this state when it comes to matters as important as this.

It's been our privilege to work together with our governor in an effort to present to you the best facts we can about the future of this community, these communities, and the future of our military as it's affected by Cannon.

GOVERNOR RICHARDSON: Senator Domenici, thank you for leading us today. Thank you for your service to this country, the world, and to New Mexico.

Commissioners, today you have the toughest job in America. And I am to summarize. You've heard it all. This has been a team effort. Today we're all Americans, patriotic, we're New Mexicans, we're not Democrats or Republicans. We love the military. And our objective is to persuade you to keep Cannon open.

I'm proud to be part of a team that is fighting for Eastern New Mexico. I'm proud to be a

governor of a state with a great military tradition. Four military bases we have. New Mexicans have fought in all our wars.

And I'm proud to be governor of the first state in America to give each of our National Guardsmen in our state a \$250,000 life insurance policy, and now 33 other states are doing it, because the federal government was not doing the right thing.

The presentations here today have demonstrated the serious errors made by the Department of Defense in proposing that Cannon be part of the closure list. You've learned from the testimony, and I admit I tried to follow all of it, that the capabilities and characteristics that can strengthen our military to a tremendous degree are possessed by Cannon. And you saw the base yesterday.

You've learned that Cannon has access to low level routes and supersonic airspace which was not considered in the Pentagon's review. The New Mexico Training Initiative is about to happen, it's going through its own process. You've learned that Cannon has terrific training ranges, crosswind runways, a Melrose bombing range. Hardly anyone complains about it.

You've learned that Cannon faces no

encroachment of any kind, there's none. In fact, we had an executive order prohibiting it. And it wasn't happening anyway, no nearby cities swallowing up its land, no major airports or traffic that would endanger the public or its military missions.

And you've learned that Cannon has that precious gift, great weather. You can't just create 329 days of sunshine. You either have it or you don't. And we have it. And we have it today.

You've also learned that the Pentagon did not take into account future missions as if the base would disappear. Capabilities that are needed for America's national security including the future conflicts that we'll be having that involve air to ground training capabilities.

The war we are engaged in now is a land one requiring these air to ground missions. Our enemies are those that want to destroy us, international terrorists, nations with nuclear weapons that are hostile to us. The training that has happened here at Cannon for the early wars in the Gulf show the tremendous military value of this base.

The Department of Defense I believe has done one thing. They've said give us some recommendations or we want to give you

recommendations based on costs and figures, many that are wrong. But not based on efficiency, not based on the national interest of the United States.

They said to you, Commissioners, we're giving you a list that saves you money but doesn't look at the overall objectives of our country. And yesterday you made a site visit. And I believe that those that have recommended closure, those in Washington, D.C., did not come to the base to make an on-site assessment.

Finally, you've learned that the community of Clovis and Portales, and there are thousands outside this hall and there are thousands of New Mexicans here from many counties, they support Cannon as if Cannon were their home.

Despite all the military statistics, and I believe we have given you that strong military rationale to keep Cannon, there is a human side. There is people. And you saw them waving their flags welcoming you.

Thousands of patriotic Americans have dedicated their lives to Cannon, strengthening its value to the military and successfully carrying out this mission.

So I ask you here today, don't disappoint

the people who have made this base what it is. The Doc Stewarts who made the prayer who has dedicated his life to keeping Cannon strong. We have shown that Cannon is vital to the Air Force. Closing it would be devastating to the community and detrimental to our nation's security.

Now, you have the toughest job. And that is to see if there are better options for closure, bases with more encroachment, with less airspace, with worse weather, inferior community support. Now that's tough to do in a nation and communities that love their bases too.

So I respectfully ask you, Commissioners, and I'm honored that so many of you turned out, the largest turnout, and I'm honored to have met almost every one of you to make our case one-on-one, that you do the right thing, that you do right per not just this community to ensure its survival, because basically the economic impact with all these figures that were given to you means that the economy of this area would be so devastated that it might not survive.

So, for the good of the American people, I ask that this Commission remove Cannon from the base closure list. And, on behalf of the community of

Clovis and Portales and Eastern New Mexico, on behalf of the thousands of New Mexicans, on behalf of the thousands of Air Force personnel that have served at Cannon, on behalf of all of us here today, I ask you to do one thing.

And I am confident having met you and seen you as independent voices with a superb staff that, if you base your decision on facts and figures and military value and human side, that you will make the right decision. So I ask you today to do the right thing. Thank you.

SENATOR DOMENICI: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I looked at the schedule. And, of course, we have a break before the next presentation as I understand. We have a period of time for questions and answers. And I believe that means it's up to you all.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Are you ready for that, Senator?

SENATOR DOMENICI: Time will tell.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Do any of the Commissioners have questions? Commissioner Coyle.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Mr. Harris and then for General Scott. With respect to today, I thought your presentation was excellent on the various

military values and criteria. And I think everyone on this Commission understands that you can't capture all that is important with sterile numbers. And that, if you don't ask the right questions, you can't get the right answers.

But I'm confused about one matter, and that is to what extent did the low scores that Cannon got come about because Cannon reported a number not realizing how the Air Force would interpret that number. For example, I think you told us, but maybe I misunderstood, that the base reported 12 hours rather than 24 for their operational hours and that they reported a lower number than they should have for buildable acres and perhaps there were other examples. In other words, my question is, if the community had used the data that Cannon itself reported, would you agree with the DoD military value calculations?

MR. HARRIS: I'm not an expert by any means. The answer to that question is no. And the reason it is no is because what we understand is that the report -- the numbers were reported in error. And how that happened I don't know. They could have gotten keyed in in error and gone down the chain.

I don't know how that happened because I'm

not a numerical analyst. But, by looking at the data available and there's still data out there, but looking at what the data is available, it didn't make sense that the data was recorded inaccurately when we could see it every day that you're out there.

And then yesterday that was verified when the Air Force showed us that they had done some rezoning and that number had now changed. Does that answer your question?

COMMISSIONER COYLE: I think so, yes. General Scott, I think you said that, in the final couple of weeks of the DoD process, the cost savings, the projected cost savings, the net 20 year present value cost savings jumped from \$1.3 million to \$2.7 million.

And I wanted to ask you, do you have any understanding as to how or why that happened? And then, looking at the chart in the book here, the community calculates that moving Cannon will actually cost more than -- actually cost \$169,000, if I read this right, rather than save 2.7. Could you explain why that is?

RET. BRIG. GENERAL SCOTT: Commissioner, in reference to the first question, we don't have a response to why. We had access to two spreadsheets

which prioritized the Air Force realignment actions and by cost savings over a 20-year period. We saw where Cannon's net savings was 1.3 in the spreadsheet dated in the latter part of April. And we don't have the data, that's why we need more information. We don't know how they computed their savings. We don't know.

The second spreadsheet question has to do with cost savings of personnel. When you take cost savings of personnel and then the forces show up in the other locations, the cost savings are not reflected in our costs. That's where we wound up with an actual small increase in costs.

COMMISSIONER BILBRAY: Yes. It was an excellent presentation. You mentioned a question whether or not anybody from the Air Force came to the base. In prior experience across the country, we have found that they have not, they have crunched numbers. Does anyone on the panel know if any representatives of the Air Force actually came to Cannon?

MR. HARRIS: I am not aware of anyone coming.

COMMISSIONER BILBRAY: By the way I want to mention, this was a great presentation. I know

the governor earlier said something about happy that we were here. When he talked to me, I thought I had to come.

You ought to know that he traveled around the country. He caught me on a Sunday morning, I missed mass. We commend you for your zeal in traveling the country. I think you're the only public official in the country that has done that.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Any further questions from the Commission?

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: Could one of you share with me, we talked about the Training Range Initiative and that that process is moving along. Is there an expected date when you will have all documents signed, sealed, and fully cleared for operations?

MR. HARRIS: Commissioner Newton, that date has moved from October to November to December to January. And yesterday I was reading that implementation would be full and complete June '06. It's an estimated target.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Further questions?

SENATOR DOMENICI: Mr. Chairman, fellow Commissioners, I think we have another New Mexico issue that follows, but we have a break. There will

be different witnesses, some will remain.

The governor has made our wrap-up, but I want to close in this way, once again thanking each one of you not only for today but for the great service you are doing for our nation.

I know that's repetitious. But let me say we all do things for our country. Some of us get elected, some of us serve in the military. But I think what's important in our great country, we always look out there and say what about the people, where are the American people, can they do things when the chips are down.

And I think you heard today, at least from this senator's standpoint, as good a presentation by laymen, by citizens who took up their time to gather up information to devote themselves to a cause and present the case for this base. I have not heard a better one. I've been in one before. We've won before.

I will say to all of you, we won one before, strictly because the department made an error in calculation, just a total arithmetic error in terms of savings. That happened to us. We went through that. Presentations then were easier. But these were up to the challenge as I see it. I hope

you agree.

Your sensitivity today and the questions it seemed to me to indicate that you and your wonderful staff will have at least plenty of questions for the Department of Defense. We hope we have done that for you and done that for them so we can reach the right decision.

And last remark, this is a poor state. You should know that. A poor state. The governor and others work very hard to move it up so it's not so poor. But I tell you, we have not been poor in spirit when it comes to wanting to help the military of the United States.

There is no state, there is no state that has their arms more open, their hearts more sensitive, and their minds more willing to say what America needs we are going to join. You don't find any base in New Mexico that has people marching, that has people saying we don't want you.

In this place we work together to expand what they need. Citizens doing it. They didn't come to me and ask for millions, they came to me and said we're going to get this range. Senator Bingaman, Senator Domenici. Yes, we will. They did it.

It seems to me that our governor is right,

our governor is right, this base has proved itself over history. And we only hope that the fact that you will not believe that those in the Defense Department who punch numbers and create models might very well have the wrong information.

You know, in this day and age, we use great computers. But, if you don't put in the right information, you get the wrong answer. Our computers may not be right when people punch in the wrong numbers. We believe we're right. And we hope that you will agree with us. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I want to thank this panel for excellent testimony and the folks here in the audience and their enthusiasm. I agree with what you said about the governor and the enthusiasm and the support that they give.

We were amazed, as we came from our motel, to see all the people lining the streets. The enthusiasm there was showing and the signs, some of them quite original on what they wanted to do here. The testimony was excellent. We appreciate it very much. Very compelling testimony.

Now, what we would like to do, because we do have another New Mexican panel right here, is to take that panel right now. And then we'll have a

five-minute break concluding that. And, of course, we'll excuse those who are not on the panel. And thank you so much for your testimony.

(Break.)

(Witnesses sworn.)

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you.

Senator, back to you, sir.

SENATOR DOMENICI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We're very pleased that we haven't used all our time and we thank you for giving us time now on these two issues. We have a very articulate spokesman who is going to talk to us about White Sands Missile Range.

And then we have a follow-up in a few moments by somebody who will talk to you about another other issue before you. I think you already addressed him, he was the governor of New Mexico. And now he's dean of the school of business. And we thought he would be a great analyst and I'd liked to introduce him. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

DR. CARRUTHERS: Thank you very much, Senator. And thank you, Mr. Chairman. I knew you back in the old days, when I served at the Department of the Interior.

I want to thank you for hearing the White

Sands Missile Range Army Research Laboratory
Community Response Team position on the realignment
of the Army Research Laboratory. Now, we provided
you a briefing book. And I hope you have a slide
presentation that I'll be going through quickly in
the next few minutes. I think that was given to you
just a few minutes ago.

I know, in the interest of time,
Mr. Chairman, I have a major rate of speech of 160
words per minute with gusts up to 320. I want to go
very quickly through this slide show because you have
an excellent briefing book. And the slide
presentation essentially summarizes what we have to
say.

I do have two witnesses, I see one of them
here, Dr. Jack Wade, who is retired as director of
the Army Research Laboratory Survivability/Lethality
Analysis Directorate and also Army Research
Laboratory assistant director for plans, programs,
and budgets.

And then I think I have Rear Admiral Paul
Arthur has just joined us here. He is a retired rear
admiral but was also as a civilian the technical
director deputy to the commanding general of White
Sands Missile Range.

And I've asked these two gentlemen to join me to answer any specific questions you may have about the Army Research Laboratory White Sands Missile Range. On behalf of the community response team, our political leadership, our business leadership, our academic leaders in the area, our citizens, we're asking you to reverse the Department of Defense recommendation to realign the Army Research Laboratory activities from White Sands Missile range to the Aberdeen Proving Grounds.

On slide three we take just a quick peak at the process criteria, the BRAC process criteria. And our contention will be quickly that the White Sands Missile Range Army Research Laboratory best meets BRAC criteria if left at the White Sands Missile Range, not moved to the Aberdeen Proving Ground.

Now, I heard about the modeling awhile ago. I'm an economist, I've done modeling. As an economist you can think of it as a religion or a science. But we do know in modeling that, in fact, your assumptions that you make and the data you put in will dictate the outcome. And so I'm not here to pound on the modeling part because I've been subject to having done the modeling and I understand the

vagaries of modeling.

And I don't believe it's appropriate because I believe we can make the our case on the BRAC criteria without considering in great detail some of the costs. But I would ask you, as I go through this presentation, to take a look at some of the numbers because we do believe the numbers you show in moving this activity to Aberdeen are considerably conservative and should be revisited.

If you'll go to slide four, we contend that there are two different businesses involved here. If you look at the VIN diagram that we presented here, on the left side, you'll see the business area. Do you have it, Mr. Chairman?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Pardon me?

DR. CARRUTHERS: Do you have the slide presentation?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Yes. I was hoping you would put it on the screen.

DR. CARRUTHERS: No, we didn't. I'm sorry. We didn't choose to do that. As you can tell by my age, I'm kind of electronically challenged. So I don't oftentimes use that even in my current academic career.

If you look in the presentation on the

left, the White Sands Missile Range, you look at the business areas, what is now called SLAD, the Survivability/Lethality Analysis Directorate. On the left side, there are business areas. And they're essentially into electronic warfare, information warfare, and basically they're testing an evaluation unit.

And you see the types of business at White Sands. Their customers are different than Aberdeen Proving Ground, their stakeholders are different than Aberdeen Proving Ground, and their funding is different. They're under a T&E funding as opposed to research funding.

If you look on the right, Aberdeen Proving Ground's business areas are basically research. Their customers are somewhat different, their stakeholders are different, they report to a different place in the Pentagon, and their funding is for research. So we would argue that these are two different business entities.

I was told, when I was asked to brief about this, that the actual Army Research Laboratory existence at White Sands, that the function that's been there for 52 years was put into the Army Research Laboratory as a marriage of convenience.

And I know a few marriages of conveniences have resulted in divorce.

And as a consequence we would probably recommend that you consider divorce of the Army Research Laboratory White Sands Missile Range from the Aberdeen operation because basically they're two different businesses doing different things.

If you look at the VIN diagram, you don't see many -- you don't see many collocation of synergies for collocating these two enterprises at Aberdeen Proving Ground.

So I would ask you to -- and, if you look at the VIN diagram, you will also note the Atmospheric Science Research, part of that operation at White Sands is the only congruence between Aberdeen and the research activity at White Sands in their testing evaluation.

If you flip to slide five, you will see a breakdown which represents that really the preponderance of the work at White Sands Missile Range is, in fact, T&E. \$120 million of their total expenditure of 152 million really are on the test and evaluation side and not on the battlefield research side.

So we would suggest to you that in part

the synergy just doesn't exist to move this. If compatibility is important to the military, it doesn't appear to us to move us -- to have this facility moved to the Aberdeen Proving Grounds in Maryland.

And also I would ask you, at the bottom of chart five, to look at the costs in the bottom of what it would cost to replace these facilities and to move these facilities. And those numbers are numbers that we established which we think are quite a bit higher than the military assumed.

Quickly we understand that military value is of great importance. So the next four slides talk about military value. I'll go quickly over them first.

There are organizational synergies at White Sands Missile Range. And SLAD has -- on the left side, if you look down that particular slide, you will see that on the left side there have been activities of a trade-off which is an Army communications activity that SLAD participated in. Right below that is a Navy activity which was the Kill Assessment Methodology.

Just below that is the United States Air Force with airborne electronic countermeasures for

missiles. If you look on the upper right-hand side, you'll see the Air Force again. That's the F-22 countermeasures. All electronic warfare measures.

So it is a joint activity for SLAD at White Sands Missile Range involving all of those three enterprises. There's also a case, and I'll point out just a minute where the Marines are.

If you look at slide No. 7, you talk about technical synergies at White Sands Missile Range. It's very important to have these technical synergies. And the one I will point out is the one they call ICE.

By the way, in this enterprise I've discovered a fondness for acronyms which apparently only occurs in the military and in economics. But ICE is improvised countermeasure equipment which is a response to IED which is improvised explosive devices which I assume to be car bombs and those kinds of things.

And so what happened some months ago, this particular laboratory, SLAD, decided that they would try to come up with some countermeasures for these improvised electronic devices. And as a consequence, within 14 months from concept paper, they were able to deliver to the battleground large quantities of

these countermeasure devices.

But the significance of it is it involves SLAD, the unit that we're talking about, the Physical Sciences Laboratory at New Mexico State University, the Yuma Proving Grounds, and two New Mexico manufacturers. And so, as a consequence of the synergies that exist at White Sands Missile Range, they were able to produce this in 16 months.

And this is a quote from our report, it indicates that unconstrained use of electromagnetic spectrum at White Sands Missile Range in unrestricted open air testing was the only reason they were able to achieve this. And it's because of the vastness of White Sands Missile Range. The SLAD unit received the Army's greatest invention of the year award in the year 2005 for this activity.

In New Mexico you will discover that networks are very important. If you look at slide eight, we talked about the networks that SLAD has with a host of entities in the New Mexico or Southwest area. In particular New Mexico State University and the Physical Sciences Laboratory has been very active with SLAD over a number of years.

Right above that is New Mexico Tech which is one of our science universities. It has students

working at SLAD and has some contracts with SLAD.

You see the Kirtland Air Force Base, Yuma Proving Grounds, Fort Hood, Texas. On the right you see a map of Playas. We have to provide a map because this is a small town way out in the corner of New Mexico, but it happens to be now a major homeland security facility. And SLAD is operating in that environment in attempting to help homeland security.

Two great national laboratories, the Sandia National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory, also do development work that ultimately end up in SLAD testing evaluation. So the network is strong. And that network has been there for a long period of time.

But the most important military value that I think is on slide No. 9 which compares White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico with Aberdeen Proving Grounds in Maryland. I won't go through all of these. But, if you go down about halfway, you'll look at the proximity to customers at White Sands as opposed to Aberdeen.

But look at the things that are really important. Dedicated unrestricted airspace. We have 2.2 million acres I'm told all the way to infinity that we can use at White Sands Missile Range. There

is restricted airspace in Maryland.

No encroachment. I don't know if you've been to White Sands Missile Range, but it's out in the desert. It's protected one side by the mountains and Holloman Air Force Base on the other side. And it is a huge, huge facility.

And there's no encroachment around that facility; whereas, we understand in Maryland that ultimately there could be some encroachment there. We have a desert and mountainous terrain. But most significantly we have the kind of space that we have at White Sands Missile Range to do these things, particularly the electronic kinds of analysis.

Dr. Jack Wade who is with me has worked both at SLAD at White Sands Missile Range and at the same time at Aberdeen Proving Grounds. And I want him to comment in just a minute, but he has told me you cannot do at Aberdeen Proving Grounds what is done at White Sands Missile Range, at SLAD. And I'm going to get him to comment.

So one could conclude I think, if you look at military value, that, if you were to move this, we would lose a definite amount of military value by moving this facility to Aberdeen Proving Grounds.

Slide No. 10 quickly just shows the cost

of living. We know you can make adjustments to that. We think it's significant, it's a cost factor. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on it, but I want to remind the Commission that in reality New Mexicans enjoy working in New Mexico. We enjoy our mountains, our dry climate, our hot chili, none of which we find very present in Maryland.

And, when I talked to this group in preparing for my few comments, they told me that they estimated about 25 percent of the people involved in SLAD, up to 170 people, about 25 percent would probably transfer to Maryland if they were required to. So 75 percent of these people would either retire early or perhaps stay in the area and try to find some other job.

We find, in this particularly crucial time where electronic warfare is so important, that that would be a damaging loss to the military, to have 75 percent of this unit not being in existence.

So the last comment I would make before I give you the business proposition very simply is 170 jobs given the challenge that you have and the numbers that you're looking at doesn't seem like a big number. I mean here at Cannon which we very much want to protect is a much larger number. But in New

Mexico 170 jobs is a really big number.

We scratch and claw and fight to try to get companies with 15 and 20 employees. And these are high paid employees in a county with relatively low income. And so, while it doesn't seem like a really big number, it is really a big number to our community and to our state.

The business proposition very simply, if I may sum up, we believe SLAD, White Sands Missile Range, best meets the BRAC process criteria by remaining in White Sands. We believe White Sands to be a premier T&E facility. And it has supported enhanced national defense capability for the 52 years SLAD has been in operation.

So we have developed a history and a culture and a number of successes at that unit at White Sands in which we think the synergies that I demonstrated are incredibly important particularly when you're doing testing and evaluation and research activities.

The expansiveness and lack of encroachment at White Sands has to be an important element in the decision that you might want to make. And then the mission relocation to Aberdeen Proving Grounds would irreparably degrade the national defense capabilities

as it happens to pertain to electronic warfare.

So I come back to my original request.

Please reverse the Department of Defense's recommendation to realign the Army Research Laboratory activities at White Sands Missile Range to Aberdeen Proving Grounds.

I want to take just a minute and ask Dr. Jack Wade to make a comment because he has more experience than any of the rest of us at this particular laboratory. Dr. Wade.

DR. WADE: Thank you, Dave. I was analysis director for 12 years. I worked at Aberdeen and White Sands. I have offices in both places. So I'm intimately familiar.

Someone apparently decided that it would be efficient to combine the two elements. Unfortunately they would like you to look at what the mission of the White Sands element is. That mission cannot be performed at Aberdeen Proving Grounds. That is the long and the short of it. A lot of people won't move.

But, if they go there, they will have to do something other than what they're doing now because most of what they do can't be done there because of constraints at Aberdeen. I think that's

sufficient justification to reverse the decision.

Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: Thank you very much. Help me just a little more with the specifics there with reference to the mission. And I'm also familiar with White Sands. Clearly it's a wonderful range and it's got all of the expanses that you just talked about.

But the specific question for this mission is what prevents it from being conducted in Maryland vice here because the idea here, as we understand it, there is some pluses in having a center of excellence when you bring in a number of other organizations together and missions together including this one.

DR. WADE: To answer your question, first, at the facilities at White Sands, we use the facilities that don't belong anywhere but White Sands. We piggyback off the testing that goes on at White Sands. For example, we build the jammers to test the missiles that are used in air defense systems at White Sands.

Our role is to build those jammers and operate them during the testing that's run by White Sands Missile Range. The people that do that can't do that at APG because the testing doesn't occur.

The second place is you can't radiate RF at Aberdeen the same way you can radiate it at White Sands. The frequency coordination problem in that congested area is a real problem.

Thirdly is we do a lot of lasers testing. We have outdoor laser ranges which can't be operated at Aberdeen. So it's a combination of activity with White Sands and individual activity on our ranges at White Sands that can't be replicated at Aberdeen because of environmental or safety considerations.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: I've been to White Sands many times, it's a wonderful place, certainly a unique test range. I would say probably in meetings that I thought White Sands was so unique that, if there were no customers for White Sands which there are many, of course, if there were none, the United States wouldn't shut down White Sands because it is such a unique place and you might need it someday.

And, as Dr. Carruthers explained, testing and evaluation is the main mission for both White Sands and for SLAD. But I want to ask about what the impact would be on the tests that are conducted at White Sands if SLAD were moved to Aberdeen?

For example, would that increase the costs of the tests that would still be going on at White

Sands, the Patriot tests or high power laser tests, the different kinds of tests that were being done at White Sands which will be done at White Sands?

Would moving people to Aberdeen and having them operate from Aberdeen, perhaps traveling back to White Sands for campaigns, would that increase the cost of the tests at White Sands to the customers, to the program at White Sands, and effectively discourage them from using White Sands?

DR. WADE: I think the short answer is yes. There are a couple of problems. They would find other jobs. The other thing I would say is that some how, some way the missile range would have -- we'll have to figure out how to reconstitute some.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Let's imagine that the Army is able to get new people at Aberdeen to fulfill the jobs of the people who don't want to move. But, nevertheless, would that have an impact on the testing that goes on at White Sands or would it be a push?

DR. WADE: It would have an impact on the jobs and expertise these people have. You don't graduate people from college with expertise in jamming radars. It's something that you develop over a career. And you just can't go out and replace the

ability tomorrow by hiring -- in a research setting by hiring. How do you jam a Patriot radar? There are no other experts in the world on that subject.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Other questions?

Thank you.

DR. CARRUTHERS: Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission, thank you very much for listening to the response team, we appreciate you being here.

SENATOR DOMENICI: Mr. Chairman, the issue that was just before you and the following one which will take a few moments is in a district represented by Congressman Steve Pearce. He's been unable to attend because of duties in Washington. He asked us if his chief of staff can deliver his message for two minutes. And I thought that would be appropriate. If you agree, he would like to read a statement from the congressman.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Absolutely.

Would you state your name.

MR. GARDNER: My name is Bob Gardner, I'm the district director for Congressman Steve Pearce, Second District of New Mexico. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, governor, Senators, Representatives. Thank you for your indulgence of me to come and read the congressman's

statement.

The Department of Defense has made a serious mistake which makes neither military, economic, nor common sense. The SLAD at White Sands and the pilot training centrifuge at Holloman Air Force Base are just what their names imply, training installations.

Yet it is incredible that DoD has mistaken them for research facilities. How else can we explain the logic of their recommendations which are based on the notion of consolidating research capabilities.

In business we consolidate product to do better on the economic scale which means less people and better machines producing the same output for less money. The DoD's choice in this case takes us in the opposite direction. Its recommendations would uproot an integral part of White Sands, a world class testing and evaluation operation, only to employ the same amount of people at greater cost.

The DoD's proposals would also exchange a relatively new centrifuge at Holloman for a significantly older centrifuge at another location. Again no savings to the taxpayers whatsoever. The same number of people would be doing the same work

somewhere else at a larger cost.

Finally, the DoD's inclusion of Cannon Air Force Base on the BRAC list constitutes an affront to every New Mexican rancher, dairyman, and farmer on the eastern side of New Mexico that has endured low flying jets and bombing exercises for the sake of our nation's security.

If the DoD had bothered to apply its own criteria in compiling the BRAC list, I suspect that Cannon Air Force Base would have been one of the least likely targets for closure. Cannon approaches optimum status in at least five categories the Air Force says it values: Number one, encroachment; number two, weather; number three, bombing range and distance; fourth, clear skies; and fifth, the New Mexico Training Range Initiative.

BRAC's process is supposed to promote cost efficiency, military values, and military effectiveness. Regrettably the DoD's ill conceived scheme achieves none of the above. The Commission's approval of these recommendations will sanction a weaker military and cost us more.

BRAC's process is supposed to improve our conditions. For two years, as a member of Congress, I have listened to complaints from ranchers, farmers,

and dairymen. And I have urged them to accept the intrusions associated with our Air Force for the sake of our country as well as the sake of jobs in New Mexico.

Nevertheless, if DoD places such little military value upon the Melrose bombing range that it pulls essential jobs out of our state, I will not ask my constituents to be and to provide anymore sacrifices. If the Pentagon doesn't care, why should they.

I urge the Commission to do their job and reject the DoD's recommendation as to White Sands, Holloman, and Cannon. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, sir.
Senator.

SENATOR DOMENICI: We've heard about the centrifuge already, but we have somebody from the area who has worked hard to try to explain it to you. So if you will give us a moment. And then, subject to a wrap up, we'll finish early.

MR. BRABSON: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners. My name is Ed Brabson, I'm a member of the Holloman BRAC task force. I thank you for the opportunity to address you today.

I'm not sure, the senator gave me a little

bit of an out. He said laymen have a little advantage over the political side, because in our group everybody stepped back but me. So I was the one who was elected to do this.

The Holloman BRAC task force does not agree with the recommendation DoD made concerning the Air Force consolidation of all their centrifuge training and research at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. Their recommendation is more expensive, more out of date for a 30-year-old centrifuge that's currently at Brooks and moving it to Wright-Pat, while mothballing a modern, more high efficient centrifuge at Holloman.

If instead the Brooks centrifuge were realigned to Holloman, a more cost-effective solution would be realized and a greater degree of synergism would be achieved. The final result would be a mission more closely addressing the interests of military value and the purpose of realignment.

You will find this proposal consolidates all the users of the long-arm, high-onset gravitational force centrifuges into one location and allows for shared-use arrangements that mirror the recommendations at Wright-Pat for pilot training and the aero-medical mission.

Such synergies and consolidation provides the opportunity to attach the centrifuge mission to either an operational unit, the 49th Fighter Wing, or the 46th Test Group at Holloman.

This proposal utilizes the centrifuge which is more advanced than the nonstandard Brooks model. Since the centrifuge model at Holloman is a standardized model, it is easier to maintain and has a lower cost life-cycle. It is safer and is closer to the state of the art than the older Brooks model.

With minor modifications the Holloman centrifuge could easily perform any medical resource mission. Our proposal eliminates the risk of moving a large sensitive piece of research equipment such as the Brooks centrifuge and limits disruption to two bases versus three.

Our recommendations save 25 million dollars in shipping and \$5 million in military construction, as estimated by DoD, to move the centrifuge from Brooks to Wright-Pat which results in a total savings of \$30 million.

This recommendation will save approximately 15 percent of the cost of living of all personnel assigned to Holloman rather than Wright-Pat in Dayton. And it saves 15 to 20 percent on the per

diem of the over 1,400 pilots that currently train at Holloman. This proposal also eliminates travel costs for the pilots at Holloman who are assigned initial and refresher centrifuge training.

Our recommendation saves expenditures associated with one-time and reoccurring annual maintenance and security costs by not mothballing the Holloman centrifuge. And, should the Brooks centrifuge be sold, this proposal avoids all those same expenditures by not retaining the centrifuge at Brooks.

The proposal avoids 100 percent of the costs of moving personnel from Holloman to Wright-Pat since the distance from Brooks to Dayton is 1,200, it's only 600 miles to Holloman. This proposal also saves 50 percent of mileage costs of moving personnel and equipment from Brooks to Wright-Pat.

While the data to the public is not available at this time, it does not break out the total costs for the current recommendations. It can be expected that this alternative will eliminate the adverse conditions at Holloman and yet with a minor impact on the Wright-Pat area.

There should be no issues regarding the infrastructure of Holloman to support additional

missions, forces, or personnel. This proposal also avoids any potential environmental impact at Wright-Pat. And there should be minimal environmental impact at Holloman. This proposal demonstrates a true military value and addresses the purposes of realignment.

Members of the Commission, we respectfully request an immediate evaluation of this scenario on the COBRA model by the Department of Defense staff to determine which of the two recommendations achieve the greatest cost savings and that our alternate proposal more closely addresses the interests of military value and the purpose of realignment.

We are confident that this review will confirm the viability of this alternate recommendation with the result being a new DoD recommendation to move the Brooks centrifuge to Holloman. Thank you for your time.

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: There's probably another option there. But this clearly -- I think you would have to understand that the total concept to the process is recommended vice just a part of what a centrifuge might do, whether they are from Holloman or Brooks.

And I don't want us to suggest that this

was just a casual conversation in trying to make this decision. I can certainly understand the option. And I have been in a centrifuge in both places and it hurt me every time I went on it. And I know the importance of it.

With reference to having one very close to the center of excellence for physiological and health reasons and that study and that research, I think that's important. Therefore, there could be another approach of Brooks going to Wright-Pat vice to Holloman and Holloman staying at Holloman. Is there some logic to that idea that you would consider?

MR. BRABSON: The biggest problem we see with Brooks is the age. I would not see a problem with that because the idea is that a centrifuge has and can do more than one capability. And leaving it at Holloman would solve the cost but also allow the pilots that need it.

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: Somebody is going to have to travel. And we've got a lot of pilots someplace that are going to travel either to Holloman or Wright-Pat as well as a study which I think you will agree is extremely important.

MR. BRABSON: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: Thanks.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: The most important thing is the pilots. The Air Force has received some criticism for not being willing to invest sufficiently in understanding the medical effects of acceleration in flight. So I think perhaps the most important thing is to have the best equipment, the best centrifuges.

And do I understand correctly that under the DoD proposal the better the centrifuge, namely, the centrifuge at Holloman would be modeled?

MR. BRABSON: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you.

SENATOR DOMENICI: Mr. Chairman, it seems like we're finished. Did we do all right?

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Just fine. You have 15 seconds left.

SENATOR DOMINICI: You already know that I can't make any statement of significance in 15 seconds. But I do want to once again not only thank you for being here, but I really want to thank you for the job you have undertaken.

And frankly I've talked with a couple of you personally and I did ask one of you why did you do this. One of you said, well, I did it because I want to do something for my country, but I wasn't

sure it was going to be this hard.

In any event, however hard or however easy, I think you know that what you decide has a terrific impact on people. And that's the point we have made today. And I hope you do not -- I hope you feel like us, that the hundreds and hundreds of people that have come, that have applauded, perhaps when you wouldn't like them to, that they are showing that they are very worried about the people impact of what would happen, what stores will close, what homes will default, what schools will have problems. All of those things are in their hearts. And we hope that in a sense you make the right decision. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, Senator.

We want to express our appreciation to the panel and the folks that are here. And we'll take a five-minute break and start with the next one which will be Arizona.

(Recess.)

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: We'll ask our legal counsel to swear you in if you don't mind standing.

(Witnesses sworn.)

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you very much. We welcome you here. Governor, we welcome you and

thank you for being here. We're honored that you can be with us and we'll turn to you.

GOVERNOR NAPOLITANO: Thank you. And thank you, members of the Commission. I'm here today with the cochair of our military facilities task force, Retired Brigadier General Tom Browning, and the cochair of our Military Affairs Commission, Lisa Jackson. We are joined as well by a number of people from Arizona.

We want to join our colleagues from New Mexico in thanking the members of the Commission for the significant service that is being done by you. And we recognize the gravity of the task before you. This is not an easy process. And we understand that.

What I wanted to do today was to address the proactive steps that Arizona has taken over the last 40 years to foster military installations and development in our state.

And I also want to ask you to reconsider the DoD recommendation to close and relocate the Air Force Research Laboratory in Mesa, Arizona. Since 1978 we have been very conscious of how to combine our support of the military, our installations, our facilities, with our role in the Southwest.

We established vicinity boxes and enhanced

notification requirements for our proposed developments. We extended the statutory military airport high noise and accident protection. We require notice to potential buyers of real estate underlying military training routes that there is military activity over their land.

I point out some of these things and they are spelled out in greater detail in my formal statement which is in the book before you to show that we have from the beginning embraced the military and its installations in our state.

And a good example of how this has worked and is working is at Luke Air Force Base. To date Arizona has removed 32,788 acres from the threat of incompatible development, more than double what is currently required in a strict definition of AICUZ.

When I became governor in 2002, a statewide military facilities task force was appointed. They recommended the creation of a permanent Military Affairs Commission. And our goal is to effectively pursue long-term preservation and enhancement of the federal military commissions in Arizona.

We have through the legislature created a military installation fund which allocates \$4.8

million in general state taxpayer funds each year for the next 20 years for purposes of preventing encroachment in our bases.

We have addressed specifically statutorily and by regulation private property rights near our military installations to make sure that they continue to thrive and perform the missions. In addition the state, county, and city local communities that neighbor our military facilities have also taken active roles in preserving and enhancing their missions.

For example, the 12 communities that surround Luke Air Force Base have all adopted zoning and planning requirements with Luke Air Force Base and the preservation of its mission in mind.

In short, we believe that Arizona which is home now to almost 600,000 veterans and is a place where the military and its need for training and cross-training and the kind of environment that training needs to occur in in times of warfare that we are engaged in is a superb place for the military to stay and indeed to expand.

Turning to the second issue, however, we respectfully request that you reconsider the Department of Defense recommendation to relocate the

Mesa lab to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. In 1995 this BRAC Commission reversed a similar recommendation that had been made in 1991. And I think the reasons for that reversal are as pertinent today as they were then.

The costs of relocation of the lab would be significant in terms of financial resources, in terms of manpower, and most important, for the military mission of the lab, it would be very expensive in terms of intellectual capital.

The financial cost has been estimated conservatively at \$30 million. But the costs in terms of lost intellectual capital and technical and engineering expertise would be much greater and indeed would cripple the lab's current function. We estimated that 80 percent of the lab's employees would not relocate to Ohio, they would remain in Arizona.

Should you decide not to reconsider in toto the Department of Defense's recommendation with respect to this particular lab, I would like to offer you another option. And that is, with the participation of Arizona State University, we will enter into an agreement to keep the research and laboratory functions there, in Mesa, Arizona, and

which Arizona State University is already building other laboratory facilities. So it creates a lot of synergy, that we could operate that in some sort of partnership that could be explored in a process to be determined down the road.

But this will enable the intellectual capital to remain where it is. It would encompass the synergy that exists between the simulator and laboratory research that's done there, and the warfare fighter training that's done at Luke and other facilities in Arizona, and will allow the mission to continue uninterrupted.

With that let me just close with one final thought. I think that every governor is going to get up before you and say their state embraces the military. But I think you show that by action.

We've shown it by 30 years of statutory action which both the Department of Defense and National Governors Association now use as models on how to correlate growth and enhance military function.

We have shown that by directly appropriating money to make sure that we do not encroach or impede on the mission of the facilities such as Luke. And we have shown that by the

commitment of our leaders from every level of government.

And with that what I would propose is, Mr. Commissioner, that I will sit down and take whatever questions you have.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Governor, are you prepared to testify generally?

GOVERNOR NAPOLITANO: We're here to answer your questions.

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: All right. Thank you, Governor and your colleagues and staff that's with you, we really appreciate the presentation that you have made. Reference the lab at Mesa and the alternative option that you propose, as you presented it, does that entail keeping the entire function or part of the function of that effort?

GOVERNOR NAPOLITANO: Our initial idea would be to keep the entire function intact because the intellectual capital is there, the scientists and engineers are right there.

And there are a variety of models that could be used to transfer ownership of the lab and the Air Force to a university. One model is, for example, the arrangement we have with the Army Flexible Panel Research Project which they pay for

under another lab.

So there are other models undoubtedly around the country in terms of how universities and research labs coexist. But our overall thought to you is to open up that dialogue if indeed you do not recommend total reconsideration of the DoD recommendation.

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Further questions from the panel? Okay.

GOVERNOR NAPOLITANO: Let me, if I might, I neglected to mention that in the booklet you have before you is not only my statement but a full report by our military facilities task force on the existing facilities, all of them which represent a constellation of training missions and others from Arizona, they all operate together.

The Goldwater Proving Ground or proving range is a big supporter. And also you'll find in there supportive letters from Senator McCain, Senator Kyl, and other members of our delegation as well as, with respect to the lab, resolutions from the airport and also from the city of Mesa.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: We appreciate that. We will probably have further questions. I assume,

if we contact you, you'll give us a written response.

GOVERNOR NAPOLITANO: Absolutely. We are here to provide information and to make your jobs easier.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: We appreciate that. With that we'll excuse you and thank you so much for coming.

(Break.)

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Our next panel is Nevada.

Good morning. We appreciate you being here. We're trying to figure out who puts the signs up.

Governor and the Nevada group, we're happy to see you here. Governor, are we to assume that you're in charge here? Normally I've given this to the senior senator, but we don't see a senior senator here. Governor, however you've got your program put together.

GOVERNOR GUINN: Since we have 30 minutes, it will be pretty short. I'll have those with me identify themselves and make their presentations and we'll stay within the time limit.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Under the statutes we're operating under, we have to swear you in.

(Witnesses sworn.)

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Go ahead, Governor.

GOVERNOR GUINN: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, members of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. I would like to begin by thanking you for your commitment in facing the tough and challenging job of reviewing and validating the recommendations made by the Department of Defense in the 2005 base realignment and closure process.

Nevadans appreciate and support the efforts of Congress and support the concept of the BRAC process. However, in reviewing the recommendations released in May, it is clear there was no objective review or application of any standard criteria to many of the locations identified for realignment or closure.

In particular the recommendations call for the realignment of the 152nd Airlift Wing of the Nevada Air National Guard and closure of the Hawthorne Army Depot. These recommendations require your close scrutiny for many reasons.

Review of the data collected and the conclusions supposedly based on that data reveal that the information is either incorrect or the format of the data call which you're all familiar with

prohibited a true picture of these facilities.

Several key leaders in the state are with me here today and will provide more detail as we move forward. But I'd like to start by suggesting how the process failed.

Regarding the Nevada Air National Guard, not only was the call for information flawed in the way it was gathered and analyzed, it made conclusions that are categorically wrong in our eyes. Others here today will identify some specific areas in this part of the process including skewed data calls that failed to present a true picture of the land, logistics, and capabilities of the Nevada Air National Guard base.

But I would like to talk to you about issues that appear to have been omitted from the process altogether. First and foremost is the department's failure to comply with the federal law that requires both consultation and concurrence with the governor of the state before acting to close or move a Guard unit assigned in a state.

In this light I do not believe the process gave any consideration to the vast state mission of the Nevada Guard and what it performs for the state of Nevada.

In a state with yearly and extensive wild fires, annual flooding, a state which lies on hundreds of fault lines, one with the largest dam in the United States, one with hundreds of miles between metropolitan centers, and one with cities and tourist attractions that are very attractive targets to terrorists, it is apparent that the process disregarded the National Guard's constitutional obligation to the state of Nevada.

Unless called to federal active duty service, the National Guard is under the control of the governor, the commander-in-chief. In Nevada's situation the C-130 aircraft is an invaluable asset to such a geographically large state. The Air Guard at state expense transports personnel and equipment to assist our citizens when their homes are in danger of being flooded.

The Air Guard at state expense trains our city, county, and state first responders helping to keep Nevada safe in this day of terrorism. The Air Guard at state expense serves as part of our Nevada emergency response plan and delivers medical supplies in the most expeditious manner should a mass casualty occur.

The Air Guard at state expense fights

regional wild fires and keeps flames away from homes and family. As you know we have many of those in the west. The guard C-130s are a resource the state of Nevada depends upon heavily and simply cannot do without.

Basing the realignment decision on bad data collection and analysis methods, then disregarding one-half of the Guard's dual state and federal mission does great injustice to our military as a whole and the citizens of our state.

I am also compelled to bring to your attention the severely flawed data and incorrect analysis in the Army BRAC report which recommends closure of the Hawthorne Army Depot. From a macro view, the Army report is unsound in five areas.

One, statistical data on employment and production capabilities; two, joint DoD activity and potential activity associated with the base; cost of the base closure is three; and four, encroachment which is very, very serious in any realignment of this particular depot; analysis of ultimate scenarios.

Regarding employment data DoD measured employment displacement resulting from the base closure to the total employment of the Reno/Sparks

Metropolitan Statistical Area. It's just not the right way to do it. The Army BRAC report determined the loss of jobs represented less than .1 percent for total employment. In fact, Hawthorne is 133 miles from the Reno/Sparks employment area.

The loss of employment from the closure represents more than 30 percent of the jobs in the entire county. Add in indirect jobs lost and the figure rises to more than 50 percent of the current employment in the county. We all know the damage that a 50 percent drop of employment can do to a community. And in particular what impact it could have on such a small community like Hawthorne.

The Army report also does not take into account joint DoD activity at Hawthorne such as the Navy Special Forces High Desert Training and Navy Undersea Warfare Center, Marine Corps Sniper Team training and weapons testing, Army Ranger high desert training, nor the processing of range scrap from Air Force and Navy bombing ranges which are extensive in the area over the last 50 years. Of note more than 80 percent of our nation's live ordnance is dropped on Nevada bombing ranges.

DoD estimates the cost of closing the depot at approximately \$180 million. Additional

costs such as retiring outdated military munitions, creating duplicate military capability elsewhere which would be very important in this great country of ours, and environmental remediation could well exceed \$840 million and upwards.

Encroachment issues face many military facilities nationwide. However, the Hawthorne Army Depot has the largest, most diverse environmentally compliant state of the art military munitions dismantling facility in the depot system of the entire DoD. It encompasses 230 square miles of unencumbered land surrounded by other federal lands of the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service.

The town of Hawthorne is situated with no threat of encroachment. Meanwhile, other depots that will have to absorb Hawthorne's mission do not enjoy such relief from encroachment. In fact, it will take five to seven years at least to complete environmental permitting necessary to build similar capabilities at other facilities that are already suffering encroachment issues.

There was no analysis done considering alternate solutions such as closing another facility and moving its function to Hawthorne. I believe the

process requires such an analysis. I also believe the statistical data concerning Hawthorne is significantly flawed to warrant full reconsideration of the decision to close the depot.

Additionally, several current joint functions of the Hawthorne Army Depot were not cited and are assumed to have not been considered in the process. Finally, the proposal to close a munitions base that does not suffer from encroachment issues and move the functions to a base that does inherently counters the BRAC mission. It counters it directly.

I ask you to give serious consideration to my remarks today in summary form and the more detailed remarks of the following Nevada participants who will be with you today. And thank you for the time. We appreciate any questions you may have now or later.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Would you like to have any of your other folks here take a few minutes. I assume you do. Thank you so much.

MR. BRABSON: Good morning. I am Giles Vanderhoof, Nevada's homeland security administrator. Mr. Chairman, members of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission, thank you for the opportunity to present information that will demonstrate how very

serious and dangerous it would be if the recommendation to remove the Nevada Air Guard C-130 aircraft and associated personnel is implemented.

You cannot begin to understand how the Department of Defense gave no consideration whatsoever to homeland defense and security, especially when our national security policy establishes the security of our homeland as priority number one.

Nevada is the seventh largest state and has great distances between metropolitan areas. Notice the two slides that demonstrate the size of Nevada compared to states in the Eastern U.S. Imagine the logistical nightmare these vast distances present in the face of disaster, whether man-made or natural. You'll see here where counties in Nevada are larger than many cities.

We are especially concerned because every year we have serious floods and wild fires. Although not highly advertised, certain population areas in the dam site in Nevada are considered among the top areas potentially targeted by terrorists.

Additionally, Nevada is rated number three in the nation for serious earthquake potential only behind California and Alaska. There are two

absolutely essential functions the C-130s provide Nevada in an emergency situation. Immediate airlift to move people and critical resources and full motion downlink video with infrared capability.

Immediate airlift is essential. And, if BRAC recommendations are implemented, there would be only one C-130 west of the Rocky Mountains. That single unit resides in the only state that is not a signatory to the Emergency Management Systems Combat.

This unit may help, but valuable time would be lost. Notice before BRAC and the after BRAC slides that graphically display C-130 coverage for our country and the West in particular. Active duty and reserve units are not allowed to assist until a federal disaster is declared.

Consider the loss of life and property if a major disaster occurred in one of our two primary centers, Las Vegas and Reno, or another remote Nevada city. With the Nevada Air Guard and C-130 immediate availability, the governor can employ the following assets and more from a safe area to an emergency area, military and civilian medical personnel, equipment and medicine, mobile medical facilities including the Air Force expeditionary medical support equipment, our world class urban search and rescue

team, the superb high tech Nevada National Guard civil support weapons of mass destruction team with their five C-130 loads of equipment, the National Guard's quick and rapid reaction and response team trained to assist civilian law enforcement personnel, the Centers for Disease Control's strategic national stockpile push package which would only be distributed at the Nevada Air Guard Base in Reno or the Nevada Army Guard Readiness Center in North Las Vegas and thousand of sandbags and other equipment for potential or actual flooding.

Nevada loses hundreds of thousands of acres to wild fires and the West as a whole loses millions of acres each year. The scapeview system on Nevada C-130s is an invaluable asset in minimizing the ravages of these fires. Scapeview's infrared camera can take and immediately send video of fires to mobile ground resources.

The infrared camera looks through the smoke, allowing the fire bosses to see exactly where the fire is, where it is going, and the hot spots, allowing them to deploy personnel and equipment in the most efficient manner. This system has also been deployed many times to other western states to aid in their fire fighting efforts.

It should also be noted that Nevada C-130s are in the plan to receive modular airborne fire fighting systems which air drops fire retardant slurry on the fires. The scapeview system and the Nevada Air Guard airborne imagery analyst, the only one in the entire United States Air Force, have also saved lives in search and rescue operations involving downed aircraft and lost individuals.

I could go on and on, but I think the point is made. Without our C-130s being available to the governor for emergency, life and property is at an unacceptable risk. I cannot understand why the DoD did not even consider the unique capabilities of these aircraft and designate Reno as a location for additional aircraft.

I thank you for listening and considering the awesome loss if our aircraft are relocated to become mere trainer aircraft. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, sir. We appreciate your testimony.

SENATOR TOWNSEND: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the Commission. Thank you again for hearing all of us from Nevada today. I I'm Randolph Townsend, State Senator for Washoe County which is the Reno/Tahoe area. And I

appreciate the opportunity to talk with you today.

You are to be given our respect and our commendation for the efforts you have put in on the topic of base closings and efficiencies to government. This is the toughest thing that many of us who hold elective office and nonelected officials who have these responsibilities will ever face. And for that you have my gratitude and my respect.

Also it's good to see a former colleague. Mr. Bilbray and I served together a long time in the Nevada State Senate. And the state is still standing. So that shows you how strong we are there.

The 152nd Airlift Wing which is located in my district has been a member of our community since 1948. Participation of the 152nd in our city to volunteer activities and military service in times of crisis is without question unmatched. In the last few months alone, the Air Guard's C-130 aircraft has provided valuable assistance in fighting a number of wild fires that threatened homes, families, and many businesses.

The Air Guard not only assisted with their fire trucks and well trained fire fighters, but with the scapeview camera sensors. Those sensors gave our fire commanders the most intimate knowledge of large

scale fires, allowing them to fight the fire more efficiently than ever before.

The aerial photographs provided during the flood in downtown Reno a few years ago gave the county emergency managers unprecedented views of the entire flood region. When roads and bridges washed out, they directed emergency crews on how best to address stranded citizens.

If the Air National Guard is closed, there will be an economic impact. But there will even be a greater impact emotionally from losing the dependability of the Guard on which we rely. Perhaps you can look more closely at this realignment and review this particular community.

What they bring to us in our community and as a state far outweighs any cost savings that may be realized down the road. Particularly one I emphasize, the members of the Air Guard in a certain private sector, for guys like me, they bring discipline, they bring a work ethic, they bring respect. And I think all employees look to them when they're looking for leaders in the private sector.

Their availability to us as leaders of our state, though, should be our greatest concern. The unit is available to provide tremendous airlift

capability which is also necessary in a state where the federal government is the owner of the most of the land.

Reno is geographically and sometimes culturally different from Las Vegas. In times of crisis, our citizens cannot depend upon ground transportation for necessary responses. Nevada is the nation's fastest growing state. And Washoe County we will be vulnerable if a crisis required immediate relief and these C-130s would be gone.

Again thank you. You are to be commended. We all respect the tough decisions you make. We're hoping that, as you move through this process, you will keep in mind the remarks of all of us today. Thank you again. And all of us, whether you live in Clovis, whether you live in Phoenix, Hawthorne, or Reno, we do appreciate and respect your service not only to this particular issue. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, Senator.

MR. ANDERSON: It's a pleasure to be in front of such a dedicated group. We know this is a thorny issue. I am Bernie Anderson, I represent District 31 which is the area where the Reno/Tahoe Airport is located and, thus, the Air National Guard is part of my constituent district.

As a former Guard member, I have to tell you that how important the Guard is to the community in which I live. The Nevada Air National Guard indeed is the only Air National Guard unit in the state and has had a long and outstanding history in serving the United States and the state of Nevada.

Established in 1948 it was originally operated out of Reno Air Base later called Stead. The unit later entered into various leasing agreements in '53 and '54 to use portions of the public field that is now Reno Tahoe International Airport.

Through these early agreements, the Air National Guard agreed to spend \$1 million for a 25-year lease on 29 acres of land. Supplemental agreements since then have expanded that lease to 2,054 and added an additional 35 acres of land to the airport.

Over the 50 years, the unit's mission has changed from fighter squadron to a bomber squadron to a reconnaissance unit to its present mission of an air mobility wing. Such mission changes have often resulted in changes to the aircraft assigned.

With the introduction of the highly versatile Hercules aircraft in 1995, the mission of

the Air National Guard changed. The current mission now has several support functions including airlift and air drop, passage of cargo personnel during wartime and peacetime.

Using the C-130 as a tactical reconnaissance platform unit also provided timely accurate intelligence reports and national security. The C-130 aircraft proposed for realignment in the Nevada Air National Guard are currently the unit's only planes. The loss of these assets would expose the state's residents to danger from both national disasters and potential terrorist attack and would profoundly change in its mission and capabilities.

Members of the Air National Guard have played a critical role in essential airlift support for the country including the Korean conflict, Operation Desert Shield, Desert Storm, Enduring Freedom, Iraqi Freedom, and the continual global war on terrorism.

Highly developed technical experienced people in the Air National Guard also play an essential role in Nevada and the Western states by providing airlift support in times of crisis such as fire fighting and flood relief as you've already heard.

Removal of these presences from Nevada to Arkansas would leave Nevada and the Western states without a critical airlift. The estimated loss of the C-130 personnel and function involved will cost the Reno economy about \$32 million per year.

In closing the state of Nevada has long been an important contributor to our national defense. Nevada's military establishment has served our state and nation proudly and effectively and are of great importance to their local communities.

The Air National Guard unit in Reno is a critical asset to the community, the state, and to the nation. The unit's continued operation in its current form and location is critical, from the propeller driven P-51 Mustangs in 1948 to the current transport aircraft. The 1,100 members of the Nevada Air National Guard have performed with dedication and professionalism.

In response to the Department of Defense's recommendation, the Nevada Legislature recently adopted Joint Resolution No. 17 which cites the importance of Nevada as a military installation and urges the Base Realignment and Closure Commission to reconsider certain recommendations including the proposed change to the Nevada Air National Guard.

Each member of the Commission will receive the enrolled copy of the resolutions when they are printed. I have brought them and they are included in your packet, a copy of the first reprint from the state legislature. Thank you very much for your time.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you. We now recognize the Adjutant General of the Nevada National Guard, General Kirkland.

BRIGADIER GENERAL KIRKLAND: Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, I'm Brigadier General Cindy Kirkland, the Adjutant General for Nevada. I want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to talk to you today.

The recommended realignment of the Nevada Air National Guard unit in Reno is flawed and it simply does not make sense. It seems clear that the Air Force BRAC process was flawed and skewed against the efficient and cost-effective Air National Guard bases.

The Air Force used a one-size-fits-all approach. The fact that a senior Air Force BRAC official told the adjutants general in May that they, the tags, were intentionally excluded from the process tells me that this was not an open and sound

process.

Many attributes of the base were not considered and the military value calculated much lower than it should have been. The primary justification was the fact that the Reno base could not park more than ten aircraft. In fact, we can currently park up to 12 aircraft. And, with a no-cost land swap that's currently at the Corps of Engineers, we could actually accommodate 16 aircraft.

Fuel storage capacity got us no points because we only have capacity on our facility for 150,000 gallons, though across the airfield we have unlimited access to the airport tank farm which is directly pipeline fed. We have unlimited access to fuel for only the cost of the fuel used.

We could also not identify our access to the world's most sophisticated ranges and training areas because they are not physically located on our facility. Yet, within minutes of taking off from the Reno base, we have some of the world's finest training environments.

On a commercial airfield, the DoD is not responsible for the maintenance and operational costs for the airfield infrastructure. We received no points for our operating characteristics since we do

not control the airspace and could not report that we have no take-off delays.

We could not report that we have an agreement with the airport to accommodate a significant increase in parking, aircraft parking to support surge or diversion requirements. In the report we have provided you, you will find much more detail on specific flaws in the data and application of the established criteria.

The process failed to recognize the unique nature of the C-130s assigned to this unit. All eight aircraft have been modified. Only these eight planes carry the scapeview system of which Mr. Vanderhoof spoke. More theater commanders have identified this system as one of their top five priorities.

Those aircraft will still have to return to Reno on a regular basis to train and maintain proficiency and coordination between the flight crew and the imagery analysts. Loss of this capability in Reno means its key system will be significantly compromised.

Air Force costs to support training will be in the millions. This was not taken into consideration. Those costs are also reflected in the

report we have provided. Recruiting and retaining quality individuals to ensure the nation's ability to respond to threats is the number one BRAC principle.

The Reno unit has consistently been at or above the National Guard bureau's strength poles and, with a growing population, has no concern with recruiting to future strength needs.

Of the more than 500 people our unit will lose, about 90 percent have indicated they will not move to another state or location. Our airmen have jobs in the local community and family and community ties that will keep them at home.

Replacing just one six-year term airman is estimated by the Air Force to cost \$65,000. But the combat and lifetime experience of senior members who will lose their positions will take the Air Force years to recoup.

I offer that empty bases will not provide for the defense of our nation. Governor Guinn and Mr. Vanderhoof have already talked to you about the impact to Nevada and the nation if we cannot respond immediately within the state during a major emergency. Homeland security is given top priority in our national military strategy yet was not even considered.

Governor Guinn also spoke to you concerning the Title 10 requirement to consult and gain concurrence of the governor before effecting units in the state. The failure of the Air Force and DoD to follow the requirements of the U.S. Constitution and statute and the simple obligation to all men and women in uniform is not acceptable.

We ask that this Commission consider increasing our assigned aircraft to support our growing transformational missions. Thank you for your time.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you, General. Senator McGinness, would you like to go first? There is some continuity in this.

MS. HARTMAN: I'm Shelley Hartman, I'm the Executive Director For Economic Development in Mineral County. This is the book that we've given you. On the back is a breakdown of our concerns about the effect of the issues on the BRAC report as opposed to the truth.

Thank you for this opportunity to point out the factual errors in the BRAC report. Our appearance before your Commission today has three objectives. One, to establish doubt about the Hawthorne data; two, to persuade your Commission to

evaluate factual data about Hawthorne and make a site visit; and three, to remove Hawthorne from the BRAC list based on our military value.

We believe the decision to close Hawthorne should be made on sound facts and real data, not incorrect and skewed information. To establish our case for reevaluating Hawthorne, we will ask five questions.

The first question is can the American taxpayer and our military really afford the expense and time to recreate the storage capabilities in Hawthorne and lose our existing established facilities.

The BRAC report stated it will cost \$180 million to empty Hawthorne and relocate the munitions to another base. We have run the real costs. It will be about \$1.3 billion. In 2003 the Army's conventional munitions storage in the United States was near to 70 percent full, with large quantities of munitions still located overseas. The military plans to consolidate about 600,000 tons back into the state site.

The 600,000 tons will go into the U.S. depot system by 2007. The existing depot system will be at 98 percent capacity at that time. That

includes the existing 10 million square feet in Hawthorne today.

BRAC recommendations do not take into consideration elimination of this 10 million square feet of storage and relocating 200,000 tons of the material to Hawthorne. They will need to build an additional thousand magazines at a cost of \$500 million to absorb everything Hawthorne has.

Hawthorne has a full complement of conventional munitions for recycling munitions. We have a plasma system, a washout system, and decontamination capability. Tooele does not have the wide variety of processes available in Hawthorne. To recreate this capability at Tooele will cost between 157 and \$340 million.

It will take about seven years to permit and construct all these new facilities. The state of Utah EPA may not allow any more air quality permits. Additionally the community of Tooele has twice forced the Army to interrupt construction of new demil facilities. The cost of time and permitting could cost a lot to the American taxpayer.

Strategically slide seven, Hawthorne can provide overnight shipping to West Coast ports and training facilities. Before the BRAC announcement,

the Navy was preparing to strategically locate 200,000 tons of munitions to service the Pacific area groups.

The Navy and Corps of Engineers have signed a memorandum of agreement with the Army to process scrap target -- target scrap from bombing and ranges. This solves critical state and federal environmental issues. Hawthorne is working with the Defense Logistics Agency to become the national repository for defense mercury stockpiles.

Our second question, why exactly was BRAC protocol set aside in the military judgment used in our case instead of military value. If you'll read the minutes, you'll find that the discussion on Hawthorne did not discuss military value, it discussed military judgment.

Moving Hawthorne mission capability to Tooele, it will go from an installation of high military value to one of low military value. Hawthorne is ranked second out of 23 storage and distribution depots, first out of 13 facilities with demil capability, and first of all installations for future military value.

Hawthorne demonstrates its multifunctional joint services value by supporting the Navy Undersea

Warfare Center and Marine Corps Munitions and Weapons Testing Facility. In the last three years, Hawthorne has had a contingent of Navy SEALs for predeployment training. Hawthorne is one of the few locations in the United States where they can practice live fire.

The Marine Cypress practice range is the only high angle firing range in the United States. The Army Rangers use Hawthorne for their high altitude desert training and have been working with the base to withdraw an additional 120,000 acres for live fire convoy practice.

How can the military replace 230 square miles and 10 million square feet of storage? How is the BRAC executive order to avoid civilian encroachment accomplished by moving from an unencroached base in Hawthorne to somewhere where they're encroached? Mineral County is 98 percent federally managed.

Our third question, was Hawthorne Army Depot preselected to be closed then the data manipulated to fit the scenario? By closing Hawthorne the military can reduce a large footprint of infrastructure and buildings from the property.

My fourth question, was the Hawthorne Army Depot data manipulated, why were 199 employees used

instead of the real number which was submitted as 565? It's under tab seven in your book.

Why was the Hawthorne job loss included in the Reno metro areas two hours away. The real impact of the report says we're .1 percent. The real impact is 27 percent primary jobs. It's going to be over 50 percent when you consider the secondary jobs.

The fifth question is why were the real economic impacts of Mineral County not considered? Faulty data is our answer right now. 879 jobs out of the total 1,800 jobs located in Hawthorne will be gone.

The base has our highest paying jobs. The remaining jobs are service-related lower paying jobs. The impacts are far reaching to a small isolated economy. When people lose their jobs, they leave. When we lose this human asset, we can't redevelop. The cost of running local government will fall on a remaining population of low-income individuals.

The impacts in my town, a \$6 million school bond that we default on. Potential loss of a hospital in Western Central Nevada. The school with students as well as our teachers, the higher paid employees. A reduced tax base. Hawthorne becomes a ghost town, and that's not acceptable to us.

We don't mind losing the fight fair and square. But we do mind when the data was screwed. We understand that the depot is not of any kind of military value. We would understand if the military could ever give us a bad recommendation, but all of the reports show Hawthorne as a high military value base.

We have capabilities ranging from logistics and munitions recycling to joint services training. We are a future asset in the Department of Defense. We even look like the Middle East.

Based upon facts that are not manipulated, your Commission must reevaluate the data please and please come make a site visit and see what we're talking about about our capabilities. We can't help but believe that, after reevaluating real data, that you will come and you will take us off the BRAC list. You guys are our only hope. Hawthorne is a very patriotic place and we invite you to come and visit.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you. Senator McGinness.

SENATOR MCGINNESS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Commissioners and staff. I guess I was chosen to bat cleanup because the governor stole most of my testimony. But I was a member of the 152nd

Tactical Reconnaissance Group. I attended grade school up in where Hawthorne is located and now represent them in the Nevada Senate.

And for your record I am Mike McGinness representing all of Mineral County and the Hawthorne Army Depot. And I appreciate your attention to our remarks.

As you probably know, I'm very concerned about the proposed action to close Hawthorne. It has been a superb provider of military objectives for 75 years. The community has mortgaged its future as a weapons depot. It's a unique location. It's surrounded by public lands and controlled by the Bureau of Land Management and the United States Forest Service.

There is absolutely no threat of encroachment by the town of Hawthorne. Other depots that would have to absorb Hawthorne's mission do not enjoy such encroachment relief. I was present at the ribbon cutting in a multimillion dollar state of the art gas demil facility less than two years ago. If Hawthorne is closed, they will too.

The Navy torpedo and line maintenance detachment and battery recycling and the Marine Corps weapons test attachment will need a new home. The

other joint military activities in the way of Hawthorne will also need a new home. I ask that you take the time to investigate these inconsistencies and closure recommendations.

I understand the vast amount of information you were asked to deliberate. This isn't the only community that is asking for a second look.

I am concerned that the devastation to the town of Hawthorne in Mineral County will not be given careful consideration because of the misinformation provided to the Commission.

So, if you would please give the town of Hawthorne the opportunity to hear, as Paul Harvey would say, the rest of the story by making a site visit, we would appreciate the opportunity to show you. I'm happy to be the cleanup hitter. I appreciate your attention.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you. Governor. For our review, we will have questions now.

COMMISSIONER BILBRAY: Since I have to recuse myself from this on advice of legal counsel, I would like Commissioner Coyle to speak.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Yeah, I will be visiting Mr. Herbert about when that would be. Part

of the problem is we're all so booked right now. I believe sometime around July we can arrange a visit and I'll work with him on that. And I'll have a chance to ask you more questions then.

But for now I notice in one of the charts in the book that especially 2000, 2001, 2002, the receiving tons has dropped nearly to zero. And obviously, if that would keep up, you're not going to ship anything out.

Can anybody explain. I can wait on this question until I get there, but can anybody explain why.

MS. HARTMAN: I can't answer the question as well as the base commander can. I think part of the storage has been moved to Tooele. They're full now. I mean, as far as reaching capacity, we are always able to. If they're not sending there, we don't have anything to receive.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Let me call upon our legal counsel for a question he may have for the governor.

MR. HAGUE: You've given us a legal opinion, a two or three-page piece in what you have provided. We got that and very much appreciate it

about ten days ago as a result of a site visit.

So my question would be has anything further developed? I think that came out of your shop, General. Has anything further developed on the legal review of that matter? That would be that question. And then, to the Governor, do you anticipate your Attorney General or other legal counsel for the state might take that issue and express an opinion about it? I'm talking Air National Guard is what I'm talking about.

GOVERNOR GUINN: Mr. Hague, no, I have not discussed taking us any further whatsoever. I thought the employment thing which was brought to my attention was presented to you for consideration.

At this point certainly we're a part of the process as I said to you earlier. But we did think it was very important for us to provide you with that. If something comes back to us to indicate we had a recent interpretation, that's what we're looking for.

If not, we would like for those of you who have to make those type of decisions to give us an opportunity to have all the facts. Maybe you'll look at all the other facts to at least strengthen our position that we're taking here today.

But, if you're asking me, I am not the type of person nor do I think those of us in Nevada would say we have a constitutional issue at this point. That's not our objective. We think it's important for us to point out such a serious area that can be rectified with explanations from reasonable people. We would accept that.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Thank you.
Commissioner Hill.

COMMISSIONER HILL: I have a couple of questions. One to General Kirkland. You said in your statement that the Air Force told you that the Air Force tags were intentionally left out of the process. Did they explain to you why the tags were specifically left out?

BRIGADIER GENERAL KIRKLAND: Well, sir, I have actually been a tag for about two weeks now. And Mr. Vanderhoof was formerly Major General Vanderhoof, the major general. So you can probably ask him that question.

MR. VANDERHOOF: Am I on. I am. Major General Heckman who I believe testified in front of this Commission, we asked him that question there because the Army didn't include all of the adjutants general. We were part of the process. And so you're

not hearing so much from the Army National Guard because we were part of the process.

We asked him why we were not included on the air side. He hesitated a moment, and his exact words were you were intentionally excluded. And he had no response as to why we were intentionally excluded. But not paraphrasing, I'm giving you his exact words to us.

COMMISSIONER HILL: I'd like to have a little bit longer discussion of the Hawthorne issue that said that, in the case of Hawthorne, you were not applied a military value unlike anybody else, you were applied military judgment.

MS. HARTMAN: Exactly. It's in the minutes. I think it's in the packet. Essentially somewhere in the discussion, when they were discussing Hawthorne, they switched from discussion of military value I believe because military value kept us off the list and switched to military judgment.

And, since that's not in the BRAC objective, we're concerned about a failure to use military value because we have a high military value by their own assessments.

COMMISSIONER HILL: Those are all

interesting points and we'll have our staff look into them specifically. I would like to have an answer.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Any questions?

I would like to ask what type of material are you shipping or propose shipping from Hawthorne to Tooele?

MS. HARTMAN: Everything that we've got.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Toxic material, GP agents, things such as that?

MS. HARTMAN: I don't think we have anything like that.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: What is it?

GOVERNOR GUINN: It's mostly ammunition.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: Governor, we'll turn to you.

GOVERNOR GUINN: I would just like to thank you for your time and consideration. We know it's difficult to provide us just a few minutes. I know that your staff would be more than happy to come out and meet with us and we'll be happy to meet with them to give them any data that we have related to the view that is not factual, I would like to clarify that, to answer questions because we would be more than pleased to do that.

And I think with the visitation we would

then bring back to you a very vivid description of encroachment. We all know, to put in any kind of extensions of freeways that are much needed in urban areas or in populated areas, you must go through the environmental studies that are extensive and costly for years.

And so we know that it's important, if you're going to continue to store this material, the solution is not to relocate and build new facilities. There was one picture on the video there that showed a number of little buildings that were all around there. Those are all filled with ammunition.

And, if you move it to Tooele or anyplace else, you're closer to a population and they're going to object to it. We know what objections mean, we are in the center of a hurricane of Yucca Mountain. And we know what people don't want across this country.

And, when this is found out and the openness and they start seeing how it's going to be and what you're going to have to spend to put it there with encroachment added to it, I think it will be devastating for all of us. We assure you that there is no encroachment issue in the area of Hawthorne.

My point to you, Commissioners, is to say look at that and pay attention like I think you have when you read that statement we gave you, our letter. And we're really trying to say to you look at that, but look at all these other elements. If you'll do that, you will see what we're talking about.

I know, when you come to visit, you will see what it would take to replace this facility and just how much money it would take and whether or not you can get it through a cultural process. Those are the kinds of things that we would ask of your staff.

If you do that, it will support the theory that we're patriotic, we're good Americans, we have been a staple of military with the Air Force base since early 1950s. We played a big part certainly in all wars past and all we have great training facilities.

But we know that it will take years to come to just get all of the ordnance off of the land that we don't own. The government owns it, but our people are exposed to it and every day millions of tourists are exposed to it. I think they do a great job with the facilities that they have and the trained staff that they have. They are very expert in this field.

We have not had a lot of issues in this area, to the best of my knowledge, in the last 50 years. And that's pretty phenomenal. Fifty years ago the way they got rid of this material is they dumped it in our lakes which are nearby. And every day they pulled out tons of material. So we know that it's a serious situation.

So, if you would do that, that's all we could ask you. We're not here to try to tie up anybody from a legal standpoint. We just want to point out the areas of concern. And hopefully that will show you our judgment is good and that we're with the process, what we think needs to be done at least in an intellectual way and a way that you would feel good about once you make your decision and we could accept it. That's what we're really looking for.

I appreciate your time and effort today. I know you have a lot of places to go.

COMMISSIONER NEWTON: Mr. Chairman, thank you. I'm sorry. I said I didn't have a question and I don't. But I do want to make a statement to the governor and the rest of your team to say thank you very, very much for bringing this material to us.

I do want to make one point, that because

we put a lot of emphasis on military value. And I just want Ms. Hartman to know and appreciate that. Right from the beginning of this Commission, we have put a lot of emphasis on the people side, on what we have to make the decision on; because, as our chairman would say, it's people who really bring out the Department of Defense as well as this entire process. So I just felt compelled to say that. So thank you very, very much.

COMMISSIONER HANSEN: I appreciate those comments. Let me just say I know you folks had to come a long way and we appreciate your being here and there was excellent testimony. I hope you would be amenable to the idea that we may need further things and we could write to you.

This basically concludes the Clovis regional hearing of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission. I want to thank all the witnesses who testified today. You have brought us very thoughtful and valuable information. And I assure you, your statements will be given careful consideration by the Commission members as we reach our decisions.

I also want to thank all the elected officials, the community members who assisted us in

our preparation for this hearing. In particular I would like to thank Senator Domenici and his staff for their assistance in obtaining and setting up this fine site for the meeting today.

Finally I would like to thank the citizens of the community represented here today for their service for so many years making us feel welcome and to have us in your town. It is that spirit that makes America great. This hearing is now adjourned.

(At 12:10 p.m. the hearing was adjourned.)

UNCERTIFIED