

2005 BRAC COMMISSION REGIONAL HEARING

TUESDAY, JUNE 28, 2005

CENTRAL PIEDMONT COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HARRIS CONFERENCE CENTER

CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA

STATES TESTIFYING

NORTH CAROLINA, SOUTH CAROLINA AND WEST VIRGINIA

COMMISSIONERS PRESIDING:

THE HONORABLE PHILIP E. COYLE, CHAIRMAN

THE HONORABLE JAMES T. HILL

THE HONORABLE ROBERT COOK

THE HONORABLE HOWARD W. GEHMAN

THE HONORABLE SAMUEL K. SKINNER

THE HONORABLE DAVID HAGUE, GENERAL COUNSEL

COMMISSIONER CHAIRING THIS HEARING:

THE HONORABLE PHILIP E. COYLE

ATTENDEES:

COMMISSIONERS:

PHILIP E. COYLE, Chairman of Today's Hearing

JAMES T. HILL, Commissioner

ROBERT COOK, Commissioner

HAROLD W. GEHMAN, Commissioner

SAMUEL K. SKINNER, Commissioner

DAVID HAGUE, General Counsel

HEARINGS BY STATE:

NORTH CAROLINA.....	3
SOUTH CAROLINA.....	113
WEST VIRGINIA.....	202

UNCERTIFIED

UNCERTIFIED

COMMISSIONER COYLE: If we have everybody here that we need, I think we'll get started.

I want to thank you all for coming -- coming out in the rain; good afternoon.

I'm Philip Coyle, and I will be the Chairperson for this Regional Hearing of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

I'm also pleased to be joined by my fellow Commissioners: Secretary Samuel Skinner, General James Hill and Admiral Hal Gehman for today's session.

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 firefight, or fund advances that could ensure continued dominance of our military in battle -- in the air or on the seas.

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 limited resources.

Congress recognized this fact when it authorized the Department of Defense to prepare a proposal to realign or close domestic bases; however, that authorization was not a blank check.

The members of this Commission accepted the challenge, and necessity, of providing an independent, fair and equitable assessment and evaluation of the Department of Defense's proposals, and their data and methodology used to develop those proposals.

We committed to the Congress, to the President, and to you, 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 of Defense on May 13th, and measure them against the criteria for military value set forth in law, especially the need for surge manning, and for Homeland Security.

But be assured, we are not conducting this review in an exercise in sterile

cost-accounting.

This Commission is committed to conducting a clear-eyed reality check that we know will not only shape our military capabilities for decades to come, but will also have profound effects on our communities and on the people who bring our communities and our military capabilities to life.

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

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 received makes it impossible for us to respond directly to each and every one of you, in the short time with which the Commission must complete its mission.

But, we want everyone to know -- the

public inputs we receive are appreciated, viewed and taken into consideration as part of our 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 North Carolina, South Carolina, and West Virginia.

Each state's elected delegation has been allotted a block of time determined by the overall impact by the Department of Defense's proposed closure and realignment recommendations on those states.

The delegation members have worked closely with their communities to develop agendas that I'm certain will provide information and insight that will make up a valuable part of our review.

We would greatly appreciate it if all of the delegations would adhere to their time limits; every voice today is important.

I especially want to thank the staff of Senator Dole, who made all kinds of arrangements,

all sorts of logistic support for this hearing. They did a terrific job. And I don't know what we would have done without their help. So, thank you very much to Senator Dole and her staff.

I would now like to ask the witnesses for the State of North Carolina to come forward.

Thank you, Senator Dole.

We are asking you all to stand for the administration of the oath, which is required by the Base Closure and Realignment statute.

And the oath will be administered by General David Hague, who is the Commission's Designated Federal Officer.

GENERAL HAGUE: If you will raise your right hand, please:

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

IN UNISON: I do.

GENERAL HAGUE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: If you will all take your seats, please.

Senator Dole and Delegates: The way we have been doing these hearings is, the delegation's

time is yours.

Senator Dole, you can talk by yourself for two hours, or you can divide it up however you decide; but the time is yours.

SENATOR DOLE: Thank you, sir.

Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Thank you all so much for being here on this very important day for North Carolina's military installations and our communities.

And I also want to thank Ali Thompson for the tremendous work that she has done in the logistics and getting us all together and helping to provide a very good format for us.

And what a key role, indeed, our bases play in America's national security.

Today is also very significant in that it marks the one-year anniversary of the handing over of power to the Iraqi government.

The fact that the President of the United States chose to commemorate this historic event from a North Carolina base is an incredible testimony to the value of our bases; what they hold for this Nation's defense.

I'm looking forward to hearing from the President at Fort Bragg this evening.

Commissioner Coyle, Admiral Gehman,
Commissioner Skinner, General Hill, Christine Hill,
and all of the BRAC staff, I truly appreciate the
time and effort that has gone into these Regional
Hearings.

The human face of the communities, their
insights, their concerns and their support can be
heard directly. The picture created by metrics and
algorithms cannot be completed nor balanced.

This Regional Hearing marks a halfway
point in your whirlwind, and I'm sure, exhaustive,
fact-gathering tour.

The objective and diligent analysis that
you have invested in the BRAC process is a credit to
you all, and will ultimately serve to make our
military more efficient and effective in the future.

Unfortunately, my colleague, Senator
Burr, is unable to be here with us today, but he has
written a letter to the Commission that has been
included in our State submission for the record.

I certainly want to recognize Governor
Easley, Representative Price, Representative
Ethridge, Lt. Governor Perdue, and the distinguished
mayors from Charlotte, Fayetteville, Havelock,
Spring Lake and Hope Mills. Thank you for being

here today.

And I also want to thank Steve Brennan, Regan Hodges, and all of the wonderful staff at the Harris Conference Center for their tremendous help.

I also thank each and every one of our community members for attending this hearing.

Many of you have traveled quite a distance, and we truly appreciate your advocacy and support so critical for your great bases.

As embodied by Camp Lejeune and Marine Corps Air Station/New River, our installations are a model for interoperability and readiness.

They are leaders on compatible land use and aggressively keeping encroachment in check. And they are environmental standard bearers.

Additionally, North Carolina is the leader in quality-of-life programs and educational support for military personnel and their families.

We are, indeed, strong in military tradition; and we are darn proud of it.

As you will see today, we are delighted that the Department of Defense has recognized the incredible value of North Carolina's military installations by expanding Seymour Johnson and bringing the US Army Forces Command Headquarters and

the Army Reserve Headquarters to Pope Air Force Base, as well as European-based forces to Fort Bragg.

However, today you will also see why the decision to realign the 43rd Airlift Wing's C-130 aircraft, deviated from the selection criteria; and how there is much to be lost and nothing to be gained by relocating the Army Research Office.

Additionally, you will see why the Naval Air Depot at Cherry Point, as well as the Marine Corps Air Station at Cherry Point merit expansion.

The Air Force's recommendation was based on a matrix that inadequately valued the C-130 aircraft and the bases that housed them.

By expanding Fort Bragg, while realigning Pope Air Force Base, we are missing a significant opportunity for interoperability and joint power projections that exist within North Carolina.

The Army Research Office in Durham has built strong relationships with the Research Triangle Park and Duke University, the University of North Carolina, and North Carolina State University.

These relationships have created synergies, which have enabled an exchange of

knowledge and resulted in scientific achievements that benefit our soldiers.

Likewise, there are unique synergies between the Naval Air Depot and the Marine Corps Air Station at Cherry Point that merit their expansion.

They have a highly-skilled workforce, superb infrastructure and training ranges that are safe from encroachment.

So, in conclusion -- as I know we are limited in our time today -- let me assure you that North Carolinians fully support our bases.

And as you will hear directly from our communities, those bases are well positioned for further expansion.

Thank you very much for this opportunity.

(Applause.)

GOVERNOR EASLEY: Thank you. Members of the BRAC Commission:

I'm Governor Mike Easley of North Carolina.

I appreciate the opportunity to be with you today.

I join Senator Dole in welcoming you to the great State of North Carolina, and thanking you

for your service to this Country.

I know this is a difficult job, and from time to time, thankless; but we appreciate everything that you do.

Like Senator Dole, I want to reserve most of our time for our communities and their leaders, so you can hear from them first hand what we are doing in North Carolina for our military bases.

We know our goal is to ensure that the United States maintains the finest military in the world, and a military ready to meet the challenges of the 21st Century.

We share the objective -- North Carolina and its local communities have a proud history of support for America's Armed Forces.

Our state is home to six major military installations:

The Military Ocean Terminal, Sunny Point, more than 100,000 brave military personnel, as well as the United States Coast Guard, the Reserves and a very fine North Carolina National Guard that has more than 11,000 strong -- and we celebrated the return of 4,500 of those National Guard soldiers just this Saturday.

Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base together is the home of one of history's finest fighting forces.

Camp Lejeune grooms the majority of the leadership for the Marine Corp.

We take great pride in the performance of the pilots and the service personnel at the Marine Corps Air Force Station, Cherry Point.

And the generations of civilian employees who have served their Country at NAVAIR, Cherry Point.

From World War II, to the conflict in Iraq, the fighter planes stationed at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base have played a vital role to this Country.

The Army Research Office in the Research Triangle Park partners with our great universities to conduct cutting-edge research.

We are also working hard to find the most appropriate outlying landing field site in our state to best serve the needs of the Navy.

We depend on our Soldiers, Marines, Sailors, Airmen, Guard and Reservists to protect and defend our Nation; just as our economy depends on our strong military presence in this state.

The impact of the military in North Carolina is \$18 billion a year.

North Carolina's economy is proud to have the military.

Military personnel and their families are truly the backbone and lifeblood of North Carolina's communities. And they are a real part of our communities; they are maximum citizens.

Today you will hear from these communities; the presenters will offer constructive suggestions to build upon the Pentagon's BRAC recommendations.

They will describe the effect of the proposed reduction at Pope Air Force Base, the recommendations to close the Army Research Office, and the cuts proposed at NAVAIR Depot at Cherry Point.

As you know, the Department BRAC recommendations also envision important new missions for us here in North Carolina, and we are excited about the potentials and possibilities of those proposals.

North Carolina welcomes an expanded role in our Nation's defense and will hear additional ideas today about what future missions can

accomplish.

As you consider today's testimony, I want you to know this, though: Each of our base communities has the full support of the State of North Carolina; we are all partners, the State, the community and the military bases.

We will work together hard on key issues with our military, including compatible land use, quality-of-life programs for military families, especially during deployment, and vital investments in infrastructure.

For instance, last year the legislature approved a \$20 million bond issue to protect even more land around the military bases, to protect against encroachment, as we move forward.

We made in-state tuition available to all of our military families and their children.

We made these investments for one simple reason: North Carolina is very privileged to have the finest military bases and finest military personnel in the world.

Our military bases are ready to meet the changes of the future. And North Carolina is ready to meet its pledge to continue to be the most military-friendly state in America.

Thank you for your work. Again, welcome to the great State of North Carolina. And if you need anything, let me know.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COYLE: General Kernan.

GENERAL KERNAN: Senator Dole, Governor Easley, Lt. Governor Perdue, Distinguished Members of the Commission and Other Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I'm General Buck Kernan, US Army (retired), previous Post Commander at Fort Bragg and a resident of Pinehurst, so I have some personal interest here, as well as some professional interest.

It is truly an honor for me to come before you today to represent Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, our Nation's 911 primary Crisis Response Force.

Present with me in the audience are representatives from six counties and numerous communities surrounding these installations.

Together, with Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, these communities form one of the closest civilian/military families anywhere in America.

That relationship has helped make North Carolina one of the largest and most nurturing states in which our military services reside.

At Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, we assumed the mantle of our Nation's primary Crisis Response Force in the early 1970s.

The communities around these installations embracing points of that mission as readily as the military organizations themselves.

It is with that common bond between our civilian and military communities and this common sense of responsibility to our Nation, that we come to you today to address these most recent base realignment and closure recommendations.

As you are aware, there are numerous acts being recommended by the 2005 BRAC Commission report that affect Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base.

First, is the recommendation to move US Army Forces Command and US Army Reserve Command Headquarters to the newly-designated Fort Bragg installation.

Second, is the creation of a Fourth Brigade Combat Team within the 82nd Airborne Division, the movement of the Seventh Special Air

Force Group to Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, and the assignment of the yet-to-be-assigned forces from Europe to the Bragg/Pope installation by the Army.

Third, is to transfer Pope Air Force Base to the Army; and last, the disestablishment of the 43rd Air Wing by the Air Force and replacement by an Air Active Reserve Associate C-130 Squadron as attended on the Bragg/Pope installation.

We will endorse each of these recommendations and provide an overall assessment of how we believe these recommendations respond to the overreaching Defense Department guidance to optimize both efficiency and warfighting capability and serve the intent for the national security strategy of the United States.

First, we believe that the recommendation to move US Army Forces Command and US Army Reserve Command to the Bragg/Pope installation fully supports the goal of optimizing efficiency and warfighting capability. It meets all BRAC selection criteria and does so by placing the Army Headquarters responsible for providing trained and ready Army forces to the combatant commander on the same installation with the Headquarters that train and sustain both Army conventional and special

operation units.

Equally important is the synergy achieved by having the Army Reserve Command Headquarters collocated on this installation, since the Reserves contain both conventional and special operations units and are an integral part of our Nation's warfighting capability.

The operational environment of our military forces is constantly evolving, and is being demonstrated each day in combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, in the ongoing threat of large-scale conventional warfare such as we might experience in North Korea and across the spectrum of non-combat mission profiles, as well.

Our military forces today are integrated in the fabric of homeland defense, providing support to multiple government agencies on our borders, and supporting transnational operations throughout the world.

In addition to conducting combat operations, our forces are executing stability operations, peace-keeping operations, peace-making operations and a full menu of other types of humanitarian and support missions in over 100 countries.

This full spectrum of operation requirements has produced new demands for close interservice and joint capability.

Just a few decades ago, the mission executed by our Army conventional forces, and those missions conducted by our special operations forces, were clearly separate and defined.

To be sure, there are certain missions today that only our special operations are organized, trained and qualified to perform.

But, as the spectrum of conflict evolved, the missions executed by our conventional organizations, and those executed by our special operations organizations, have gone from separate and complimentary, to integrated and seamless in support of combatant commanders worldwide.

US Forces Command has direct responsibility to ensure the proper training and equipping of Army conventional forces.

US Army Special Operations Command, which is also assigned to Fort Bragg, has direct responsibility to ensure the proper training and equipping of Special Operations Forces; therefore, it makes eminently good sense to collocate these two commands at the same installation; where, together,

they can best affect the future of training for not just combat operations, but for the full spectrum of missions in which both Army conventional and special operations forces would perform.

The Bragg/Pope installation is just that location. It's a wise recommendation and one that we strongly endorse.

Additionally, a historical and institutional priority of the Army has always been to ensure that the highest level of leadership and decision-making have their roots with the soldiers on the ground.

Assigning FORSCOM to the Bragg/Pope installation insures this kind of activity and maintains the direct contact between the Army's four star Headquarters and the troopers in the trenches.

Additionally, FORSCOM will now be collocated with the Army and Joint Contingency Force Headquarters that execute these precious missions, that being the 18th Airborne Corps, US Army Special Operations Command and Joint Special Operations Command.

This further strengthens the linkage from the tactical to the strategic level of command.

These joint linkages are further

enhanced by the proximity of a Marine expeditionary force at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, building on decades of the habitual training between those Marine forces and the Army forces at Fort Bragg, as well as Air Force units at Pope Air Force Base and Seymour Johnson Air Force Base.

Another benefit is that it places FORSCOM in closer proximity to its higher Headquarters, Joint Forces Command, which is located at Norfolk, Virginia.

The recommendation to move Forces Command and Army Reserve Command to the Bragg/Pope installation, in our opinion, achieves economic benefits for the Army to be sure; but more importantly, it best serves our joint warfighting potential and our Nation.

The second recommendation is to increase the size of the 82nd Airborne Division by adding a Fourth Brigade Combat Team, to move the 7th Special Forces Group to Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, and to assign future additional forces from Europe as bases are closed overseas.

This recommendation tracks with the joint nature of the 2005 BRAC process, is supported by the selection criteria enhancing military value,

and is consistent with achieving efficiency and sustaining warfighting capabilities.

The Army deployable forces on the Bragg/Pope installation actually increase under this recommendation, adding an additional Brigade Combat Team to the 82nd Airborne Division, compensates in gross numbers for the loss of the deployable personnel as the 7th Special Forces Group moves to Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.

Each of these decisions track with the Army's current modularity process and the Defense Department's focus on joint training and power projection.

The addition of a Fourth Brigade combat team to the 82nd Airborne Division is part of General Shoemaker's ongoing transformation of the Army into a brigade-based modular force, thereby enhancing flexibility and deployability.

The final point of this recommendation was the probable assignment of additional forces coming out of Europe. It is really premature to address these forces at this time, but the addition of any forces from Europe will increase the Army's capabilities at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base and add to its operational flexibility.

These first two recommendations assigning additional forces to the installation generates some obvious questions about space to build new structures and the adequacy of ranges and training areas.

These are, of course, legitimate concerns, but the Bragg/Pope installation is sufficiently robust to more than accommodate the increased demand.

The garrison staff at Fort Bragg will provide an assessment to Headquarters Department of the Army as to what the garrison will need in military construction, funding, and other resources, to meet those -- these future increases in base organizations and personnel.

Range and training area availability will be adequate to meet the future needs of the Bragg/Pope installation. With the greatest enhancements to training coming in the form of better virtual and constructive capabilities that can be tied to the live training environment.

I highly recommend the Commission use this opportunity to address modernization of installation training areas to accommodate the modern weapon systems and state-of-the-art training

and technology; thereby, allowing organizations to truly train-as-they-will-fight at home stations.

The third BRAC recommendation creates the greatest challenge to sustaining joint fighting capability:

As the Air Force proposal to realign Pope Air Force Base disestablish the 43rd Airlift Wing and transfer the Lift to the Army.

Recommendation creates what I believe are the most significant challenges to joint warfighting capabilities and should be carefully rethought.

The strategic value of the joint team at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base had been one of the Department of Defense's most successful stories, as they have executed the Nation's 911 missions for over several decades.

In 1981, we learned a hard lesson from Operation Desert One, as we failed in a rescue attempt of US hostages in Iran.

That operation was a clear example of how even highly-skilled war fighters from the different services cannot be thrown together to train for a short period of time and expected to conduct a highly-complex mission in a very fluid

environment.

The service has learned that lesson well, vowed not to repeat it and instituted habitual training relationships that were made possible by dealing through collocation.

Since 1983, when forces from Fort Bragg were part of Operation Urgent Fury, and the rescue of United States citizens on the urban-influenced Island of Granada.

The Nation's Strategic Crisis Response Force from the Bragg/Pope power projection platform has executed over a dozen separate combat and humanitarian relief operations; most notably, Operation Just Cause in Panama; Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm in Iraq; Operation Uphold Democracy in Haiti, and the current combat operations in Afghanistan and Iraq.

I might give you a history lesson or walk you through each of these operations. But I do believe it's important to address a couple of very different operations to understand the significance of the habitual relationships and training and mission preparation between the winning Headquarters at Pope Air Force Base, as part of the joint strategic strike force, and the Army and special

operations forces at Fort Bragg.

First, Operation Just Cause into Panama -- this operation was planned and executed as a strategic decisive blow administered with overwhelming force to collapse the government of Manuel Noriega and his military forces.

To accomplish the 18th Airborne Corps portion of that operation, on the tight and demanding timeline required, joint Army and Air Force units had to stage and launch out of Pope Air Force Base, Shaw and Seymour Johnson to meet the execution over Panama.

The corps' fighting, planning, preparation and execution oversight was accomplished from Pope Air Force Base, and was greatly facilitated by habitual professional relationship and trust established between the Army and Air Force leaders at the Bragg/Pope Air Force Base military community.

An ice storm in North Carolina on the night of execution could have created delays that could have compromised the mission, had the Joint Air Force/Army Command Team not had the confidence in each others' mission capabilities that only comes from the habitual training relationships.

Next was Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm into Iraq.

In August of 1990, 18th Airborne Corps and the 43rd Airlift Wing were alerted to conduct airborne and air/land operations into Saudi Arabia to deter further aggression by Iraqi forces following Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait.

It was critically important to have the initial forces on the ground in Saudi Arabia on the timeline set by the President, so that he could demonstrate the United States resolve to our allies and coalition partners.

Twenty-four hours after alert, the Air Force aircraft, the lead elements of the 82nd Airborne Division, took off from Pope Air Force Base to put troops on the ground in eastern Saudi Arabia.

Without the winning infrastructure in place at Pope Air Force to support the crisis response timeline of 24 hours from notification to wheels up, the Presidential and CJCS directed timelines could not have been achieved.

What followed that initial Crisis Response Force into Saudi Arabia was the largest military airlift from Pope -- from Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base in history.

Over a six-week period, first the Wing, and then Pope Air Force Base operations, orchestrated hundreds of aircraft in and out of Pope on a 24-hour-a-day schedule, pushing forces into theater as fast as airframes could be mustered at Pope -- and from around the world.

That projection of combat power could not have been sustained on a timeline without the requisite infrastructure at Pope Air Force Base to support high Air Force operational tempo and without the trust and relationships that has been established through years of practice, joint training and this mission execution by collocated Air Force crews and Army crisis response forces.

In each of these operations, in both services, regulatory guidelines had to be waived. Commanders had to stretch the rules in order to accomplish the mission of "on time/on target".

The fact that these units -- that their units had to habitually train together, and they knew each others' levels of skills allowed those combat leaders to accept risk.

It is no exaggeration to say that the United States was able to project visible, capable military power into Saudi Arabia immediately upon

the outbreak of the crisis, because of the long-standing relationship between the Army and Air Force units at the Bragg/Pope joint installation.

I believe with the departure of the 43rd Wing, we will lose a large portion of the jointness of strength and training, planning and execution that has led to over four decades of strategic crisis response success.

The proposed training squadron will not have the organic command and control, maintenance or logistical capabilities to sustain a planning and execution relationship with 18th Airborne Corps, the 82nd or special operations forces.

Now, I'm sure that the Air Force and Army are looking at new and imaginative ways to compensate for loss of these long-standing relationships.

But clearly, success will now be far more difficult to achieve on a mission that can accept nothing less than success.

Failure, or even delay, is unacceptable when a Nation's primary Crisis Response Force is called.

Therefore, we would like to address some special challenges in this proposal and some areas

that require more detailed examination.

We are going to call General Dordal, previous Commander of the 43rd Airlift Wing who will provide those insights. Paul.

GENERAL DORDAL: We appreciate the opportunity to address the BRAC Commission with our concerns about the realignment of Pope Air Force Base.

I think the General Commander made a very compelling case that Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base have been very successful as America's 911 Crisis Response Force.

And they are the first to be called because they formed a very unique power projection capability.

Especially training forces at Fort Bragg, and with a large major airfield at Pope Air Force Base adjoining that installation, they are able to react quickly and stage and deploy to hotspots around the world.

And it's this mission, this capability to respond quickly to contingency and large-scale deployment surge operations, that make this base so important.

So when we reviewed the BRAC data and

the BRAC deliberations leading to this proposal, we expected to find significant justification for the proposal.

However, that was not the case. And what we found instead was that there were differences in priorities and inconsistencies between the Air Force BRAC process and the OSD guidance.

Now, OSD guidance is very clear:

Military value must be the primary consideration for the selection criteria.

And I would like to point out that the overarching principle for operations which is in the second bullet, emphasizes that joint combined basing, power projection, rapid deployment capability, and the capability to mobilize and surge should be weighted high.

Based on this guidance, the joint cross service groups were established to assess the opportunities for joint basing.

And at the end of March of this year, the Headquarters and Support Agency, Joint Cross Service Group, actually approved establishing Bragg/Pope as a joint base, along with eleven other joint basing initiatives.

And if accepted, this Bragg/Pope joint base would have complied with all the OSD guidance, and would have ranked very high in military value.

The Air Force would have continued to operate the airfield.

However, there was a disconnect between this proposal and a separate proposal that the Air Force is working to close Pope Air Force Base and transfer the installation to the Army.

So less than a month later, in April, the Joint Cross Service Group removed Bragg/Pope from the joint base list and superseded it with the current Air Force proposal to realign Pope Air Force Base.

And since this decision occurred so closely to the release of the BRAC report, in all likelihood, cross service coordination was limited, at best.

And if this proposal is enacted, Pope Air Force Base will be operated as an Army airfield, and the Air Force units will end.

And when that occurs, the primary concern is whether, in the event of contingencies, can the Army still meet the crisis reaction timelines?

And is there enough time to deploy an Air Force command team to the installation to conduct planning and execution for deployment and surge operations?

We also need to question whether the Army can conduct airfield operations and maintain the airfield and facilities at the same level that exists today, and to the extent required to support contingency and deployment operations.

We don't know why the decision to establish a joint base was rescinded and superseded by the Air Force proposal; however, we do know that the Air Force set their own priorities for BRAC, and their proposal was based on these Air Force priorities.

Now, the Air Force used this BRAC to consolidate its aircraft fleet, to right size its squadrons and retool the infrastructure; and that's what's reflected in the Air Force guidelines.

Now, with that BRAC, the Air Force is trying to correct a problem that was created in 1990, when they established a Composite Wing. Composite Wings grouped different types of aircraft together in smaller squadrons and positioned those around the world.

At Pope we had A-10s, F-16s and C-130s as part of that concept. And it's an excellent concept in theory; but, in reality, it's proven very expensive to maintain and support.

So using this approach to BRAC, gave priority to consolidating aircraft at specified bases, and resulted in inconsistencies in assessing military value.

Bases that were selected for fleet consolidation were rated high in military value, and bases that support joint operations, such as Pope, were rated lower in military value.

And this was identified by the BRAC red team as an inconsistency, and it appears to violate OSD guidance and may have compromised the service recommendations as the process moved forward.

The first four selection criteria are the military value, and Pope Air Force Base was rated very high in most of these categories.

In fact, it was rated the number one base in the Air Force for support for special operations and combat search and rescue operations.

And the selection criteria number one and two were rated high for those airlift operations.

However, selection criteria three was rated low in both categories, resulting in an overall low rating for Pope Air Force Base.

We couldn't find an Air Force rationale for the low rating, but we feel it was unjustified and should have been much higher for the following reasons:

Selection criteria number three is based on supporting contingency mobilization and force requirements for operations and training, which is the primary mission at Pope Air Force Base; and the low rating in this category is surprising, given the magnitude of the improvement programs that are ongoing at Pope Air Force Base, such as the outload and improvement and enhancement program to improve those very capabilities.

These improvements, combined with the planned replacement of the C-130Es with the new 130Js, should have resulted in a much higher rating for selection criteria three and the military value of Pope Air Force Base.

Four, the Air Force deliberations regarding Pope may have been effected by OSD's decision last year to cut the funding for the C-130Js.

The funding was not restored until after the BRAC announcements were made. We don't know how much this affected the Air Force deliberations; however, in the Air Force proposal to first close and then to realign Pope Air Force Base, the justification states that:

"The efficiencies of consolidating 18 weapon systems outweigh the detriment in installation value;" the aging fleet referred to is the C-130Es.

We don't think that the Air Force intentionally violated OSD guidance; however, their proposal to deestablish the Wing and transfer Pope Air Force Base to the Army was based on a desire to consolidate C-130 operations at another base and save the cost of operating the installation.

In their assessment, the Air Force undervalued the capability of Pope Air Force Base to support contingency and mobile requirements; and this contradicts the BRAC statute that selection criteria must make military value the primary consideration. And it is counter to the OSD principle to ensure that joint base and realignment increases the military value of that function, which, in this case, is to support surge operations.

We feel that the Bragg/Pope installation cannot afford a degradation in mission capability, and it doesn't track that if the Army is building forces on Fort Bragg, the Air Force is reducing their presence and transferring Pope Air Force Base to the Army.

Based on these significant deviations from selection criteria, our recommendation is that you reverse the proposal to disestablish the 43rd Airlift Wing, and you establish Bragg/Pope as a joint base.

These actions would be most consistent with the Department of Defense guidance to sustain joint warfighting, power projection capabilities and deployment in surge capabilities.

Now, as we address these military concerns, our civilian leaders are already assessing how they can best support these changes for a mutual community.

And regardless of the final BRAC decisions and actions, the surrounding communities are committed to supporting these changes.

I would like to introduce Mr. Tony Chavonne, who is with Cumberland County Business Council in Fayetteville, who will address some of

the highlights of their preparation.

MR. CHAVONNE: Good afternoon. Thank you for being here.

I would like to make remarks that reflect both our community's eagerness and our capacity to support the BRAC recommendation to move US Forces Command and Army Reserve Command Headquarters to Fort Bragg/Pope Air Force Base.

As a life-long resident of Fayetteville, I have seen first hand the changes in our Nation's military and in the communities that surround Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base.

We have developed a civilian/military relationship that has strengthened over the years, especially as our military has been called upon again and again to respond to crises and to deploy rapidly to protect our Nation's interest around the world.

Fayetteville's motto is: History, Heroes, and a Hometown Feeling.

And we take pride in our great reputation as one of America's most patriotic cities.

The Fayetteville/Fort Bragg/Pope Air Force Base is a community on the move.

We were recently named an All American City for the second time in the past 20 years.

Fort Bragg was recently honored by The National Association of Installation Developers with their Defense Installation of the Year Award, recognizing the enhanced mission effectiveness resulting from the working collaboration between the base and the community.

We increasingly see our joint relationship recognized as a model for civilian/military communities in the Country.

We are a growing community which offers extensive infrastructure to support a growing military installation.

We currently offer many competitive advantages and have growth capacity to support any future requirements.

North Carolina enjoys the largest state-maintained highway system in the Nation; the second phase of the Federal outer-loop will open next month and will ultimately provide increased security for the base and direct access to 95, the main north/south highway on the East Coast, providing even quicker access to several major east/west interstate highway systems.

Amtrak serves our community with four passenger trains daily between New York and Miami. And the state is also exploring a light rail service that will connect the Federal Fort Bragg/Pope area more directly with the seaports at Wilmington.

The Federal Regional Airport is currently served by US Airways and Delta with expansion plans for a third airline.

According to the master plan completed in 2005, the airport has excess capacity and can handle up to 150 more operations annually.

There are currently over 5,000 hotel and motel rooms available in Fayetteville and Cumberland Counties. And based on recent occupancy rates, this results in 650,000 room nights available annually in the area.

A wide range of meeting and conference facilities are available. The Crown Center Complex offers a variety of meeting and conference options; including an 11,000 seat coliseum and a 60,000 seat exposition center.

There are significant recreational and cultural opportunities -- we offer four minor league sports teams, a thriving arts community, a regional theater and over 90 recreational centers and parks.

We also enjoy an exceptional climate and offer easy access to both the coast and the mountains -- as evidenced by the US Open held only a few weeks ago -- we offer exceptional golfing opportunities in the sandhills of North Carolina.

(Laughter.)

With 54,000 students, we have the 75th largest school system in our Nation, and we continue to lead the other metropolitan areas of the State in the percentages of schools that meet the annual yearly progress goals.

We are home to three institutions of higher learning with over 20,000 student in local colleges and universities.

Fayetteville and Cumberland Counties enjoy a low cost of living; currently, almost five percent below the national average, and consistently ranks amongst the most affordable housing markets in the United States.

Recent collaborative efforts with Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base to improve the environment have helped prevent incompatible development around Camp McCall, reduce the environmental footprint of Fort Bragg, help facilitate recovery of endangered species, and

reduce training restrictions and provide mitigations for wetland and stream impacts that occur on the bases.

But even more important than these infrastructure advantages is the spirit that exists in our community.

In Fayetteville, our military forces are respected and made to feel welcome each and every day of the year.

As one of the most culturally diverse communities in the Nation, our faces reflect the history of America's military efforts throughout the world.

Thousands of our citizens proudly trace their ancestors to Eastern Europe, to Africa, Japan, Korea, to Vietnam, to the Caribbean base and into the Middle East.

Their life experiences, and those of the military served throughout the world, give our community a true international feel, and provides for an exciting combination of cultural opportunities and a very, very real hometown feeling.

The sincerity of this community spirit is evidenced by those you see here today, who come

to show their support.

It is also reflected in President Bush's decision to visit Fayetteville and Fort Bragg today, to meet with our community members and share his plan for the global war on terrorism.

Like our friends in the military at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base, we stand ready to respond to our Nation's call.

We have infrastructure in place to support the BRAC recommendation to move US Forces Command and Army Reserve Command Headquarters to Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base.

We offer an award-winning model for a civilian/military communities to thrive. And we have a spirit that leads us all to say: All present and accounted for, sir, and ready for our Nation's next call.

I return the floor to General Kernan for closing comments.

GENERAL KERNAN: Ladies and Gentlemen:

I would like to complete our comments by saying, it is never easy to close bases. They obstruct the lives of thousands of civilian and military families, affect the local economies; and in the end, truly extract the expected savings in

the magnitude proposed by these BRAC initiatives.

The Department of Defense, the Services, and all involved in the process, are trying to achieve the best solution for the future without compromising security.

In truth, the actual impact on operational capabilities is always a crucial question, because the field commanders are not part of the assessment. The BRAC process, and all those associated with it, have a daunting challenge.

They must strike the delicate balance between budgetary efficiency and the sustainment of warfighting capabilities.

But in the final analysis, the ultimate goal must be enhanced readiness and operational capability.

That is why we are here today, to endorse those recommendations, to promote national security and identify possible areas requiring additional study.

We thank the members of the Commission for providing us this opportunity to present our comments, and are prepared to answer any questions. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you very

much, General Kernan.

Did you folks look at what the cost savings might be from joint basing, as compared to the cost savings that the DoD projects from their proposed realignment of Pope Air Force Base?

GENERAL KERNAN: The specific data of that?

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Yes.

GENERAL KERNAN: We did not, Mr. Chairman.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you. And questions anybody wants to ask?

COMMISSIONER GEHMAN: I was doing some research about this 43rd Wing. And I cannot find -- just from the pieces of papers I have here -- the BRAC recommendation -- I mean, the Department of Defense recommendation lists what happens to the airplanes, the A-10s and the C-130s, but I couldn't find what happens to the 43rd Wing Commander and staff.

GENERAL DORDAL: We don't have any information on that. It disestablishes the Wing, and the aircraft primarily --

COMMISSIONER GEHMAN: And your suggestion was, the Wing Commander and staff were

instrumental in these strategic plans. They didn't employ in 130s. They didn't go to Somalia in 130s. But the Commander and staff were instrumental --

GENERAL DORDAL: That is correct.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: I want to follow up with what the Admiral said:

As I understand it, the Wing at Pope -- it's your position that they support the functions at Bragg for deployment, and I assume, as well as training.

Yet, as I understand it, the deployment -- not only the one that we just talked about to Somalia, but other deployments really occur in aircraft that are not at Pope, but are at other facilities, and that are basically brought in to handle the mission.

If, in fact, Pope Air Force Base became Pope Army Airfield, and was fully supportive and was part of the garrison of Fort Bragg, maybe it would become Bragg Army Base, I don't know. I don't want to get into a debate on what name it should be, but -- that would open a whole other can --

But either way, it would be a facility that, as I understand the recommendation, would be under the garrison command at Bragg, and would be

supported by Bragg, and would have the facility -- and Bragg would maintain the facility that would allow the airplanes to deploy.

What is the real logic, then, of keeping the C-130s and the A-10s for deployment. There might be a logic for keeping them for training, but I'm not so sure what it is for deployment, when those are not the aircraft that would be used for deployment anyway.

Maybe the Wing Commander wants to handle that.

GENERAL DORDAL: Yes, sir. The Associate Reserve C-130 squadron could adequately handle the daily training for the airborne mission. And that's really not the issue. The issue is whether or not the Wing could support -- or the replacement for the Wing could support the contingency operations in a crisis reaction mode.

The Air Force would have to deploy in a command team for execution and planning and control of all the airlift aircrafts coming in to Pope Air Force Base to move the Army forces out.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Your position would be that in addition to what the Army would do to prepare -- the preparation for the loading, that

there's more to that, that the Army couldn't do that the Air Force would have to do that -- rather than just putting an airplane on the ground, dropping the ramp, feeding them in, taking all the equipment that has been provisioned by the Army at Bragg, putting it on and moving it out, that that required -- that that mission had to be performed at Bragg/Pope, or could that not be done somewhere else?

That is what I'm having a little trouble understanding.

GENERAL DORDAL: I think it goes to looking at what is its strategic capabilities that have been imposed on the joint forces that are at Fort Bragg.

Those tasks are going to have to be done, unquestionably; whether they are done from Fort Bragg or somewhere else.

One of the things that is going to have to be accomplished is the strategic task analysis to insure that those critical timelines and the ability to rapidly deploy forces, wherever the Wing Commander would require them, in the condition required to be able to go right into combat -- must be addressed.

So, could Pope Air Force Base become an

Army installation? Sure.

But you are going to have to put the requisite infrastructure there, and then you are going to have to make sure that you have the necessary operational commanders to be able to address the time-sensitive missions that have been imposed on the contingency forces and special operations forces.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: So you would suggest that the Commission and our staff should analyze the capabilities that would be required to provide that support mission, and see what is the best and most -- where the best and most logical place and most cost effective place to put it at, to make sure that the warfighter reaches the war in time with the equipment and properly deployed.

GENERAL KERNAN: Absolutely. And one of the things we have to look at is what is the JSCOT mission; and can we meet that. And then cost is a piece of it, but those habitual relationships are making sure the ability to develop tactical techniques and procedures and standardization allows you to very safely and precisely execute that mission -- have to be factored in also.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: And one last

question: The A-10s, which are basically, as I understand it, a close combat low level, you know, outstanding support aircraft to the Marines, infantry, and anybody that is in the field, those aircraft would mainly be used at Pope, to support the training of the combat brigade at Pope -- at Bragg -- as soon as you go there, that is going to be built there, as well as the others in their training missions.

GENERAL KERNAN: As well as the air troops. Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Right.

GENERAL KERNAN: That air/grounds mission is very important, and as it goes to support troops on the battlefield is paramount to our success.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Are there support helicopters at Bragg that the A-10 would support?

GENERAL KERNAN: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: And work closely with?

GENERAL DORDAL: They do work as part of a joint team. The A-10s primarily do train away from Fort Bragg ranges. They have training opportunities. They primarily train at other

ranges, and they deploy overseas regularly.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Thank you.

GENERAL DORDAL: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you very much for your testimony. We appreciate it very much.

And we can have the next panel now, please.

GENERAL OVERHOLT: If it please the panel, we would like to get started.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: We would, too. Thank you.

From what I have in front of me, it looks like Mr. Smith is going to go first.

GENERAL OVERHOLT: I will go first, on behalf of the Marine Corps Air Station at Cherry Point, now they are a Depot.

I'm joined at the table by Major General (Retired) Tom Broughton, former Commander of the Marine Corps Station Cherry Point, and Marine Corps Air Base Lee, and Troy Smith, a long-time resident of our area, and who has represented Havelock for over 36 years.

I would also, if you give me a matter of leave, recognize all of our folks from our area that took -- got up at 4 AM this morning to come down

here.

If you would stand, please.

(Applause.)

GENERAL OVERHOLT: And particularly Jimmy Saunders, who is the President of the ACT, Jimmy is here. Wave. Thank you very much, Jimmy.

We appreciate the opportunity to be here with you.

And I want to also thank Ali Thompson. Senator Dole has already mentioned her. Without her, I don't think we would have pulled this whole deal together. It's been a really remarkable job.

(Applause.)

GENERAL OVERHOLT: The Governor of North Carolina has addressed this group. He has made a wise decision to give to the Lt. Governor, Beverly Perdue, who will address you later, the responsibility for also organizing all of our communities. And she's right back here. And we appreciate everything she's done.

I am here on behalf of Allies for Cherry Point Tomorrow, which is an organization that was started in the 1993 BRAC.

And we have kind of been living with base realignment and closure through '93, and then

again in `95, and into the present BRAC.

We have found that the Lord gives and the Lord takes away.

We who are designated in `93 to be the receiver of some 12 squadrons of airplanes from the closing Cecil Field, Florida, and we prepared for it -- and Troy is going to talk about that in a few minutes.

And then in the `95 BRAC, they redirected to the Oceana Naval Air Station, so that has left us with a lot of research, a lot of effort going through a lot of environmental impact statements over the years as we have tried to look at our area and what we have to offer.

But one thing we want to make absolutely clear for our community that we are here to support the brave men and women that are on freedom's frontier, and that we know is our mission. And we know that you feel the same way.

I want to talk about the NAVAIR depot, then I will go to my colleague for some other help.

Let me tell you a little bit about the depot:

We have 3,800 civilian employees at the depot.

We have less than 100 military assigned there.

It is the most welcomed tenant of the Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point, and it is one of the biggest industrial employers in North Carolina, and certainly the biggest industrial employer east of Highway 95.

Over one-fourth of our economy in our four-county area is dependent on the NAVAIR depot, and probably a little bit more when we have the Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point.

We are very proud to have the Depot and to have the Marine Corps Air Station.

What does the Depot do? Well, we fix and rebuild airplanes. And, of course, because we are the NAVAIR Depot, and we do a lot of work on what we would call aging airplanes, in fact, the whole fleet has aged. So these guys -- men and women -- are very busy all the time. And they do their work with excellence.

We have a slide up here that shows you the Depot awards and commendations over the period.

Without hesitation, I tell that you we have the best and the most efficient aviation Depot in the business. And you can look at -- the staff

can report back to you because you might not believe me, they will confirm this -- if you look at all of the matrix that go into figuring out who can do this the best, our folks can.

We have a lot of awards, but one of the ones that we are the most proud of is our ISO qualifications. And we are the only Depot that has earned all of these certifications.

And in the big business of repair, this is a tremendous achievement, and we are proud of that.

We are not only at Cherry Point, but we are in Iraq, and we are all over the Country doing the Nation's business from the Depot.

As far as our capabilities, we have full capability to fix any type of airplane or rebuild any kind of airplane.

Air frames, engine components, and a lot of folks that are unfamiliar with Depot work, and I'm sure you all are not, but a lot of folks that are unfamiliar, think we may just put wheels on or something like that.

Our parts that we have to get anymore for airplanes are out of service. We make them. We can make a part -- if you need something for

steering, we can make it, and we can rebuild it.

And this is an enormous talent that is wrested in one place and one that is very precious to the defense of the our Country, to have this type of employee or civil servant that is available to do this.

We have a lot of help from North Carolina in what we do at the Depot.

I would say this, that under the leadership of the State government, we have established an Institute of Air Technology at a cost of \$5 million.

This institute is directly across the street from the Depot, and it has full FAA certification. And we have 60 students in there now. Our first class was last year, and we are a major feeder for the NAVAIR Depot, so we will go into the fourth and fifth generation of men and women working from our area at the Depot. We are very proud of that.

The DoD recommendations are -- as to our Depot -- if you look at the list we got the day it came out, it was a package you turned to North Carolina, and you immediately looked down at gains, and you looked down at losses.

And we saw that we were to lose 600 civilian jobs, if you call it, or civilian positions, at our NAVAIR Depot.

But when you went to the data that supported this, you saw that this was clearly part of the bigger plan to do intermediate maintenance for the Department of the Navy.

So, we are -- we are part of the thread that's here. But that raises some concerns. This -- we are now going to change from A NAVAIR Depot to a fleet readiness center, and then to have the same capability that we have now.

But, we are seriously concerned about the job loss. The job loss is not identified in any way by position. It's not like Hugh Overholt is going to be moved to Saskatchewan. It's not termed in that sense.

We lose direct labor hours out of our inventory of expertise to go to various other fleet readiness centers on a smaller scale.

And when you look at all of the backup data to that -- somebody mentioned algorithms -- I think Senator Dole did. I appreciate that. That was good, with all of those rhythms, I can't really get straight in my mind.

But I do know this: We lose 554,871 direct labor hours.

This is to be put into effect, if you will, over the next six years.

So, I don't know who is going to move where. We also know that some of those labor hours that are leaving us -- and we will talk to the staff about -- may be labor hours that we don't have now.

And this has been very difficult to assimilate. We also know that we will be receiving other work when the B-22 aircraft becomes operational in a couple of months; that that will be some added work.

So, I would say that we need to study very closely what we are doing here.

And if this, indeed, is a better support for the warfighter, then okay.

But, I caution you to make sure that this is not some method of avoiding the 50/50 rule, or it's not some method to enable contracting out at the other end, wherever the labor hours go.

Make no mistake, we support our Marine Corps, but we think that these are things that should be looked at.

And I appreciate the opportunity. Now,

I'm going to let Tom Broughton talk to you about the Marine Corps Air Station at Cherry Point.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you.

COMMANDER BROUGHTON: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I'm Tom Broughton. I'm retired Marine former Commander of Cherry Point and the East Coast Air Base.

Thank you for this opportunity.

Just from a user's perspective, a short word on NADEP. As a young pilot used to get shot-up plans back from Vietnam, we were amazed at the condition that NADEP gave us those aircraft 35 years ago, old CH-46s they are doing the same thing now. They are still dragging planes -- and the artisans down there, the dedicated civilians who are really incredible, and we do appreciate what they've done.

But my task today is to tell you a bit about Cherry Point, the best installation in the Marine Corps, and possibly in the DoD. But since I haven't visited them all, I wouldn't make that statement.

But what makes Cherry Point great are clearly the Marines, civilians, sailors that have worked there in the past, the ones that are there now, and the great community that we have supporting

us.

The other factor, and a very significant one, is space. We were blessed in 1941 when they selected the site and started building Cherry Point, they kept a lot of room; they procured enough land that we could expand and be able to do what we needed to do in the future to serve the Country.

We still have that ability to expand now, and it's been very useful.

The slide up on the wall now just backs up my assertion that Cherry Point is the best installation in the Marine Corps. And this was the work of the infrastructure analysis team, as they were preparing some information for you.

Cherry Point is the largest of all the Marine Corps Air Stations, about 13,000 acre on the installation itself; then another 17,000 acres of training areas.

It's a master jet base. We can easily handle the aircraft that are based there. We can also easily handle the many transient aircraft that come to Cherry Point to either train or to exercise with us.

The 2nd Marine Aircraft Wing is there. They have their Harriers, their EA-60 Prowlers,

electronic warfare aircraft, the KC-130s, the unmanned aerial vehicles. They have their engineers there, their support group and their control group. We have everything they need. Ranges, messing facilities, barracks, housing, fuel, quarters, space, everything one could need to have a good training opportunity is there.

And that's been one of the great things about having the community who has helped us to preserve that.

And the other benefit they have is they have the NADEP who can fix things. And they have Halyburton Naval Hospital.

It's very comforting for the young troops who are off on their first deployment, leaving their spouse behind to have their first child, to know that at that hospital, their wife will give birth to a child and will be well taken care of aboard the base.

In the Marine Corps, every Marine has a rifle. Those who are not infantry or riflemen understand who it is they support.

Our infantry Marines on the East Coast are stationed at Camp Lejeune -- very close to us -- about 35- or 40-minute drive away. When they

receive a 911 call, they can depart in a couple of ways:

One, they can join our Navy brethren on amphibious ships; the other, which is, they come over to Cherry Point, and they go through our aerial port of embarkation.

We have done a lot of work on that aerial port of embarkation over the past several years.

It has a superb capability to refuel aircraft and to handle cargo of any size and personnel.

That is very good for the Marines, because it allows us to get the Marines to the fight very quickly.

It's also very good for the many transient squadrons that come and visit us, because we can take care of the personnel, their aircraft, their cargo, and they can focus their energies on the training opportunities at hand.

And speaking of training, if you are going to fight, you have to train hard.

On the installation, we have all the things that the sailors and Marines need to maintain their physical fitness.

Obstacle courses, running path,
gymnasium, weight rooms, ball fields -- all of those
things that are important for physical fitness.

We also have very sophisticated aircraft
simulators, indoor simulated marksmanship trainers,
water survival training tanks and dunkers, training
classes so that mechanics can study every possible
thing they may have to fix and the devices they can
practice on. And then we offer some military
education and off-duty education to keep the minds
working, as well.

The way this airfield was laid out, we
can do numerous tasks simultaneously. We can have
UAVs flying, while someone else is doing
touch-and-goes, while someone else is doing
instrument approaches. It allows us a great deal of
flexibility.

When you depart the airfield, you come
on to the training areas that are depicted on the
slides now.

Starting from the lower left, Oak Grove
is about a 15-minute flight. It's used by
helicopters for low work, night vision goggle
training and carrying external loads.

Bogue Field is where our aviators do

their field carrier landing practices -- day and night.

Atlantic Field is an incredible electronic warfare range. They can simulate any kind of enemy radar, and the pilots can be flying and look on the screens and have the same feeling as if they were being painted by the radar before the missile was launched at them, which is a huge advantage; now they can develop tactics to avoid being shot down.

Once the flight is over, they go back to Cherry Point into a very sophisticated room, sit down, replay the entire mission on the computers, stop it when they need to look and see what they have done well, and look and see where they need to do some more work.

On Piney Island, the far northern one, is where we actually drop our ordinance and shoot the guns. That is also where the Coast Guard comes in to train to do some of their anti-terrorism training. The ranges are ideal for the Cherry Point aircraft.

But more importantly, if you look at the use, they are truly purple in nature. Aircraft at Seymour Johnson, from Fort Bragg, from Oceana, from

Beaufort, come there regularly to use our ranges.

We also have aircraft from the state, the State Bureau of Investigation, Forestry, we have the Air National Guard.

As a matter of fact, they are the most heavily used ranges on the East Coast, and they allow us to do what we need to be ready.

This just backs up my assertion that Cherry Point is the best installation; 51 environmental awards since 1988.

Those are Secretary of the Navy and DoD awards for cleanup, for pollution prevention, for those sorts of things that make us good stewards of the environment.

We received awards for our crash fire rescue folks. They have been selected as the best in their category and the best in the entire Department of the Navy.

We received the Governor's Order of the Long Leaf Pine Award, which is not given out easily.

And as you can see from the last bullet, Cherry Point is the only seven-time winner of the Commander-in-Chief's Installation Excellence Award.

We try real hard to be good stewards. One of the areas that is very important in eastern

North Carolina is the quality of the water. So we have done a lot of work on water. And one of the things we have done, as you can see from these two slides, is we have done our water treatment plant to the point that we actually have an excess capacity of two million gallons per day. And our sewage treatment plant has a tertiary treatment to it. And the water that comes out of there, it goes into the Neuse as drinkable. And the man who runs that plant actually drinks from the discharge point each time they give a tour, just to prove that it really is that good.

So we work, and we use that water on the golf course, so we discharge even less.

The infrastructure -- these are just numbers you can look at -- the railroad track, that is because we use the railroad to bring in jet fuel. That is very important for our aerial port of embarkation. It's very important for our high-speed pits, for our aircraft and the visiting aircraft.

We built a lot of new buildings, development center training buildings that allow us to train and prepare even better. Living quarters for the bachelors are very good; are too the married personnel, they are getting better. We are in the

middle of demolishing some of the older homes and building some new homes through a public/ private venture, which will allow us to take even better care of our young Marines and sailors, because that is why the Marine Corps succeeds.

We have the capacity to handle more, that is for a couple of reasons:

One, good planning.

Secondly, because we have very good neighbors.

We bought the land, we have protected the land. The Marine Corps/Department of Navy cannot do that alone. It's a partnership to make that land available.

And my good friend, Troy Smith, will address our fine neighbors.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Tom.

Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, the slide you see on the screen is there to help you envision what you don't see there. We do not have an encroachment problem at Cherry Point or its surrounding training areas.

Cherry Point, from a geographical point of view, and training areas Piney Island, Atlantic are all bounded by two North Carolina counties.

There is only one municipality close to the installation, and that's Havelock.

The area is really bounded, as a practical matter, by the New River, which ranges from five to 12 miles wide along this area on one side, and by Croatan National Forest on the other three sides.

We are, I would submit to you, one of the best buffered air bases in the Country.

As our Governor said, we believe that North Carolina is not only the most military-friendly state, we believe that we prove it by what action we take.

We believe we do have an encroachment partnership with the Department of Defense, the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

This is historical. This is not a Johnny-come-lately, let's respond to the BRAC with some immediate solution.

I will give you some examples of the proactive, rather than reactive, nature of where we have been.

And I have been the City Attorney for the City of Havelock, which is the principle municipal located closer to the base than anybody

else, for 36 years.

1975, the City Board of Havelock passed a moratorium and suspended granting building permits in that community for 12 months. Totally unheard of before or since by any municipality in the country, solely to give the municipality and the Marine Corps time to study the issue of the possibility of impending encroachment.

As a result, in 1976, the community passed, and has continued to update, stringent zoning and land use requirements to ensure, in effect, the sanctity of that air base facility.

That has been updated as we have gone forward. The latest effort in that regard was started in 2000, when General Broughton was still with the Marine Corps. It was the Eastern Carolina, multicounty, multimunicipality Joint Land Use Study.

That study was completed and won a national award for planning, but that's not really important. Implementation is what is important.

And that plan has been implemented, 32 recommendations. It was participated in by the Department of the Navy and the Marine Corps in developing those 32. And yesterday the President of ACT was notified that NCAPA has awarded the East

Carolina JLUS, the Implementation Award, which to us is, the proof is in the pudding, not the study, but the implementation.

To give you some idea of how strong the support from the local government population is as it relates to protection of the base, I quote you to -- very briefly -- one phrase out of the City of Havelock's land use plan: It restricts uses to "uses deemed compatible with air base operations."

It is driven by the military, not the civilian community; and we welcome that.

Interestingly enough, generally, when you talk about encroachment, you talk about sound attenuation. We don't have any of that, because there are no buildings that need it.

On the slides -- the overhead slides -- you see some red areas both with regard to the Cherry Point Air Base and the Piney Island bombing range.

Those areas in red are committed for state funding acquisition. As the Governor mentioned to you, the State passed a bond issue last year to acquire land to help our bases. As we sit here, \$3 million of that money is being spent with willing sellers adjacent to Cherry Point Marine

Corps Air Station.

The blue areas are authorized MILCON fund acquisitions.

Two other quick examples of our partnership:

1992, as you have heard from General Overholt, '93 rather, we expected out of that BRAC, 204 aircraft. DoD modified that, recommended 205 and BRAC agreed with them. In the meantime, the local community had committed schools, water and sewer infrastructure -- they kept going.

They did not slow that process down. And as a result, community college campuses opened adjacent to the base. The IDT has opened adjacent to the base. The citizens in 2005 were a little disappointed but not discouraged. They kept supporting the base.

The OLF, which we have all heard a lot about, the Outlying Landing Field, which, as you know, is currently in the hands of the Federal court -- between the courts and the Navy to sort out. And that's not an issue for today, but as an example, Craven County was one of the two counties in which the base is located, was the second selected choice by the Navy both in the EIS and in their own

selection process. It's 35 miles further south, as you will see from the slide.

The governmental entities listed there within that area have gone on record with resolutions in full support if the Navy and the court system deem it appropriate to put that outlying field in Craven County, and we welcome it.

Again, we are strongly proactive.

In conclusion, I would make just a couple of quick points:

Number one, we believe strongly that the 2005 BRAC criteria that modified from prior BRACs, the 2005 criteria had been met both at the Depot and at Cherry Point. And we welcome a close review and examination.

Number two, Cherry Point has existing capacity for a large number of additional aircraft base there. There are Marine Corps and Navy F-18s, that are going -- I would submit to you -- need to be moved from current locations. It would be a location that is already capable of taking them, and we would welcome them.

Local governments in our area have not made the Department of Defense or former BRAC commissions any promises. We have just delivered on

what we have done.

You can compare the testimony in the 2005 BRAC that was given by the officials in Virginia Beach as to what they were going to do as it relates to taking into account that influx of aircraft that went from Cherry Point and was realigned to Oceana.

Contrast that 10 years later, the promises, one, weren't kept; and, number two, you have 3,000 inverse condemnation lawsuits pending right now against the Department of the Navy.

When I came to this part -- or our part of the Country, which is a whole lot further down east -- 36 years ago, there is a sign I saw out front of the base, still there, 36 years later, it says: "Pardon our noise" -- there is a picture of it, "it's the sound of freedom".

I never have. These folks over there never have. And neither have our neighbors. Because you don't pardon something you welcome.

We thank you for your time.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you. I think next we have people representing the Army Research Office in Durham.

MR. PRICE: David Price. I believe I need to be sworn in.

GENERAL COUNSEL HAGUE: Raise your right hand. Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give, and any information that you might provide, is true to the best of your knowledge and belief?

DR. PRICE: I do.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Dr. Price, the floor is yours.

DR. PRICE: Members of the Commission, I'm David Price, member of the House of Representatives for North Carolina, 4th District, the proud home of the Army Research Office.

I want to welcome you to North Carolina. I want to thank you for tireless effort over these many weeks to devise a base closure and realignment plan that puts our military and our Country at top strength.

I come to you today with an urgent and earnest request: Look very, very carefully and critically at the Department of Defense's proposal to relocate the ARO to Bethesda, Maryland.

I believe that you will conclude, as I have, that this is a bad idea.

I want to assure you that I'm speaking

not merely as the Research Triangle area's Representative in Congress, as proud as I am of the Triangle's success story and of the ARO's part in it; my main focus, and I'm certain yours, as well, is rather the quality of the research that ARO generates and its payoff for our defense capabilities.

The possibility of including ARO in consolidation plans was considered and rejected in previous BRAC rounds and other reorganization efforts.

Fortunately for the soldiers who rely on cutting-edge technologies to maintain battlefield superiority, the quality of research has always trumped any minor financial saving, or the desire to tidy up an organizational chart.

Now we have a new proposal put forth under the mantra of collocation. What we hope to convince you of here today is that ARO already enjoys the collocation that matters most.

Collocation with North Carolina State University, Duke University, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and other research organizations, gives ARO intellectual synergy, joint appointments, collaborative projects and enhanced

ability to recruit and retain the best and brightest program managers, and the opportunity for those managers to keep an active hand in research.

Why would anyone want to uproot these highly-productive personal and institutional connections?

The supposed gains of bureaucratic ARO collocation with the Navy and the Air Force Research Offices in Bethesda cannot hold a candle to the collocation ARO already enjoys.

AROs 114 employees have ready access to, and daily interaction with world-class researchers and institutions. I don't know where this could be replicated; certainly not in the proposed new location.

ARO professionals work with entrepreneurs seeking innovative applications for emerging technologies. They work with top-flight universities professors and students on an astounding array of research endeavors.

In fact, almost half of the research managers are involved in active research projects with universities in the area.

Collocating the military's premiere research organization into a heavily-bureaucratic

environment would uproot all that, and many of the most creative research managers would choose, no doubt, to leave the AOR rather than to move.

It would run counter to the primary purpose of research organization, damaging the very fiber of innovation and creativity.

We staked our national defense on building a smaller, quicker, more lethal force than our foes. Our technology advantages provide our forces huge tactical advantages. Technology is transforming the battlefield. The collection, dissemination, interpretation of information allows our forces to operate with speed and efficiency.

Our weapons have previously inconceivable power and accuracy. Medical advantages, saving thousands of lives that would have, in the past, been lost. Maintaining collaboration and synergy on cutting-edge technology is the lifeblood of a research organization; and research is the lifeblood of the modern military.

So I would simply conclude by saying -- pleading -- don't mess with a good thing. The ARO is a premiere research organization performing its mission admirably.

I urge the Commission to analyze

carefully the role its present location plays in that performance.

If you do that, I'm confident that you will keep the ARO exactly where it is.

And now I would like to recognize Dr. Robert McMahan, Research Professor of Physics and Astronomy at UNC Chapel Hill, Adjunct Professor in Technology and Management at North Carolina State and the Senior Advisor under Governor Easley for Science and Technology.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you.

DR. McMAHAN: Thank you, sir, and thank you very much to the community for the opportunity to address you today.

I'm here to speak specifically on the BRAC's recommendation for the ARO in the Research Triangle Park.

And the ARO's story in the RTP is really linked specifically to Research Triangle Park and research triangle area. And so I would like to begin with that, please.

If you are not familiar, the Research Triangle Park is the largest Research Triangle Park in the world. It's located in North Carolina. And it's -- the research triangle name comes from the

three universities: Duke University, the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and NC State University in Raleigh. The longest access of that triangle is about 20 to 25 miles. It's a very small community in which three top ten nationally ranked research universities lie. And the ARO lies at the heart of this triangle. And the only time we find that triangle to be a little bit too small, I guess, is during basketball season.

But otherwise, RTP is known as a national center of technology innovation and transition.

And it provides a very powerful environment for ARO program managers to establish credibility and to initiate programs for the Army in transition.

The ARO specifically funds Army research in over 200 academic institutions across the Country. It administers and manages the Army SBIR and STTR programs. And it assesses the scientific opportunities to achieve the Army's long-range technology vision.

Specifically, it focuses over \$350 million annually on research in support of Army transformational technologies. And this research

support has paid huge dividends. R. E. Smalley, who is the discoverer or inventor of the Buckminster Fuller, which is a large-scale molecule, which is the beginning of nanotechnology, for which he was awarded the 1996 Nobel Prize in Chemistry, credits ARO's basic research technology capacity with spawning his discovery. And that is just one example of critical technologies that have been developed using ARO's capacity.

In fact, ARO has provided critical funding and support for 15 Nobel Laureates, beginning with the laser of Charles Townes in 1964, and the latest with the recent three physicists who won the 2001 Nobel Prize.

As such, RTP is really a national asset. Within 600 mile of RTP lie half of the Nation's population. But it, in itself, comprises a very rare commodity. It is one of the few locations in the United States where you have three high-performance research universities so closely located -- collocated.

In fact, ARO's location in the Research Triangle Park was chosen as the result of a national search, looking for just this type of capability outside the Beltway, in an attempt to expand the

high-technology community.

Today, RTP is fully one of the Nation's foremost technology hubs. It has pioneered their organizations and institutions which have pioneered the science underlying all of the major Army technology systems.

And ARO's close proximity and integration into the Research Triangle Park environment has permitted a unique form of synergy, of collaboration, between the program managers and scientists of ARO and the intellectual resources of the region.

And, in fact, that is probably this facility's greatest distinguishing characteristic, that the program managers at ARO are hands-on researchers, widely acknowledged for their scientific competence.

This is, in fact, the key to ARO's success. Many don't appreciate the fact that the RTP has the Nation's strongest innovation capacity.

The small table I have up on the overhead is taken from the Progressive Policy Institute Metropolitan Indicator Study. And they look at the top 50 metropolitan areas in the country and evaluate their performance in a number of

criteria, one of which is their aggravated innovation capacity.

You will notice that RTP is number one. And this is a function of the number of degrees granted in science and engineering as a weighted measure of the total workforce, and the amount of academic R&D, and the breadth of that R&D occurring in the area.

ARO, with its close proximity to RTP, is able to maintain a strong link to this capacity and this innovative capability.

Through professional staff research, there are 41 Ph.D.s in ARO that are conducting joint projects, have joint appointments with the research universities in the area, and are -- act as program managers with active research in areas as diverse as polymers, microelectronics, nanocomposites, intense lasers, etcetera.

ARO's location in the Research Triangle Park also provides a very rich environment for technology, professional staff recruitment and interactions.

And in this very densely-populated slide, which I can see is not terribly legible, you see just a representative sample of some of the

active research projects being conducted by members of the ARO professional staff.

As stated before, ARO interactions have resulted in Nobel-prize winning research in new areas of science.

But also key to our current success is the ARO professional staff are active in areas like soldier nanotechnology, soldier power, quantum computer, which is the one hope we have for defeating Moore's Law, quantum communication, biotechnology. RTP is now the third largest biotechnology cluster in the United States and ARO sits as part of this, and that will speak to the Army's ability to integrate and identify new technologies, not only in medicine and biotechnology directly, but in materials and advanced electronics.

So to conclude, specifically, the BRAC's recommendation with respect to the ARO is to collocate, to relocate the ARO and its program managers to the facility in Bethesda, Maryland, and the rationale presented for this relocation was really three-fold:

One, that it would result in enhanced synergy between the research program managers of the Army and other Defense Department elements.

It would enhance the force protection posture of the facility, and would also have a direct monetary payback.

In the transformational Army, I would argue that the most important synergy is that between the Nation's innovation resources and the ultimate user, which is the warfighter, through an organization such as ARO.

So I urge you to consider the following:

I urge you to consider to leave ARO in the Research Triangle Park, to maintain this long-standing technical excellence and synergy with one of the Nation's finest and most rapidly growing intellectual technology communities, and that you relocate and expand the Washington arm of ARO to achieve the required inneragency synergy, leaving ARO in the Research Triangle, sustains a proven technical excellence, that's all, that is achievable only with the kind of direct and close interaction with researchers in a community such as the RTP.

Collocated and expanded ARO Washington facility would achieve and accomplish the BRAC recommendation for inneragency synergy.

Higher level of security -- addressing the higher level of security issue. There are

available lease facilities that meet security stand-off requirements. The current facility lease meets stand-off requirements -- excuse me -- or there is a Federal campus with traditional military installation-type security available within two miles of the existing facility.

Certainly, leaving the ARO outside the Beltway reduces the concentration of such resources in the DC area.

Third, finally, cutting-edge technology is the key to the modern military.

So, along with Congressman Price and the North Carolina delegation, I, too, urge you to analyze carefully the role that the location of the ARO in the RTP plays in the performance of that organization, and I think when you do, I and the citizens of the State of North Carolina are confident that you will keep the ARO where it is.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COYLE: A quick question -- some of the communities we have met with, or the Commanders, they are military commanders, that their base activities are in question, have asked their people whether or not they would move to the

proposed new location.

Do you know -- has that been done in the case of this ARO group?

DR. McMAHAN: I cannot speak directly to that, sir. I can speak circumstantially of conversations I have had informally, and I think there would be a significant resistance to relocation for many of the professionals.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you. Any other questions?

Thanks very much.

DR. PRICE: Thank you.

DR. McMAHAN: Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Mr. Pate, were you in the group sworn in earlier?

MR. PATE: I'm sorry?

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Were you part of the group that was sworn in earlier?

MR. PATE: I'm Troy Pate from Hillsboro. And I thank you Commissioners for the opportunity to speak to you today.

As Chairman of the Seymour Support Council, I'm pleased to represent the City of Goldsboro and Wayne County which are home to Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, the 4th Fighter Wing, and

the 916th Air Refueling Wing.

It has been my privilege to have been a community advocate for Seymour since 1965.

As a layman and a taxpayer, I want to personally thank you for the time and sacrifice that you are giving to serve our Nation. You are spending many hours away from home and family, and for that dedication, we are grateful and indebted to you.

Our community supports the Department of Defense's recommendation to add additional missions to Seymour Johnson.

Someone once said: "Respect and responsibility are not granted, but earned."

We believe that Seymour Johnson has earned the respect and responsibility necessary for additional missions.

In fact, a recent Air Force Times article noted that Seymour Johnson rated highest on three out of the eight mission categories that the Air Force established to rate the bases.

Seymour Johnson scored highest as a fighter, bomber and unmanned aerial vehicle base.

It also finished second in airlift and fourth in special operations and combat search and

rescue, among other bases.

Seymour Johnson has a history of high office. The Air Force 2001 Commander-in-Chief's Award, the 2004 Top Wing Commander Award, and the Outstanding Unit Citation winner, which is unprecedented for two years at the same installation to win in the same year.

Strike Eagle is -- the only Air Force training facility and operations facility for the F-15 Strike Eagle fighter jet. Seymour Johnson is critical to our Nation's defense structure. Seymour Johnson's location is the home of the 916th Air Refueling Wing, which is a vital resource at an ideally-located facility, which means pilots over the Atlantic, up and down the East Coast, and beyond have extended range and extended impact.

As a community, we are gratified that the Department of Defense knows what we have known for five years; that Seymour Johnson, Goldsboro, Wayne County and the State of North Carolina are a tremendous team.

Our community has a long history of supporting the mission of Seymour Johnson. Our very active Military Affairs Committee is known throughout the Air Force. We work diligently to

listen and adapt to the base's needs in order to support its missions. And we are proud of the way Seymour Johnson is woven into the fabric of our community.

We strengthen that fabric every day through regular meetings between local and base officials. Involvement of a base representative as a voting member of the County Planning Board, involvement of a base representative as a non-voting member of the Wayne County School Board, and the creation of the Seymour Support Council and organization of business and community leaders dedicated to strengthening the ties between the base and Air Force and DoD.

For us, the gates at Seymour Johnson are just a physical barrier. We consider the base and its personnel an integral part of our daily life. The base personnel consider this their community, too. Seymour Johnson personnel work hand-in-hand with the Chamber of Commerce on joint events. And 400 base representatives volunteer 80,000 hours annually in our area.

Over the years, our community and state have undertaken numerous efforts to support the mission of Seymour Johnson and the Dare County

bombing range. As a training facility for F-15s, Seymour Johnson must have access to adequate low-level routes for training, and access in the ranges, open runways and the ability to take off at any time of day.

That is why we have invested millions of dollars to keep encroachment to a minimum, while enhancing and preserving the national and cultural resources around the base.

In one area adjacent to the Seymour Johnson runway, the community is preserving two natural creeks through a \$1.7 million grant from the North Carolina Clean Water Management Trust Fund, with local matching funds of \$600,000.

The base is restoring the Headquarters area to its original state. The city and county have also applied for an additional \$6.4 million to purchase nearly 3,000 acres to protect land from encroachment.

Zoning is also a top priority for our community. Since the 1960s, we have implemented stringent zoning regulations to ensure that the areas around the base are free of development.

In 1987, the City of Goldsboro extended zone jurisdiction around Seymour Johnson to gain

control over all development within one mile of the base boundaries.

In the mid-1990s, the county also revised zoning to include the entire air installation's compatible use zones area to give the county more control over land use.

In 2003, Wayne County established a moratorium on new subdivisions and mobile home parks in high-noise areas. The county's zoning map includes noise overlays, subdivision plats and all areas within a half mile of the 65 decibel range. The county has adopted rules that would affect about 26 square miles of land around the base. New homes are no longer allowed in areas with noise levels averaging more than 75 decibels.

And the City of Goldsboro has adopted a new unified development, including a noise overlay zone that does not allow new mobile homes, schools or other similar land uses.

Also, the city and county own several acres near the runway that include a Civil War battlefield. We are working with the US Park Service to ensure the preservation of the memorial.

We thank the State of North Carolina for working to protect the Dare County bombing range,

the largest manned range on the eastern seaboard. And their premiere air-to-ground target training range on the East Coast; which, incidentally, is shared with the Navy and Marine Corps.

Our state has the largest available air space on the East Coast. Our community has worked to ensure that Seymour Johnson pilots enjoy free access to air space and low-level flight path, combined with our local government's efforts to limit encroachment, pilots have take-off times.

Wayne County and the City of Goldsboro is home to our servicemen and women and their families. And we work together to make sure that our community is a good home while they are on active duty or in retirement.

For active duty, we have a website developed solely to help military spouses find employment. The cost of living in our area is very affordable, and we boast a low crime rate. Many of those who served at Seymour choose to return to our area for retirement.

In fact, four of our seven County Commissioners, and the City Mayor are Seymour Johnson alumni.

While our cost of living and crime rate

are low, and excellent education remains exceedingly high, there are more than a dozen prestigious higher education institutions within an hour's drive.

Mt. Olive College is minutes away, while the Community College offers classes right on base.

To ensure open dialogue between our local schools and the base schools, principals meet with parents quarterly on the base.

The 4th Fighter Wing Command serves as a non-voting member of the Wayne County School Board.

As a member of the Military Children's Education Coalition, Wayne County Public Schools work closely with base personnel to create local action plans to benefit students from military families.

Recently created the first urban and rural transportation system in the state, which made it possible for active-duty personnel to have access to anywhere in our county. This new bus system serves more than 100,000 riders within the county.

In addition to our new bus system, all major roads into Goldsboro are currently being upgraded for easy access to I-95 North and South, and I-40 East and West, makes it easy to reach our state's biggest attractions. The beach is only two

hours away, and the North Carolina mountains are four hours away. Air travel has never been easier. Raleigh/Durham is approximately an hour away, and Kinston Regional Jetport is 30 minutes away.

Our comprehensive health care, our local hospital is known for innovations in medical technology, with leading specialists in oncology, a surgery and intensive care. In addition to several renowned institutions within a 90-minute drive: Duke University at Durham; University of Chapel Hill and the School of Medicine at East Carolina University.

In 2003, Wayne County merged 911 systems, serving various areas, into one comprehensive EMS system, through a grant from the Department of Homeland Security. The result is an average response time of just over six minutes to anywhere in the county.

As the BRAC process continues through the rest of this year, we will continue to celebrate the successful partnership between our community, state and Seymour Johnson. It's a partnership that is vital for the Nation, it's vital for the state, and is vital for our community.

And I thank you.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COYLE: COL Gombar.

COL GOMBAR: Commissioner Coyle, Admiral Gehman, General Hill, Secretary Skinner; good afternoon.

I'm COL Bruce Gombar, United States Marine Corps, (retired). Let me just say that as a retired Marine and Former Chief of Staff at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, it's a pleasure for me to be here today to share with you Onslow County's perspective on DoD's recommendation to the BRAC Commission.

As regards Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune and Marine Corps Base/New River; together, these two bases are strategically critical for power projection for our Nation's premiere readiness force, the United States Marine Corps, and are superb training bases, not only for Marines, but for joint and allied forces, as well.

Most Commission members are intimately familiar with the importance and relevance of Camp Lejeune and MCAS New River, so I will be very brief.

Onslow County is generally pleased with the DoD's recommendations to the BRAC Commission regarding these two major installations, and we do

not intend to challenge those recommendations.

Instead, I would like to take this opportunity to emphasize the unique value and future potential these two bases have to our Nation:

Within 100 mile of Jacksonville, the seat of Onslow County, lies every major military installation in North Carolina: The ports of Morehead City in Wilmington, and the global transpark, a huge air cargo terminal with an 11,000 foot runway that has tremendous potential for use as a military airport of embarkation and debarkation.

Camp Lejeune's location on North Carolina's coast, its excellent training areas and ranges, the close-by availability of Marine Corps Air Stations New River and Cherry Point, along with the aviation bombing ranges and MOAs, continues to ensure that Camp Lejeune remains the world's most complete amphibious training base, and the home of the Marine Corps' East Coast Expeditionary Forces in readiness.

Furthermore, these same factors, combined with Lejeune's proximity to North Carolina's other military bases, and those in Norfolk, Virginia, offer opportunities for joint training that cannot be duplicated anywhere else in

the United States.

In fact, training between North Carolina Marines soldiers from Fort Bragg, SEALs from Little Creek, Virginia, and airmen from Pope and Seymour Johnson was occurring at Camp Lejeune long before jointness was mandated.

For the reasons already stated, it was a natural. Today both large- and small-scale joint training exercises are conducted at Lejeune and New River. Additionally, the Coast Guard Special Mission Training Center, located at Courthouse Bay aboard Camp Lejeune, prepares Coast Guard, Navy and Marine Corps personnel for port security operations.

And New River Air Station has been designated as the training center for all Marine Corps, Air Force and Navy pilots, mechanics and avionic technicians for the B-22 Osprey, the tilt-rotter aircraft that will revolutionize assault support aviation.

Since the beginning of World War II, Lejeune and New River have been a vital launching pad for the Navy/Marine Corps team on the East Coast. Marines trained at Camp Lejeune and New River participated in the island hopping campaigns of World War II, have maintained a continual

presence in the Mediterranean since the early 1950s, participated in the Korean conflict, the Vietnam conflict, Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm, and are currently fully engaged in the global war on terrorism with II MEF forces participating in Operation Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom.

Additionally, Camp Lejeune-based Marines have been involved in numerous other operations throughout the globe as directed by the National Command Authority, including training indigenous personnel in counter-drug operations in Latin and South America, peacekeeping operations in Beirut, Bosnia and Haiti, military-to-military training with foreign military forces from Western and Eastern Europe, South America, Africa and the Middle East and unit deployment training in Okinawa.

Lt. General Marty Burns, Commander of Marine Forces Atlantic, and formerly the Commanding General of II MEF, often remarked that: "The sun never sets on II MEF," because of all the places around the world where II MEF forces are deployed.

Ever since the early forties when Camp Lejeune and New River Air Station were build, Onslow County and its municipalities have not only embraced the military mission of these bases, but have

genuinely supported the servicemen and their families as valued members of the community.

While the community and the bases have always been close, this relationship has become even better within the last 15 years. So that today, Onslow County and its military bases enjoy a relationship that is unparalleled within the Department of Defense. This relationship is manifested through such programs as the organized systematic monthly recognition of superior service members by the Jacksonville/Onslow Military Affairs Committee, by the nationally-recognized Military/Civilian Task Force for Emergency Response, (MCTFE), an organization originally formed to coordinate local, military, civilian, state and federal response to natural disaster, but which was expanded following 911 to include weapons of mass destruction and terror attacks, by Project Care and other nationally-recognized visionary community-based support network that coordinates closely with the local military support system to identify and quickly respond to problems encountered by dependents of deployed service members while their spouse is away.

Finally, the support demonstrated by the

local community in helping to obtain infrastructure funding for the 4th MEB at Camp Lejeune, assistance in helping to establish New River Air Station as the B-22 training site, as well as efforts to have New River Air Station designated as the Tilt Rotor Center of Excellence.

Furthermore, as part of the County's preparations for the 2005 BRAC, a Joint Land Use Study was completed. The recommendations of which are in the process of being modified and implemented. When finalized, the implementation will benefit both the military installations and the surrounding communities.

Although there are currently no encroachment threats to Camp Lejeune and New River Air Station, the emphasis on the JLUS is to prevent such threats from the future. Perhaps one of the greatest strengths that Onslow County bases bring to the Nation, is the superb ranges and training areas capable of meeting both current and future requirements within close proximity.

When coupled with their capacity to accommodate additional units, including those from other services and assuming that money for infrastructure is provided, these advantages would

greatly enhance the installation's already extraordinary value to DoD.

As an example, the Department of the Navy, the Marine Corps and the Congress, have recently recognized both the importance of these bases -- pardon me -- have recently recognized both the capacity to accommodate additional units and the strategic importance of these bases, by announcing the addition of 3,500 new Marines and sailors at Camp Lejeune, and by providing nearly \$76 million in the defense supplemental budget to fund the necessary infrastructure to support them.

In summary, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune and Marine Air Corps Station New River enjoy broad-base community support, have a proud history of joint operations in training, a proven track record as an ideally located power projection platform for the Navy, Marine Corps team; and provided that funding for infrastructure is approved, substantial capacity to absorb additional military units.

It's hard to imagine two bases better suited to meet the challenges of the 21st Century, to be most ready when the Nation is least ready, and to help provide stability in an unstable world.

Thank you, gentlemen. If there are no questions, I will be followed by Lt. Governor Perdue.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

LT. GOVERNOR PERDUE: Thank you. Members of the BRAC Commission, Mr. Chairman, and Commissioners, for your attention and your staying power, your service, and most of all for your sitting power these last two hours.

We here are blessed to be in North Carolina today, and glad the hearing is here. And I also wants to recognize a lot of folks that drove up from Pope and Fort Bragg, as well as Havelock and Cherry Point. So, thank you all, for all that came today.

And the State wants to take a special moment to thank Lee McNarie, who has led the effort for North Carolina on the ground in Washington with us.

The work you are doing is so important, and we are grateful. And as Lt. Governor of the State, I'm especially grateful. I live near Cherry Point and near Camp Lejeune. My family trained

there. I'm part of the military; that is what got me to North Carolina. So we are proud in this State of our military.

We know you have a difficult job, and that you are determined to do, as Commissioners, what is best for this Country and for our long-term security -- we want you to do that for all of us.

I believe the testimony you have heard today makes clear that we, North Carolina, share those goals -- we really do.

Our witnesses have focused on the military value of our bases. They evaluated the Department of Defense's recommendations in light of the Defense Department's own BRAC selection criteria.

They have stressed how we can improve upon the Department's recommendations by applying some of those criteria to increase our military readiness as a Country.

I have been given this job of concluding the hearing for North Carolina on behalf of all those folks you have heard testify.

We have a phrase in this State sometimes that we use to express the unity we feel as a people, it describes fairly, simply how we try to

work as a team to move our whole State forward. It conveys a sense of unity that knows no political lines or socioeconomic boundaries, you would be surprised some nights during basketball season that it can even bring together Carolina and Duke fans. That phrase is simply: "One North Carolina."

You have seen it on display here this afternoon, I hope, from Senator Dole and the members of her staff to our Congressional delegation to Governor Easley to the witnesses from the these bases and these communities and for all these folks here in the audience.

We care about the military of North Carolina, and we do believe we are the most military-friendly state in the Country.

We are One North Carolina, and we speak with one voice.

This afternoon you have heard compelling arguments on behalf of the individual installations. We urge you to consider the negative impact on our rapid deployment capabilities and operational readiness of the proposal to close the 43rd Airlift Wing at Pope Air Force Base.

While that proposal would hurt, really hurt, joint operations, I believe, we strongly hope

that you will support the Department's recommendation to promote a joint environment by moving Army Forces Command Headquarters and the Army Reserve Command to Fort Bragg.

Our witnesses have made strong arguments on behalf of NAVAIR Depot at Cherry Point and potential impact on aircraft maintenance of the proposed reductions there.

And please know that North Carolina shares the community's desire to see additional aircraft located at the Marine Corps Air Station at Cherry Point.

The Army Research Office has done tremendous work over the years for the Army in cooperation with the university community of North Carolina.

I believe that it would be counterproductive to relocate that facility away from the valuable resources it can partner with daily in Research Triangle Park.

We are really excited about the prospect for growth at Seymour Johnson Air Force Base, and also for the long-term growth at Camp Lejeune.

Each of our installations and base communities has its own unique story to tell you,

but I think if you think on what you have heard today, you will find some fairly simple common themes.

Our bases, all of them together, are the military's power projection platform on the East Coast.

We should do nothing at all to jeopardize that; in deed, we believe we should build upon it.

North Carolina welcomes, with open arms, additional missions and expansion of the military presence in our State. Fort Bragg is the logical place for FORSCOM, and the Army Reserve Command. Cherry Point and Seymour Johnson can accommodate additional aircraft. Camp Lejeune is poised to accept more troops.

We are determined, as a State, to remain the most military-friendly state in the Country. We will do whatever it takes to keep that title.

North Carolina has been a leader in compatible land use initiatives and infrastructure investment to keep our bases viable for the long term.

We support retention of military personnel with extensive programs to improve the

quality of life.

We understand that the soldiers, sailors, pilots, marines, enlists; that the family reenlist.

I want to speak just a bit more on that point for North Carolina.

Because we can make a difference at the state level in what you are about, thanks in large part to the leadership of the Military Affairs Committee and the Governor and the long-term strategic plan, we have passed tremendously proactive military legislation year after year in this state.

We are particularly proud of the bond issue you have heard about today that was approved to allow our communities to purchase land at fair market value around bases, and the expansion of the program that we are delighted in to provide in-state tuition to every military folk and their dependents for as long as they are in this state, and after they are relocated to another military installation; that is historic in this Country.

That those initiatives are key to maintaining and growing our bases, and to retain quality, good people in the military. That is what

we want.

We can continue to work with the military year after year. In April of this year, I joined with a bipartisan group of legislators to announce the Military Support Act of 2005. One of the things that does is return half of the gas revenues collected on military bases to those base communities to be used for quality-of-life programs for base personnel, our military and their families, as well as for compatible land use. That is historic. The Act is going to ease the transition to work for military families relocated to North Carolina by streamlining the professional licensure requirement so that military folks can get a job real quickly and support their families.

It supports military training programs at the community colleges, funds Troops-to-Teach-Others Program.

We making it easy for the kids of our military personnel to transfer course credits from one state to the other; that is problematic. And we fixed that in North Carolina.

We support our military families and show that support year after year with tangible initiatives that target soldiers, sailors and Air

Force and Marines and their families.

We take these steps because when it comes to supporting the military, we are One North Carolina. We work together. The Governor and his cabinet, our state legislators, Senator Burr and Members of Congress from both parties, all these elected officials, the mayors and citizen groups, business leaders that you see in this room today.

But the most important thing that we know as a state, and that we submit for the record, is that One North Carolina in terms of the military in this state, includes everyday citizens from all corners of this great state who make it clear day after day, time and again, that they welcome the men and women of the military as friends and neighbors.

And we are mighty proud of them and thank them for the service to our Country.

That is why, Members of the Commission, you can count on North Carolina's absolute commitment long term to sustain our military bases for decades and decades to come after you and I are all gone.

I assure you we are focused on that future. If there is one thing I have learned as we have gone through this process one more time, it's

that in North Carolina, we don't just wake up when a BRAC comes around to the importance of the military.

Our commitment to the defense of our Nation in this state transcends the process.

The military is part of the fiber of this great state. And the men and women of our Nation's Armed Forces are an important part of the life of North Carolina. They stand strong first to defend our freedoms but, you know what? They also stand with us each day in our communities and our neighbors, in our churches as little league coaches and blood drive captains, as choir members and as friends. And those men and women of the military are a vital part of the One North Carolina we cherish.

We thank you for being here. We thank you for listening and considering our testimony. But most of all, we thank you for the important work you are doing on behalf of America.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COYLE: We are going to take the shortest possible break now. Give you a chance to stretch your legs and ours. I'm going to try to get everybody back together starting with South Carolina in about five minutes.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Senator Graham, the way we are doing these, the lead Senator from the state has the agenda and the time allotted. You can speak for the whole time all by yourself, and it would be fine with us.

SENATOR GRAHAM: I think I'm smart enough not to do that.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: We would like all of the people who are going to be speaking for South Carolina to stand and to be sworn in, as is required by the law.

GENERAL COUNSEL HAGUE: Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you are about to give, and any evidence you may present, will be complete and accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief, so help you God.

ANSWER: I do.

GENERAL COUNSEL HAGUE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Senator Graham, the floor is yours.

SENATOR GRAHAM: I'll try to set a good example by saying what I have to say as quick and directly as possible, but understanding how important it is.

Number one: To each of you and your

staff, thank you for serving your Country. This cannot be easy. I know you have to make some hard decisions. Nothing about BRAC is easy. But it's important, and thank you for taking the time away from your businesses and your families to be part of something good and important for America.

Generally speaking, we think the Department of Defense got most of it right when it comes to South Carolina. There are a few exceptions, and we will talk to you about that.

But the bottom line is, that I support BRAC, and I think most of my colleagues do. Because in this war, this global war on terror, it's not about saving money. And to those people who are in the audience, it's not about saving money, it's about taking hard-earned taxpayer dollars and putting them into the fight, to the places that really are relevant to the war on terror.

And I think that's why South Carolina, generally speaking, did very well.

Commissioners, you know that South Carolina was plussed up 700 jobs overall, and for that we are grateful for the Department of Defense. And I think it reflects the spirit of South Carolina in terms of her relationship with the Department of

Defense. You will find no state more welcoming, more patriotic, more ready to serve, more capable of serving than South Carolina.

But this is a business enterprise, BRAC. And I know that all of you come with a great business resume. So I applaud you for your service, and let's look at the business decisions that we've made.

Number one, we've lost 1,000 positions in Charleston, let's start with a tough part. There are 25,000 Department of Defense jobs in Charleston. Charleston was hit hard in the last round of BRAC. The consolidation going on with the Department of Defense finance centers makes sense.

I know there are over 30 centers in the Country being looked at in the terms of consolidation. I make one plea to you, do it as humanely as possible. But I do understand that Department of Defense is not amenable from good business practices. The engineering services center, NAVFAC, a lot of people here, please look at that. Because we live in an age where you don't have to be in Jacksonville to do your job.

Let's don't move positions that are performing well for the Country because some chart

says so.

Please listen to the people from Charleston about the data regarding this move and about the logic behind it, because I think if we will look and listen, we can save some dollars and avoid disrupting lives and be more efficient by keeping people in place where they are already doing a good job for the Nation.

(Applause.)

SENATOR GRAHAM: I know what it must have been like to go to South Dakota. But my friends from Charleston, I don't know how this is going to come out, and I know we are not going to save ever position possible, but we will try to make the best case possible. But these gentlemen and their staff have a hard job. But there is a story to be told about the engineering services in Charleston, and it will be told well.

Generally speaking, South Carolina did well for a reason. Fort Jackson, half the people in the Army come through Fort Jackson. And if you can find a better place to locate a military base, I would like to find it.

Very supportive people. When you talk about jointness, Fort Jackson is an example of

jointness that I'll put up against any place, any time; that is why we did well with Fort Jackson.

Shaw Air Force Base, half the Air Force went through Shaw. That is why it did well. All the Commanders at the top level of the Air Force, probably have been there, Wing commanders. We've got 800 Army people, a new company coming to Shaw Air Force Base in Sumter, South Carolina. That was a great decision. I hope you will support it. Because that footprint serves this Nation well, and you will find that support in the community of Sumter. But consolidating an Army group at Shaw Air Force Base makes a stronger Nation a great place to put them.

Beaufort, anybody been to Beaufort? Wonderful place to visit. It's the heart and sole of the Marine Corp. I have always said the day they close Parris Island is the day I will get drafted by the NBA. Parris Island is the Marine Corps. And she survived. Beaufort Air Station survived because she got the Naval and Marine Corps using the base to its fullest, also have the Army there. But you got training abilities right off the Coast of South Carolina that nobody in the Country can match.

So please listen to what the DoD said

about Beaufort. I think you will find their recommendations to be sound.

Charleston, sealift and airlift, second to none, that is why we did well at Charleston Air Force Base and the Naval center there, the weapons center. Charleston has been a great footprint for the Department of Defense, and it needs to grow where it can grow.

McEntire, a small little Air National Guard base. It's unique on the East Coast. We can do things at McEntire you can't do anywhere else in the Country, like cut off the lights and train at night. I have a little bias, here as I was a member of that unit for five years.

And I know the people who serve there, and the Department of Defense did say not only keep it open, but bringing new 9 F-16s to McEntire at a time when the Guard has been put to much.

I really do want you to look at what we have done in the Guard and Reserves, but those nine F-16s came into McEntire back then because they are blocked in; they need to be at the same place. When you are picking a place to put F-16s in the Air Force, you can't find a better place than McEntire; the Top Gun winner of 1989, probably the most

decorated, most efficient squadron in the modern Air Force.

The bottom line is that South Carolina, generally speaking, did well. And for that we are grateful.

There are opportunities at Charleston that we need to look at closely, not only to save money, but really add value to the Department of Defense. And the people who came up here today, I'll put their work product against anybody, anywhere in any city.

I appreciate your service. I know it's a hard job, but South Carolina and her citizens have earned the right to grow with the Department of Defense. We have earned a right to be in this fight. We welcome the Department of Defense's presence, and anything you want to send our way, gentlemen, we are capable of handling it. God bless you, God bless America. Thank you.

(Applause.)

SENATOR GRAHAM: I would like to enter Joe Wilson's statement in the record, too.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Without objection, Senator. Governor Sanford.

GOVERNOR SANFORD: I will follow up

where Lindsey left off, and in even shorter form, because as he said, the local and most effective communities have a very strong case to tell. And I would like for my time to be accrued toward their end.

I will simply say this:

I think what's interesting, and I think even fascinating, is what today is, today is Carolina day. 229 years ago today, the British were storming Sullivan's Island just off the Coast there at Charleston, June 28, 1776. And the locals were able to basically hold off the British there at Sullivan's Island. And much like, I guess, the Battle of Marathon, a single horseman took off for Philadelphia to tell the Congress of this win, one of the first great wins for the patriots back in the 1700s.

And a week later, the Declaration of Independence was signed. And that declaration basically said to the world: We are ready, willing and able to fight for freedom. And what happened at Sullivan's Island there in South Carolina proved -- basically, told the world not only were they ready, willing and able, they, in fact, were very able to do just that.

And if you were to go fast forward in time, today basically that tradition still holds very, very strong in South Carolina, as you all know. And that is, you have a community that has very strongly supported the military for 200 years now, that is embedded, if you will, in our culture.

And so we are folks that basically recognize the importance of BRAC, recognize the importance of the very hard decisions you all have to make, recognize the idea of aligning base structure with force structure, in being the best interest of the military, being in the best interests of the taxpayer.

And I guess what I'm here to say is simply this:

We have great infrastructure in South Carolina. It's been recognized over the years with the Pentagon, and Department of Defense, and we have it with installations, we have it with ranges, we have it with training facilities, we have it most of all with the local support of the military infrastructure in South Carolina. And as Lindsey already mentioned, we are plussed up 700 positions in South Carolina. The Department of Defense has recognized South Carolina's contributions over time.

They have recognized the value of the installations and the structure in place.

So, for the jobs that have come to South Carolina, we would say "thank you". And we would say that those communities stand ready, willing and able to take on additional commissions, should you decide that's in the best interest of the taxpayers.

For the areas that were not on the receiving end, and they are going to make their case very, very shortly, I would say that they are going to really focus in on just one or two areas. They are going to focus in on data that appears, from their end, flawed. And I really ask you to take into consideration the case they will make from that area, and the other options that they think would better serve, again, the Department of Defense and taxpayers as a whole.

I would ask you to pay special attention to those two veins of thought, if you will, that they will bring to your focus. The Charleston community, particularly, is going to make a very, very strong case both with regard to the engineering facility and to the Navy warfare systems facility.

I would ask you to, again, pay particular attention to those two issues and what

they will have to say on those two things.

I would again say thank you very, very much for what you all are doing. Again, I would ask -- I hand my time over to the community, thank you.

(Applause.)

SENATOR DEMINT: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, thank you for this opportunity. I think we probably have folks here today with all the data you need to hear. I think probably more important than me trying to create a lot of data, maybe just to share some things I think that are less tangible.

I think one of those is just the fact that you are looking at the whole South Carolina delegation; folks that have driven from all over South Carolina to come here to tell you how important the bases are to us, and how important we think they are to the Country as a whole.

And we like our military families, and we like taking care of them, Federal government's military assets.

And we do have a proud tradition of serving the military and hosting here. And as many of you know, many people who served here on bases of South Carolina, come back here to retire because

they feel so welcome here.

There is always a warm welcome for soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines. The cost of living in South Carolina is very reasonable, and that saves the military a lot of money. And for this reason alone, I think the Commission should think long and hard about some of the recommendations, too. For some of our missions, as Senator Graham and the Governor mentioned.

And I would like to say for those who might say that South Carolina has not made its fair share of sacrifices in this BRAC, it's important to remember that during the last two BRACs, that we lost a major air base in Myrtle Beach and major Naval station in Charleston. But we continue to make hosting military families and military assets a priority here in the State.

As the Senator and Governor have covered from Fort Jackson to Parris Island, McEntire Air Station to Beaufort Marine Corps, Shaw to the Charleston military complex, our state has been very supportive of the military, and we appreciate its presence here.

Each of these facilities, and I would appreciate you just looking at this, and how active

and how critical that they have been to the war on terror. And apparently, the Department of Defense feels that they will continue to be. We had the capability to surge and also to take on new missions.

So, as we have talked about, Fort Jackson and Parris Island are the cornerstones of basic training for the Army and Marines and the National Guard pilots. And McEntire is known throughout the Air Force as being some of the best around. The men and women at Shaw and Beaufort are constantly deployed. We see them all over the Middle East when we go visit there. But for this reason, the Department of Defense and BRAC recommendation clearly realized that we are doing a lot of things right here in South Carolina.

With this in mind, if I could just, one disappointment I think in the Navy's recommendation, we would just like you to listen to today. I'm here just to encourage you to listen to the facts and the statistics of the Charleston military complex and their great record. I visited there many times. Their contribution to the war on terror is unmatched.

The aerial port of Charleston Air Force

Base is the busiest aerial port in the Continental United States. The Naval weapons station has been a key ship loading and unloading facility for Operation Iraqi Freedom. It's the busiest on the East Coast, the second busiest in the Continental United States.

We need to keep that critical mass there. From an engineering and acquisition perspective, the professionals of the Naval Facility Engineering Command, the Southern Division are executing their mission incredibly well by providing reach-back capability across the board in diverse geographic areas.

Their technical and execution capability is unmatched in any organization, as you will see from some of the statistics that are out there. The space and Naval Warfare Center, I think, if you haven't been there, is one of the most impressive places I have ever been in Charleston, most modern and efficient C-41 SR facility in the Navy.

By all measures, it leads in efficiency, low-cost delivery, and speed of delivering equipment to the war fighter. They are not just a Navy lab, but a joint war fighter engineering facility with nearly half of their business outside the Department

of the Navy.

So, those of you here from the Charleston community, and others, we are here to just ask you to consider them. We appreciate your service. We thank you for considering South Carolina. But your job is to do what's best for this Country. And we think we can play a key role in making sure South Carolina is making sure that America's military is the best in the world. Thank you again for your service.

(Applause.)

REPRESENTATIVE SPRATT: Members of the Commission, I am John Spratt. I want to thank you for allowing me to testify.

I served in Congress and on the House Arms Services Committee for 22 years. I have been through this process four times before, and I understand -- intimately understand -- the burden that you have taken upon yourselves. And I want to thank you for undertaking this responsibility.

I represent the 5th District of South Carolina. And I'm proud to say that includes Shaw Air Force Base's F-16 Wing. DoD proposes additions to Shaw that are welcome, but come as no surprise. Shaw hosts the Headquarters of the Ninth Air Force

or SINTAB, the Air Force component which puts it in the thickest of the very heart of the most dangerous theatre in which our troops are engaged.

Shaw also hosts the 20th Fighter Wing, which has three F-16 squadrons that make up 40 percent of the Air Force's capacity for suppressing enemy air defenses. Air superiority is the first mission of the Air Force, and the 20th Fighter Wing plays a critical share. Shaw's F-16s and 27 troops were among the first to deploy at Desert Storm.

After the war, they flew Northern Watch and Southern Watch. They deployed to Aviano for operations over Yugoslavia and then to Enduring Freedom for operations over Afghanistan.

In the days after 9/11, they flew controls up and down the eastern seaboard.

And in February of 2003, they sent the first wave of service and F-16s in support of what was to be Operation Iraqi Freedom.

All of this shows that they are combat ready and proficient, and they do so, they stay combat ready, because they enjoy some of the best training opportunities in the Country.

Just minutes to the East, they find themselves over the ocean. A few minutes more to

the West, and they are approaching the mountains. Closer by, F-16s taking off from Shaw's two runways, taking off from Shaw -- barely wheels up before they are over Point Set Range where electronic signals emit or simulate enemy air defenses.

Last year we obtained funding for joint transmitters at Point Set, state-of-the-art simulators to simulate double digit sounds.

We are working now with the Air Force to link Point Set with nearby Gamecock and Bulldog military operating areas, which will increase training missions available, not just to Shaw, but to others, as well.

On base, Shaw's facilities are among the most modern in the Air Force. In just the last five years, we built a new enlisted dining facility, a new education center, a new aircraft maintenance facility, deployment processing center. We've renovated housing. We've added two and a half millions dollars in the last several years for simulated hardware and software to Point Set range.

We have literally, and I can say this from personal knowledge, having shepherded most of this money through the Congress, we have literally rebuilt this base from top to bottom, from the early

eighties, well equipping it for missions far into the future.

These improvements make sure a natural business fit for the Third Army Headquarters which the Pentagon proposes to realign from Fort McPherson.

The current round of realignment is aimed as jointness. And General Jumper has described Shaw as the classic example of what jointness is all about, putting air and land components side by side, seeing to it that they trained together and work together every day of the year.

One final point that may not find -- be found in your daily cause is the relationship between Shaw and Sumter, the local community. It has to rank among the strongest in the Air Force. It manifests itself in every sort of way; favorable zoning, affordable housing, accessible highways, public education, hospital coverage and hundreds and hundreds of strong personal relationships.

The people of Sumter know what Shaw means to them, and they bend over backwards to show their appreciation.

I hope that my brief comments and

observations give you a more vivid, livelier idea of Shaw Air Force Base than that dry material you have assembled there before you. Because I think it is a splendid situation.

Shaw has stood the Pentagon's scrutiny five times, and for good reasons, for the same good reasons the Pentagon has decided to bolster jointness in it's most -- one of it's most important commands by collocating the Third Army Headquarters here.

I urge you, urge you to affirm the Pentagon's recommendations in your final submission to the President.

One final point, the one area of South Carolina, and I don't represent it, but it's hit hard by the Pentagon's recommendations again, It is the Charleston Naval complex, NAVFAC. These facilities, the Charleston community have some compelling recommendations for those facilities, and hope the Commission will be able to give them the consideration that they are due. Thank you.

(Applause.)

REPRESENTATIVE CLYBURN: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission, I am James Clyburn. I proudly represent South Carolina's Sixth

Congressional District. I want to thank you for this opportunity to be here today, to speak on behalf of those installations in my District that are being affected by this round of recommendations.

I am in an enviable position of being sandwiched between John Spratt, who represents an area, Shaw Air Force Base, who gained significantly; and Henry Brown, who represents part of my District that is losing in these recommendations.

I am also the only current member of the South Carolina delegation that has represented a community that has gone through a significant base closing. I was in Congress the last time around when Charleston suffered dramatically with those recommendations.

Today, approximately 1,100 jobs are slated for realignment or loss in Charleston, again. Many of these individuals are constituents of mine who relocated to the Charleston area after the last BRAC round. Others who are currently working at the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and Defense Financial Accounting Service Center in Charleston, were formally employed at the Charleston Naval base and Naval yard and were retrained for the jobs they are currently holding.

I am hopeful that this investment of time and money and energy and talent will not go unnoticed by this Commission.

Those who will testify on behalf of the Charleston region will demonstrate to you that several of the recommendations that have been made seem to deviate from the BRAC criteria.

Will it be most costly to the American taxpayers and may detract from military value? I echo their concerns.

You and this process are necessary and vital to ensure that our Nation's Armed Forces can efficiently and effectively carry out their missions.

I ask this Commission to request that additional scenarios be run that will maximize value to the military and the American taxpayer.

Since 1993, I have had the pleasure of watching Fort Jackson in my current hometown of Columbia, and Shaw Air Force Base in Sumter, where I was born and raised, successfully fulfilled the missions they were charged to undertake.

I believe the recent recommendations to further grow these facilities are testimonies to their successful implementations of previous BRAC

realignments.

McEntire Air National Guard base, which is sandwiched between these two facilities, and is in my Congressional District, has shown that it is uniquely vital to our Nation's military operations. It, too, has been tapped for expansion. McEntire, Fort Jackson and Shaw Air Force Base are collectively expected to gain 1,858 new jobs as a result of the recent recommendations.

These changes will have a dramatic economic impact on these communities and comply with the missions overall goals of transforming the United States military into a more agile, joint expansion Air Force. And I think that is to be commended.

These recommendations will help to centralize our forces and military operations and eliminate waste.

This strategy is exemplified by the Department of Defense's recommendation to centralize the Armed Forces Military Training Institutes and establish a joint state of excellence for military training and education at Fort Jackson.

I am very proud of the military commands in my community and all that they do to serve and

protect our Nation. I ask that you uphold the recommendations made by the Defense Department as it relates to the military establishments McEntire Air National Guard, Fort Jackson, and Shaw Air Force Bases.

And I ask that you reexamine the data used and the recommendations made by the Department of Defense to relocate the Naval facilities in the Southern Division and the Defense Finance and Accounting Service Center in Charleston.

Please listen closely to the testimony of my constituents from Charleston and the Low Country of South Carolina. These relocations could have a dramatic impact on the community that has been devastated once before by the BRAC process.

I want to thank you once again for allowing me to be here, and thank you very much for your great service to our Nation.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Mr. Brown.

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: I, too, would like to thank you for coming, and for your commitment to service in this particularly difficult time. I know that everybody that comes would certainly make a plea for defense of their

installation. But I would like just to make a special plea, and I'm the last speaker on this particular panel, and sometimes all the speeches you have prepared have already been said.

So I will not bore you with having to repeat, but there are some personal items I would like to add to this directive and members of this Commission, is that I'm a fourth generation from the Charleston area. And I'll tell you that the Charleston area has always been a very military-friendly town. It has been a good relationship that we have had as long as I can remember, and I guess through those four generations.

But I know without your particular operation and without the BRAC process, we probably would still be dealing with the cavalry and wagons and some other parts of government we know is not efficient. So I, too, believe in the BRAC process.

But I would like to just add some relationships to it that I believe has already been maybe mentions, but I like to reemphasize.

The end result is, we want to have a more efficient process. We want to have a more accountable military operation that will defend our borders and defend us against the terrorists.

The two installations I want to talk about today are those installations that fit within the mold and the purpose and the goal of the Defense Department. Why we want to move them from Charleston? I don't know. If, in effect, they were inefficient, and they were going to be eliminated, then I would say it would be a taxpayer savings. But these installations are installations that could be anywhere. We gratefully have them in Charleston, because Charleston, I believe, has a great quality of life for the -- for our citizens. It's cheaper than most places to live, so the cost of living would be cheaper. And most of the operations that they do is not actually focused within the Charleston region, but focused outside the regions, so those installations could be anywhere.

So I would hope, as you make your recommendations, that you would focus on these people. These are real people that would have to be moved or lose a job. These are seasoned -- I'm seasoned myself, all of these people have been working at their jobs a long time. I think the resources, the capital resources that you would lose by transferring them to some other location, they might not be able to go. Their job, although could

be moved, the person might not be able to move because of their connection within the community.

So I would hope that in the process that you see where you're uprooting families and concentrating into one location without unnecessary tax saving to the taxpayers, I believe would be -- would not be the proper thing to do.

So I know you all have an awesome responsibility. I certainly would hope that you would look at those personalities and families that would be uprooted because of the decision. And I believe that it's not a cost savings to the taxpayer, which I think is absolutely the ultimate of what you all are trying to accomplish. But, anyway, thank you for coming. Appreciate the opportunity to listen to my petitions, and I hope you have God speed.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COYLE: I don't believe we have any questions for you gentlemen. So thank you so much for your testimony. We appreciate your being here today.

COLONEL PAYNE: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is John Payne. I am the Chairman of the Beaufort Military Enhancement

Committee.

First of all, I would like to thank the Commissioners for hearing us today, and Senator Graham, Senator DeMint, Governor Sanford for giving us time on the program.

With me here today is Laura Solomon, the Executive Director of our organization. Stand up, Laura. Laura is not only our Executive Director, but she brings a real insight into the job, because her husband is one of the Navy pilots at one of the two Navy squadrons at the Marine Corps Air Station in Beaufort. So she understands this life completely.

We understand that the Commission still has some very difficult decisions to make regarding new aviation. While we were very pleased that we were not on the closure list, we would like to offer the following thoughts for your consideration as you make those different decisions about new aviation.

There are three installations located in Beaufort County, South Carolina; the Marine Corps Air Station in Beaufort, Marine Corps Recruiting Depot at Parris Island and the Naval Hospital at Beaufort.

Today I will talk about the Marine Corps

Air Station in Beaufort. However, if you have any questions at all about Parris Island or the Naval Hospital, please feel free. We have -- I think we can could answer anything you might have concerning those.

Not only is Beaufort Air Station one of the strongest installations on the East Coast in terms of military value, it is one of the most cost effective. It lies in the bite or bend in the North American continent, that puts it well away from the encroachment of the major commercial airline routes of Atlanta to the metropolitan areas of both the Northeast and Miami, as well as the routes from Miami to the Northeast.

You can see those major commercial airlines depicted by the bold red lines on the slide. Marine Corps Station Beaufort owns two major ranges. A computerized air-to-air combat training range offshore depicted here in turquoise, and a 5,000 acre air-to-ground bombing range which also has computerized scoring, as well as a complete variety of threat emitters, it is shown here ashore in green. What is unique is that the two ranges are connected by a quick-thrust corridor military operating area shown in yellow.

Fighter attack aircraft can engage an enemy on the attack range offshore, gain air superiority there -- and here is the unique part, they can remain completely tactical as they pass through the quick corridor and then engage targets on the ground at the Townsend Bombing Range.

And they can do this all on one tank of fuel, precluding the need for expensive air-to-air refueling, making Beaufort one of the most cost-effective ranges on the East Coast.

It's also the closet Navy Marine Corps range to the Pine Castle Bombing Range in Florida, which is the only place on the East Coast where live bombs can be dropped. Beaufort is the only Air Station on the East Coast where simulated attacks can be initiated from the sea and completed in a fully-tactical scenario against the defended coastline.

Simply put, Beaufort is the very best place to train like we fight.

Encroachment is a major concern for every air installation, civilian or military.

We have had some recent developments that are critical to the future value of the installation that were not recognized in the BRAC

identifiable process.

At the time of the data, the Joint Land Use Study was not complete. We are pleased to report it is now complete, and is being implemented by all three affected communities.

Beaufort is leading the Nation in working to prevent future encroachment. As many of you are aware, the DoD has a program called Land Partnering, where they -- the DoD -- will match dollar for dollar that money that the local community spends to purchase land, or the development rights to tracks of land to prevent encroachment.

It's our understanding that Beaufort County was the first in the Nation to avail itself of that program. Last year we purchased two tracts of land and have several more scheduled for the near future.

We have also recently been selected by OSD for a national pilot program on encroachment mitigation.

In may, a two-day developer's forum which included OSD, the Chamber of Commerce and both national and local developers, real estate developers, was held at the Marine Corps Air

Station. The objective was to glean information about how MCAS Beaufort could be a model for other installations in an encroachment litigation.

Bottom line is this:

Encroachment does not affect the day-to-day operations of Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort. Flight patterns have not been altered due to encroachment.

Beaufort has the room for expansion across four key operating areas. There is land for an additional 8,000 foot runway. I think you can see from the overhead photograph here to the northwest of the long runway, that long runway is 12,000 feet to the northwest of that runway, is room that for another 8,000 foot runway, if the Navy so desired.

Four outlying field locations have been located. Two of those already are owned by the Federal government.

Our ranges are not at full capacity, there is room for growth at our ranges.

A recent study of the Air Station indicated that three to five additional squadrons could be taken without major military construction dollars.

And if the money was spent for an outlying field and an additional runway, eight to ten additional squadrons will be possible at Beaufort.

And last but certainly not least, Beaufort is in air quality attainment today and will remain so even after the Joint Strike Fighter comes online. And I think all of you are aware Joint Strike Fighter will put out more particulates. It will be a little dirtier here.

In conclusion, I would like to emphasize that there is room to grow both at the Air Station and in the community. Again, I stress that encroachment is not an issue now, nor will it be in the future.

The combination of minimal encroachment, unique geography in the null of civilian air traffic, and proximity to key training ranges, make Beaufort an extremely unique, irreplaceable asset to the Department of Defense.

The local community is very proud to make a home for these installations and units and their families. But again, we thank you for your kind attention.

Are there any questions at this time?

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you very much
for your testimony.

(Applause.)

MR. McLEESE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
members of the Commission. My name is Ike McLeese.
I am President of the Chamber of Commerce in
Columbia, South Carolina. Today I am speaking on
behalf of the Columbia business community and our
citizens, as well as our mayor, Robert Coble.

Columbia is home both to Fort Jackson
and to McEntire Joint Air National Guard station. I
would like to first address the community's
relationship to Fort Jackson.

It began in 1911, according to the
minutes of my chamber, when the business community
in Columbia raised the money to buy General Wade
Hampton's estate and deeded it to the War
Department, hoping they would locate a military
installation in our community.

In 1917, the War Department complied
with that request, and started Camp Jackson, which
has been in continuous operation ever since.

Our strategic importance is that we are
the first impression that over 50 percent of the
soldiers serving in the United States Army get of

their Armed Forces.

We have over 130,000 parents who visit those soldiers for graduation nine weeks later.

So we feel that we are an important part of the recruiting process in the way that we treat the soldiers in Columbia.

Not only do they begin their service in Columbia, over 25,000, including six former commanding generals, have chosen to retire in Columbia, none of whom had South Carolina connections. And they say they do so because they are treated better in the uniform of the United States Army in Columbia, South Carolina, than any place they have served.

The Columbia/Fort Jackson relationship is further evidence that during the first Gulf War, when these basic trainees who were there at the holiday season were not able to go home for their normal Operation Exodus, which is a break in the basic training, the citizens of Columbia made sure that these soldiers not only had opportunities to be downtown for basketball games and other community activities, but invited them into their homes, and during the holidays season made sure that each soldier had a gift appropriate to their religious

faith.

We continue today to work on a daily basis. In previous rounds of BRAC, we have received the SSI school, the Army Chaplain School and the Department of Defense Polygraph Operator School.

In each of those cases, the Chamber organized a visitation party to that particular mission, where we not only talked to the soldiers about Columbia, we also made presentations to very important people, and that's the civilian employees of these missions that do not have to follow.

And we have been very successful in assisting the Army in transferring very valuable civilian employees.

What we would pledge to you today is that if you affirm the recommendations of the Department of Defense, these new missions coming with the various religious training, the Chaplain School, the major Army Reserve unit, that we would, in Columbia, treat these people -- welcome them into our community and incorporate them as citizens of the Columbia, South Carolina.

We take great pride in that. Also, at McEntire, we are accustomed to the airmen there being our friends, neighbors, fellow employees,

because they are civilian soldiers.

The Department of Defense has seen fit to recommend a regular Air Force unit from Mountain Home, I can assure you we will work with the folks at McEntire to make sure that these airmen are incorporated into our community are properly welcomed, properly treated and are properly housed.

And we would respectfully, on behalf of the Columbia community, request that you affirm the DoD recommendations. And we can assure you that the soldiers that come to Columbia will walk away with a great impression of the community.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Major McElveen.

MAJOR McELVEEN: Thank you. Good afternoon. On behalf of the citizens of Sumter, South Carolina, I thank you for allowing us to make this presentation, and for undertaking what, at times, must be a thankless job, but we think one of the most important that is going on in our Country right now.

I also want to thank the City of Charlotte and the State of North Carolina for hosting this meeting today.

The comments about Congressional delegation and our Governor demonstrate the type of support that South Carolina has for its bases and its host community.

And that's not just during BRAC years, it's all the time. Sumter has been the home of Shaw Air Force Base for over 60 years. I am 58 years old and a native of Sumter, and I believe I know our people in Sumter.

We love our Country, we love freedom, and we know that without the United States Armed Forces, we would have neither.

Many of us are veterans, many are military retirees, so we are proud to have a role in the defense of our Country.

We try to fulfill that role by doing whatever we can to welcome our neighbors at Shaw into our community by being good friends to those who remained behind when the warriors must leave, and by anticipating the needs of our military friends before those needs become problems.

We in Sumter know that we get much more than a federal payroll from our base. Over the years, Shaw has brought diversity and talent into our community. Airmen work side by side with

citizens in our churches and in our charities.

Many choose to retire in our community, as I said, such as Major General Tom Sullivan, who has been our Military Affairs Director 12 years.

For all of these reasons and more, we are excited at the prospect that the addition of Shaw will be enhanced in the coming years.

We have already begun preparations to welcome any troops who will relocate to Sumter once this process concludes.

As I said, Sumterites understand and appreciate the military and what it does. And we are proud to be a part of it, if only in a small way.

We will be ready. I believe the Commission staff are visiting Shaw this week. I'm sure that every base will tell that you they have a good relationship that their host community. But the International City Management Association has recognized the base community relationship at Shaw and Sumter with an award. But yet national awards do not tell the whole story.

I dare to say if you examine the Shaw/Sumter relationship carefully, you will leave knowing -- leave Sumter knowing that the

relationship is more than good. It's special. The leadership at Shaw and Sumter work hard to make it that way and will continue to do so. We have had an organization with the Shaw/Sumter Community Counsel that has gone on probably for 50 years, that works on this weekly, if not daily.

You know the strengths at Shaw Air Force Base, and you know the areas that need improvement. We are working to improve the strengths, and we constantly work to improve those places where we need to improve.

The overriding question, of course, is the value of our base to the defense of our Country and freedom, to the mission of the armed services.

When you consider the recognition that Shaw annually receives for excellence in so many areas of military preparedness and mission effectiveness, when you consider the easy access to multiple training opportunities for pilots, and when you consider the stellar performance of the 20th Fighter Wing and the Ninth Air Force in every recent military endeavor from Operation Desert Storm to the Balkans to homeland defense, we in Sumter believe that the answer is: Yes, Shaw is essential to the mission of our armed forces.

And although we don't claim to be military planners or strategists, locating the Third Army Headquarters at Shaw would mean to enhance the effectiveness of future joint operations. It seems pretty obvious, even to somebody who doesn't understand all this.

I know this is a difficult time for Commissioners with so much to do and so little time to do it. I will leave by saying we are pleased at Shaw and Sumter, that Shaw Air Force Base will remain open and grow. In fact, we have got plenty of room to grow. We have got an area that is ready for a squadron of F-16s right now, and we hope that will be considered sometime in the future. Sumter stands ready to continue its role in supporting and support in the military community.

Thank you very much for your time, your attention and your dedication.

(Applause.)

MAYOR SUMMEY: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today before you. My name is Keith Summey. I'm the Mayor of the City of North Charleston.

I am here on behalf of the Charleston region, a region comprised of three counties and

over 560,000 people.

First, let me say -- start by saying that our community supports the BRAC process, understands the process very well.

I dare say the Charleston community probably understands BRAC as much as any other community in the United States, because we have a wealth of BRAC experience. As you well know in 1993, we were BRAC'd. And today we are held up as a model community for having experienced BRAC and living to tell about it.

Unbeknownst to most people, even within the Navy leadership, is the fact that the Navy is still the single largest employer in the Charleston region. But we also understand that our Nation must make changes and retool and restructure the Department of Defense as the world around us changes.

And these decisions must be based on what is best for our Nation's defense. But they also should make sense both economically as well operationally, or else BRAC is unsuccessful.

In the early 1990's, the Charleston military complex was one ready for 20th century conflicts and the Cold War.

Today, our military complex is a model of the 21st century wartime support with Charleston Air Force Base and its C-17s, the Naval Weapons Station Joint ordnance support with over 2,000 additional developable acres, the leading-edge SPAWAR System Center, the Army's prepositioning Combat Group Afloat, the 841st Transportation Battalion, which has loaded or unloaded over 140 ships for Iraqi Freedom in Charleston, and over 20 other significant commands that operate in a joint base concept.

We have exercised our community responsibility to critically review the 2005 BRAC recommendations that affect our Charleston area and want to review our conclusions with you.

We have reviewed the recommendations and underlying analysis with regard to the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, the Naval Weapons Station, the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, Southern Division, and the Space and Naval Warfare System Center, Charleston.

First, the Defense Finance and Accounting Service or DFAS.

DoD has recommended that DFAS Charleston be realigned as part of a national consolidation of

DFAS centers, and will result in a loss of 368 civilian jobs. While the loss of hundreds of positions is always painful, we find no fault with the logic or conclusions that resulted in the recommendations and loss of these positions in Charleston.

However, we are concerned that DFAS' decision will impact people who have already been BRAC's once before. Many of the people who work at DFAS are former employees of the Naval facilities closed with the '93 -- when in '93 the Charleston Naval Shipyard was BRAC'ed.

We trust you will take this into account as you make your decisions.

Next, Naval Weapons Station Charleston.

DoD has recommended realigning Naval Weapons Station Charleston by relocating all installation management and functions -- support functions to Charleston Air Force Base. This realignment will result in a loss of 250 positions, half military, half civilian.

For a number of years, we have articulated the Joint Transportation Logistics Engineering and Training Complex Charleston. That vision is recognized by this realignment, but we

have been unable to fully understand the personnel losses from the available data.

In concept, we support the DoD recommendation for consolidating and streamlining base station support functions. However, we are concerned about the large loss with little or no gains in Charleston Air Force Base to take on responsibility of 17,000 additional acres with over 40 tenant commands.

Next, is the Naval Facilities Engineering Command or NASVAC, Southern Division.

We believe the analysis that underlies the NASVAC Southern Division is fundamentally flawed, and the embedded facts and rationale misleading.

As a community, we have prepared to counter the Navy's analysis and offer sound alternative solutions that will save millions of dollars to the taxpayer while enhancing mission performance.

I have asked Bill Lewis, retired former commander of this NASVAC Southern Division to brief you on our conclusions. His testimony will follow mine.

Finally, the SPAWAR System Center

Charleston or SPAWAR. While we do not take specific exceptions to the direct impact on SPAWAR Charleston, we have serious concerns about the inappropriate relocation of Maritime Information Systems from Virginia and Rhode Island to San Diego in lieu of more cost effective and better realignment of work for relocation to SPAWAR Charleston.

We do not understand why a Charleston scenario was overlooked and not run by DoD and the Navy.

I have asked Jim Hoffman, retired former commander of SPAWAR Charleston to brief you on a scenario that should have been further explored in developing the BRAC recommendations in the interest of military value and savings to the American taxpayer.

In closing I thank you for giving us the opportunity to present our findings, and I trust that you will take our in-depth analysis and viable proposals into consideration.

One thing we learned from 2003 BRAC, it's like Sergeant Joe Friday on Dragnet, all you want is the facts. And we are going to give you the facts. And with that I will turn it over to Bill

Lewis.

(Applause.)

CAPTAIN LEWIS: Commissioners, thank you for the opportunity to testify today about an outstanding command, NASVAC Southern Division in Charleston. My name is Bill Lewis, and I was privileged to serve as the Commander of Southern Division from 1998 to 2000. I'm currently today Executive Director of Capital Improvements in the Charleston County School District.

While I have no current role in NASVAC Southern Division, my tenure as a former commander gives you an in-depth yet arm's length perspective to raise important issues for the consideration of the Commission. I come to you today because I believe the BRAC recommendations to close NASVAC Southern Division in Charleston was improperly analyzed, will be very costly, counter to the objective to BRAC, and would ultimately serve to undermine NASVAC's ability to serve the Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force and Department of Defense agencies in the central 26 states.

Let me begin by briefly summarizing the main points I'll provide today as to why we believe the BRAC analysis is wrong: One, cost-effective

solutions in Charleston were not considered in the BRAC analysis, even though an additional savings of \$49 million is available through the exercise of an option now possible because of BRAC actions.

Two, the geographic dispersion of commands that NAVFAC Southern Division support is unique, the engineering workload in the central 26 states is highly disaggregate. There is no location in the area of responsibility where there is a major workload concentration. This is unlike the other locations where NASVAC is established; echelon four facility engineer commands to better support the regional commanders and the bases in the fleet concentration areas.

And often overlooked is the fact that the Naval Facilities Engineering Command is a Department of Defense construction agent. Its mission is not only to support the Navy but the Marine Corps, the Air Force and the Department of Defense's clients in its area of responsibilities.

Point three, the BRAC cost analysis of NASVAC Southern Division is overshadowed by the magnitude of savings generated by NASVAC closing two of its commands in Philadelphia, the Engineering Field Activity Northeast and the Navy training

center. The BRAC cost analysis should have been done separately for Charleston and Philadelphia and not done together to drive NASVAC predecisional realignment.

Point four, personal savings claimed in the BRAC scenario are not BRAC savings. They are savings that are already being realized in the NASVAC transformation, through the alignment and consolidation of management positions in Jacksonville and Great Lake and are not dependent upon personnel relocation from Southern Division.

Point five, the military value component of BRAC's analysis is heavily weighted by collocation. I ask you, how can 35 percent of the military value of a command be attributed to the location of a command in today's highly network centered Nation?

The assumption that collocation has a greater importance to a command military value than effective and efficient mission accomplishment is just wrong.

This is counter to Southern Division's historical ability to delight it's clients by successfully executing their workload and Southern Division's recent experience providing outstanding

response to Pensacola after Hurricane Ivan.

This flawed logic, taken to its illogical conclusion, would lead you to believe that a nuclear aircraft carrier's military value would be greater tied to appear than forward deployed with a battle group. That is nonsense.

It is in the Department of Defense's best interest for NASVAC's Southern Division's workforce to remain in Charleston. This command can now be moved into a dollar a year antiterrorist force protection compliant facility that will become available through the recommended BRAC closure of DFAS Charleston.

This approach saves money and enhances performance excellence. Compared with the BRAC recommendations that are costly and debilitating, to fragmentation in its command at Jacksonville, Great Lakes and Norfolk. And, unfortunately, the BRAC analyst did not study this option in any other scenarios, and this option is clearly superior to the BRAC recommendation to close NASVAC Southern Division.

Commissioner Hill, and members of the BRAC staff have already seen the DFAS facility and actually have toured the building on their most

recent visit to Charleston.

Cost effective scenarios, continued presence in Charleston were also not considered in the BRAC process, despite the opportunity to save more than \$49 million over the next 20 years.

Cost savings claimed in the BRAC analysis, again, are dominated by efficiencies already underway in the NAVFAC transformation process. These transformation savings are realized with NASVAC Southern Division remaining in Charleston, and should have never been included in the BRAC recommendation analysis.

In addition, the analysis is highly skewed by the closure of the NAVFAC activities in Philadelphia.

When integrated with the parallel BRAC recommendation to close DFAS Charleston, substantial savings are available to Department of Defense by keeping NAVFAC's engineering capability intact to serve the central 26 states located in Charleston by simply moving Southern Division from its leased GSA facility to DFAS facilities now becoming available for alternative government use.

Southern Division's engineering and construction workload is very disbursed over a

26-state area with a very varied portfolio of products and services. Support to Naval Region Southeast in Jacksonville is not a significant part of Southern Division's overall engineering workload. And the workload to support Naval Region Midwest will decrease dramatically with the completion of the recapitalization efforts for the Navy's Recruit Training Command at Great Lakes.

This is a significantly different reality to these other concentration areas where NAVFAC has created a loan for facility engineering commands. Southern Division has established the engineering capabilities and the corporate culture that gives it a unique ability to morph as the workload changes and responds effectively to the shifting missions to serve its clients with documented performance that has been rated through the use of matrix that measure its effectiveness and efficiency as NAVFAC's top performer.

This slide shows that the greater Jacksonville area represents less than 15 percent of NAVFAC's Southern Division's mission. And see how diversified the workload is in this 26-state area.

Again, the Great Lakes workload will drop off dramatically with the completion of RTC in

2000.

The BRAC recommendation to close Southern Division and relocate the engineering and acquisition professionals to the Facility Engineering Command that have been recently Commissioned in Jacksonville and Great Lakes will disaggregate the workload and fragment the work force.

This will result in two less capable and two less flexible commands that will undercut the current mission capability with little or no improvement to the support of the regional commanders.

This proposal is counter to the management initiatives that large private sector architect engineer firms and engineering construction firms have taken to improve their effectiveness and ability to compete in a highly competitive marketplace.

These firms have gone through a number of mergers and acquisitions to aggregate workload, build technical competency, decrease overhead and exploit technology to better serve their clients.

This BRAC proposal would never have made it out of a corporate boardroom. The cost savings

used to justify the closure of NASVAC Southern Division is flawed. The analysis includes personnel saving that are not BRAC related. The decision to save 62 full-time civilian positions is already underway and driven by transportation. This is a good move, but don't be faked by this analysis. It is not BRAC savings and should not be used by the analyst to close Southern Division through a BRAC action.

In fact, the relocation of the main body of NAVFAC Southern Division to Jacksonville has no recurring annual savings. When compared to keeping the main body in Charleston, the southeast consolidation in Jacksonville is a negative \$49 million investment in constant 2005 dollars.

In Charleston, we say: "That dog won't hunt."

In conclusion --

(Applause.)

CAPTAIN LEWIS: That conclusion is based on the anomalies in the DoD analysis. One, cost avoidance of current annual leased space can be achieved in Charleston through the use of several options. Most notably, a parallel BRAC action. The proposed closure of DFAS is now a viable option that

was not considered. Ideally sized facilities will be available for NAVFAC with minimal renovations and at a dollar a year lease cost, that is the same that NASVAC has for Southwest San Diego, except what the Southwest did, is not ATF compliant.

The relocation of these spaces can be achieved years earlier than the relocation to Jacksonville and Great Lakes, reducing the total leased cost savings in Charleston for leased space alone are estimated over \$20 million over 20 years.

Point two, reassignment of personnel to Jacksonville, Great Lakes and Norfolk would be expensive, both in terms of relocation costs for those that transfer from Charleston and the recruitment and training costs for those who chose to decline the transfer.

Loss of intellectual capital will be substantial. And the one-time cost is estimated at \$40 million.

Point three, Cost savings for the transformation can be applied in the analysis of all locations.

Again, let me stress that these savings are not the result of BRAC. In fact, operational effectiveness and efficiency to serve the commands

in the central 26 states is higher with NAVFAC Southern Division engineering and acquisitions, professionals remaining in intact rather than fragmenting this expertise in three separate locations.

A strong centralized engineering and acquisition workforce is the optimal configuration for a disbursed and changing workload in its area of responsibility.

The premise of the BRAC proposal is that the NAVFAC can better serve the commands in the central 26 states with the engineering and acquisition workforce collocated with the Regional Commanders is incorrect.

Chasing the flag comes with a \$49 million price tag. It's not cost effective for the taxpayers to pay a high cost to relocate these professionals to be collocated with region commands, and there is minimal benefit to collocating engineering and acquisition personnel to three separate locations to serve two regional commanders in the central 26 states.

This is in stark contrast to Norfolk and San Diego, where the local base support workload within a 100-mile radius is one-half -- at least

one-half of their portfolio.

To paraphrase the great American philosopher of common sense, Henry David Thorough: "Unthoughtful conformity is the hobgoblin of this fact realignment."

There is no productivity enhancement gained by breaking up Southern Division and locating at Jacksonville or Great Lakes because of -- because of the disbursed workload. But the DoD analysis gave military value to installations collocated with the region. The real synergy gained in Admiral Loose's NAVFAC transformation creating geographic Facility Engineering Command, to support regional commanders is the alignment of areas responsibility and the tailoring of on-site workforce to support specific installations in these fleet concentration areas.

The current NAVFAC plan for supporting the Navy addresses the facilitating personnel that are already in place in public works, in the field construction offices at all Navy installations.

Again, that transformation is underway.

In fact, dividing the engineering and acquisition workforce into three elements abounds substantial benefits of mission stability and

destroys the technical reach-back capability.

Today, NAVFAC Southern Division is a powerful reach-back engine that supports its local offices, that delivers work at the local installation level, providing two major benefits.

First, it eliminates the duplication of specialized expertise and decreases overhead.

Today, centralized technical resources are available to project managers whose projects are disbursed over a large area. Fragmenting the workforce will create a need to depreciate some of the specialty expertise and growing overhead.

Secondly, the larger geographic region allows the benefits of load level. You can see how the load changes over time.

Smaller geographic regions would expose the facility engineering commands in the Southeast and Midwest to large swings in the workloads at any point in time. This is highly inefficient and very difficult to maintain technical core. The vast majority of the engineering and acquisition work is delivered to installations across the Southeast and Midwest separating the long distances from the regional commanders in Jacksonville and Great Lakes.

The support provided for those

installations from Charleston has been excellent.

Service excellence has been driven by the optimization of Southern Division's reach-back capability, not the proximity to the regional commander.

As with the March operations assessment of four of NAVFAC engineering divisions, NAVFAC's Southern Division was ranked the most effective in 11 of 19 performance matrix.

Over the years, workload has spiked at various locations within Southern Division's geography. Southern Division has distinguished itself building the Trident Submarine King's Bay, the Naval Air Training Command in Pensacola, Nuclear Power Training Command in Charleston, BUPERS Headquarters in Millington, and now the Recruiting Training Command in Great Lakes. That work has been accomplished, and in an exceptional manner.

Another more recent example of operational excellence is NAVFAC Southern Division's overnight response support to the recovery of hurricane ravaged Pensacola.

The Southern Division team awarding \$47 million worth of emergency repairs and had 1,650 contractor personnel mobilized and on the ground

within 17 days.

They had the air field operational within ten days, completed \$37 million worth of repairs of the Chevalier Hall within 89 days, and are on track to complete \$600 million worth of repairs in the short two-year timeframe.

A smaller organization could not do this.

A particular concern I have is that if this BRAC recommendation stands, it is probable that over 50 percent of NAVFAC Southern Division professional engineering and acquisition staff will not relocate to Jacksonville, Norfolk and Great Lakes.

The quality of life in Charleston is very high. The economy is robust and many career NAVFAC professionals will choose to remain in Charleston instead of moving. The headhunters are already circling Eagle Drive.

Aside from the cost of retirement and relocation, the NAVFAC professionals who do not move will have to be replaced. And their replacements will have to be trained. It will be years before NAVFAC rebuilds the mission, knowledge and technical expertise that might be lost if Southern Division

closes.

When NAVFAC moved Headquarters of Engineers Field Divisions on the West Coast from San Diego to -- excuse me, from San Francisco to San Diego, decisionmakers made a grave mistake. That hub assumed the civilian workforce would move. But the vast majority of them did not, and it took NAVFAC over eight years to recruit and train the personnel it needed at this new command before it became fully mission capable.

The BRAC recommendation, if it makes the same incorrect assumption, it would have the same negative impact on missions accomplished.

On February 9, 2005, the Federal Times reported that the Department of Defense is seeking to hire more than 14,000 scientists and engineers.

Through the increased departure from baby boomers and lower participation in technical programs at the University, we must assure that any significant loss in technical capability is only incurred where there is a clear and measurable benefit in military value.

Let me now present you with three alternative options, each will provide the Department of Defense with a greater cost savings in

the current BRAC recommendation.

The first recommendation is to move to the DFAS building, an attractive option in Charleston which, again, was omitted in the analysis. With the recommended closing DFAS in Charleston, excellent facilities are available for NAVFAC. The facility has 78,000 square foot of space available to support the entire technical staff and their specialized engineering needs.

While this facility is not on federal property, the government holding the 50-year lease at \$1 per year on the facility, that is assignable to any other Federal entity.

There are 46 years remaining on the base lease with an option available for another 50.

The City of North Charleston owns the facility and has agreed that should DFAS decision be upheld, the lease could be transferred to NAVFAC.

This alternative will allow for the closure of current expensive leased space occupied by NAVFAC, again saving \$20 million and avoiding capital costs of \$14 million for new facilities that must be built in Jacksonville.

This presents a very attractive alternative to construction of new engineering

facilities, since the facility assumed to house NAVFAC expansion in Jacksonville, Great Lakes and Norfolk, do not exist.

Additionally, the DFAS building is already antiterrorist force protected compliant; however, we have developed a plan to improve the protection of the building, estimated at approximately \$150,000, which is included in our cost analysis. Converting the space to a suitable engineering activity is estimated at just over \$1 million, including a sophisticated communications systems.

An alternative to the DFAS option is a proposal to build a new engineering center on the Naval Weapons Station that was presented to the Secretary of the Navy by the community on December 9, 2004.

The Berkeley, Charleston, Dorchester County governments had made an unsolicited proposal to build offices on government land for NAVFAC Southern Division, under lease-back arrangements with the Navy. While the Navy could not consider that proposal as a part of the BRAC recommendation, it remains a viable option.

The 20-year lease cost for the facility

are stated at \$14 million, and this option represents a \$38 million savings over the recommended BRAC scenario.

A third option not considered is for NAVFAC to remain in its current location. Even this as a scenario would provide a cost saving of over \$37 million over the BRAC recommendation.

The BRAC recommendation proposes spending \$57 million to save \$49 million.

That makes no sense. The options to remain in Charleston require the Department of Defense to spend far less.

I have highlighted the transformational costs saving again, since these have nothing to do with BRAC, the saving are the same. They are already occurring, and this is BRAC funny money in the analysis. The preferred option to keep NAVFAC Southern Division intact and move it to DFAS facility spans \$49 million less.

In conclusion, we encourage you to consider each of these scenarios, and to examine carefully the cost of each compared to the actual cost of relocating NAVFAC to Jacksonville, Great Lakes and Norfolk.

In our analysis, the BRAC recommendation

makes absolutely no sense. We are certain that if you look at these options, you will agree. The best option for the Department of Defense, the Navy, the Command that NAVFAC Southern Division serves, is to keep the engineering and acquisition workforce intact here in Charleston.

Admiral Vern Clark, Chief of Naval Operations says it best: "I'm not interested in proposal that does not produce money."

Gentlemen, neither do we. Thank you for your time. And it's my pleasure to introduce Jim Hoffman.

(Applause.)

MR. HOFFMAN: Gentlemen, thank you for the opportunity to testify today about the SPAWAR Installation in Charleston.

My name is Jim Hoffman, and I served as Commanding Officer of SPAWAR System Center Charleston from July, 1998 to October, 2000.

I currently work for Evan McAllister Associates, Incorporated.

SPAWAR has approximately 1,400 employees housed in over 1.1 million square feet of state-of-the-art facilities on the Charleston Naval Weapons Station.

The decision during the 1993 BRAC was to consolidate a number of facilities in Charleston and elsewhere on the East Coast into the SPAWAR Systems Center Charleston.

I am here today because we believe that the BRAC recommendation to relocate Maritime Information Systems work from Dahlgren, Virginia, and Newport, Rhode Island, to SPAWAR System Center should be to Charleston -- not San Diego.

We believe the present DoD analysis is flawed. Under the proposed action, 111 civilians at Dahlgren are slated to move to San Diego; 112 more are slated to move from Newport to San Diego. Additionally, an estimated 50 contractors are slated to move over the same timeframe from these locations.

By relocating this function to Charleston, instead of San Diego, DoD could realize a savings of approximately \$29 million over the 20-year timeframe, as compared to moving these individuals to San Diego.

The higher anticipated retention of relocated employees will result in an additional \$1 million in savings.

Transferring this work SPAWAR System

Center Charleston, in lieu of San Diego would save an additional \$30 million over 20 years, and would retain all of the consolidation benefits in SPAWAR site consolidation, and would take advantage of the enormous synergy between the transferred scope and the work already assigned to SPAWAR Charleston.

SPAWAR Charleston has demonstrated success of BRAC '93, when over \$60 million was invested to build a modern C4ISR facility on the East Coast.

This approach not only saves money, it integrates the Maritime Information System with ongoing SPAWAR Charleston activity. And C4ISR in combat systems, submarine information systems, platform integration and joint and interdepartmental programs.

There is substantial cost benefits to the assignment of the Maritime Information Systems work to SPAWAR Charleston:

First, Charleston labor rates are five percent lower than the San Diego area, according to the standard published locality pay differentials. And Charleston is 30 percent less expensive than San Diego for the contractor workforce.

In terms of work execution, SPAWAR

Charleston is the most efficient of all the Navy engineering, warfare commands.

Third, movement of personnel along the East Coast from Dahlgren and Newport to Charleston is much more likely to preserve intellectual capital by offering a cost-effective relocation, as compared to San Diego, whose cost of housing is 65 percent greater than Charleston's.

Experience in previous BRACs showed that few key personnel will elect to make cross-Country moves.

Moving to Charleston has greater potential to preserve intellectual capital.

SPAWAR Charleston's current missions are highly synergistic with the work being relocated from Dahlgren and Newport.

Specifically, the Maritime Information System scope fits well with SPAWAR Charleston's work in C4ISR and combat systems, submarine systems, platform integration activities, and other joint and interdepartmental programs.

Relocation of this work to Charleston supports the reduction in the number of technical facilities engaged in Maritime sensors, electronic Warfare and Information Systems from 12 to five.

Cost saving for that consolidation would apply to relocation to either San Diego or to Charleston.

Movement of personnel along the East Coast from Dahlgren and Newport to Charleston is much more likely to preserve intellectual capital by offering cost-effective relocation, as compared to San Diego; where an average 2,400-square-foot home costing \$597,000 in San Diego -versus- \$229,000 in Charleston, personnel are much more likely to move to Charleston than San Diego.

Thus, preserving highly-trained personnel on important military programs and saving money.

Our cost analysis does not consider savings achieved through SPAWAR Charleston's more efficient cost structure as documented in the Secretary of the Navy study conducted by Bruce Allen.

The study illustrated that SPAWAR Charleston is the most efficient of all the Navy engineering and warfare commands.

In C4ISR, in combat systems mission, SPAWAR Charleston is a major provider of system for Navy applications. It has long been a desire to

have a closer coupling between C4ISR from development and operational standpoint.

In fact, FORSNET objectives can be more readily achieved through this closer coupling. SPAWAR Charleston is the developer and implementer of the FORSNET integrated baseline, and was the focus of the Navy's 2003 Strategic Studies Group: FORSNET Engagement Pack Concept. SPAWAR Charleston is also the leading DoD activity, providing engineering, acquisition and life-cycle support for shipboard interior communications.

Charleston's facilities combine interior communications system engineering capabilities, with shipboard network, laboratories to provide integrated data, and voice interoperabilities solutions afloat that are used extensively in relaying information between C4ISR and combat systems.

SPAWAR Charleston is the only DoD activity providing engineering life-cycle support and program management for shipboard wireless communication systems used for damage control, flight-deck communications, at-sea replenishment, security force protection, small boat ops, weapons handling and interfacing with telephone systems.

SPAWAR Charleston has been recognized by the Office of the Secretary of Defense as a leading organization for global information grid band with expansion, or GIB BE, engineering and test evaluation described as years ahead of anyone else.

GIB BE is DoD's transportation backbone necessary for transferring information between sensors, shooters and command control nodes.

Movement of Dahlgren's Information Systems work to SPAWAR Charleston provides many synergistic benefits in achieving the Navy's FORSNET concept. And in a larger picture, DoD's transformational goals.

SPAWAR Charleston is the technical agent for many submarine Information Systems programs, including common submarine radio room, BO up submarine communications, submarine single messaging solutions and the submarine mobile training team.

SPAWAR Charleston is also the only DoD facility supporting essential and critical projects for this strategic systems program office, including submarine navigation, fire control, launcher and other components and systems.

SPAWAR Charleston fabricates, integrates tests and provides life-cycle support for the common

submarine radio room, replacement for the Trident integrated radio room, which is the predominant piece of the IST DNA work at Newport.

SPAWAR Charleston's 90,000-square-foot facility contains cable manufacturing, preintegration, integration and rack refurbishment capability and unencroached communications connectivity, all necessary for common submarine radio room integration and testing activities.

Platform integration activity also offer substantial synergy. SPAWAR Charleston has the mission to design, develop, build, integrate, install and support radio communication suites, ship signal exploration spaces and common submarine radio room systems for new ship construction and retrofit programs.

Newport submarine radio room integration room fits well into SPAWAR Charleston, using proven techniques and procedures for rapid platform integration and testing.

Joint and interdepartmental programs are significant areas of focus for SPAWAR Charleston. Out of a total obligation of authority of \$2.4 billion in 2004, 47 percent of SPAWAR Charleston's work efforts were for other joint service and other

federal agency customers. Many of the systems that are developed and fielded at SPAWAR Charleston are born joint, because of heavy leveraging of technologies, capabilities and subsystems across programs for multiple customers.

SPAWAR Charleston is a Navy working capital fund activity operating much like a business, though not earning a profit.

This business model, based on maximum reutilization of previous work, harvesting of technology and passing savings on to the customer, has led to a better than three-fold increase in total obligational authority since BRAC 1993.

This greatly increased workload has occurred because customers want to bring their work to SPAWAR Systems Center Charleston, and not because they have to.

By moving this workload from Dahlgren and Newport to Charleston, even greater opportunities exist for leveraging, reutilization and economies of scales future systems are developed with jointness of mind.

SPAWAR Charleston -- one of the five activities planned to perform maritime C4ISR into the future, focuses on information system

development and acquisition as a primary mission.

The predominance of the work performed at Newport and Dahlgren targeted by this action is in the Information Systems development and acquisition area like Charleston.

SPAWAR Charleston was ranked number four in military value out of 105 activities performing IST DNA efforts. This activity was also ranked as the most efficient of all Navy warfare engineering centers by the Secretary of the Navy's efficiency study.

SPAWAR Charleston is not just a Navy lab, but is a significant national asset, as confirmed in the e-mail sent by Mr. Spankey Wells after a visit to SPAWAR Charleston -- quoting part of the paragraph that is shown here: "They are not just a Navy lab, but could form the basis for a joint warfighting engineering facility."

In summary, Charleston is not only leading in cost and efficiency, but also in implementation of joint information technology systems.

Charleston is a better location than San Diego because of the strong synergy already in place, and the major opportunities for increasing

these joint system developments that Charleston offers.

The cost savings and efficiencies of relocating these jobs to Charleston -versus- San Diego was not a scenario that was considered by DoD prior to its BRAC recommendation.

We encourage the Commission to look at this alternative scenario as a viable option.

It's now my pleasure to introduce the Hon. Joseph P. Riley, Mayor of Charleston, to conclude our testimony today.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Could we ask you a couple of questions, before you get away -- before the Mayor summarizes?

MR. HOFFMAN: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER GEHMAN: I have a couple of questions: First of all, thank you both for an extraordinarily-well-put-together presentation; it was very nicely done -- well done.

And I know I'm telling you something that you already know, but the Commission, on a regular basis, does run alternative scenarios. That is within our power, and we do that.

So I need to ask if you and your staffs are available to help our analytical staff if we

decide to take up some of these issues -- that we will need your assistance.

For example, one of the things that we have to deal with is, the statute requires that we could only deal with certified data.

Now, you had a lot of view graphs with \$30 million of this and \$40 million of that, which I find to be very compelling.

But when we do our scenarios, we got to use certified data. Your numbers might be the right ones, and might not be the right ones; but we would have to have your help, if we are going to pursue these things. So I'm asking you for that help.

Case in point, for example, I'll just bring up this one issue, and then I will rest my case.

I assume I have your support if we want to run alternative scenarios.

MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, sir; please.

COMMISSIONER GEHMAN: For example, SPAWAR Charleston, in your last slide, outranked all others -- all other labs -- in military value and cost efficiency. I assume this could be documented.

MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER GEHMAN: Thank you very

much. That would be helpful. My question was:
Will you assist us in this effort?

MR. HOFFMAN: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Following up on
Admiral Gehman's comments, it's my understanding
that your suggestion is that NAVFAC -- we keep the
NAVFAC as it is, rather than consolidating it.

As I understand it, this is basically a
consolidation of NAVFAC; you're not suggesting that
-- my question to you is: You have not recommended,
if, in fact, there is no construction costs here, at
least under the DFAS proposal, and there is -- under
the recommendations, there is a 14 -- something like
that -- million dollar expenditure at Pensacola, why
don't you -- and didn't you talk about the option
other than it may be unseemly, but it wasn't too
unseemly when you talked about San Diego.

But -- so I don't think it is. I think
it's a legitimate option to put on the table. If it
is an option, I would like to hear your thoughts on
it.

MR. LEWIS: Sir, if the BRAC
recommendation was to keep workforce, but move as
one force to a location, I understand that scenario.

But the real flaw is, it takes a robust,

technical engine, and breaks it into two little Briggs and Strattons that are far less capable.

What it's taking is the 462 men and women of the Southern Division, moving 60 to Norfolk -- and I don't remember the exact numbers -- but 89 to Great Lakes, and the lower number down to Jacksonville. It doesn't purpose to keep the whole together. It is not the replication of moving the Western Division that was located in San Francisco, as a complete engine, down to San Diego.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: I understand. But if you believe that some count -- you know, I visited the Great Lakes facility there, they also have a lot of facility, but they are not as close to the customer as you were.

So, if, in fact, your argument that you should be close to the customer, and, by the way, it doesn't -- it seems to me that a lot of the customers are up and down the Coast on both sides; and so, therefore, as I count them, we have got four NAVFAC -- if you count the one in Washington, the one in Norfolk, the one in Charleston, and the one in Pensacola -- Jacksonville, I'm sorry -- we have four.

MR. LEWIS: The way we have gotten close

to the client is the key part of the transportation.

Every single Naval installation has a public works organization. And part of the NAVFAC, which is called the Resident Officer in Charge of Construction, those have been put together at the location. Those are forward fully deployed.

In '98, we connected electronically to everyone. We have up links on the satellite down to our field offices. We have T-1 data lines. We can do VTC. Our technical engineering in Charleston, with the capabilities that we have put in place, if they need technical consult, the taxpayer doesn't have to write a plane ticket. They can just use the VTC capability.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: And that goes to my point; therefore, under that, I agree with you, technology allows you to do a lot more than -- allows you to consolidate a lot more than you traditionally would be able to do in this Country, both in the private sector, as well as the government.

And you are going to want to have people onsite to touch and feel the customer on a regular basis.

So why wouldn't you -- why doesn't that

argue for fewer facilities rather than more facilities highly wired with technology and having people in the field?

Because, by the way, as I understand it, you have the responsibility here for Great Lakes.

MR. LEWIS: Mr. Commissioner, you are making our point: That is the better efficiency, to do it out of consolidated location. We have achieved that efficiency; it is documented. It is documented not only in mission performance, but in the cost.

The reason why a lot of work, just like SPAWAR work comes to Charleston, is that the cost to do the work is less, and our demonstrated performance mission efficiency has a greater output.

When program managers have a choice of where they send work, presently they have been sending it to Charleston.

In the last round of BRAC, the BRAC program manager sent a tremendous amount of workload to Charleston, because nobody else could get it done. These men and women got it done.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Then I guess we are in agreement. The only thing we disagree on is that I didn't hear from you, an option if, in fact,

consolidation might make sense, or efficiency, why you wouldn't bring Norfolk down here, Washington down here.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Or Jacksonville up here.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: I don't want to get everybody all excited. I just heard an argument from your compatriot here. And I know it's a little different argument. If you're a center of excellence, and you believe you're a center of excellence for NAVFAC, then I would at least like to see some certified data on -- if we bought the concept, that we can have fewer, you know, commands and going from 23 to 16, we can take it down even further, then you ought to at least be in place and have an option for us to look at -- that was my only thought.

MR. LEWIS: I have had an experience to work as a subordinate for a Norfolk organization. Their focus is operational. The one star, or two star there supported the four star in Europe, supporting the four-star operation in Norfolk, and that marvelous organization is predominantly focused

-- what has been distinguished is that it has been able to focus on the Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force missions in the central 26 states, and has not been pulled back and forth on the operational tugs as the two other engines have.

And that's significant. So we are not trying to say, with any case, and I appreciate you asking that question, because when I was a wisenheimer young captain, I said that once when my Admiral suggested that we close and subsume into Norfolk, I said that I thought that the better bang for the buck was for Norfolk to close, and we would subsume them, but I chose not to do that in public. And I choose not to do it here. Because I know the -- I know the mission difference.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: I throw in those two just for a little discussion, I'm really looking at your work is being disbursed, and one that is right down the road, so to speak, is at Jacksonville. And I just wondered if you looked at the alternative of the cost of Jacksonville -versus- here, in the Southeast being consolidated on a combined mission.

MR. MIKOLAJCIK: I have been previously sworn in. I'm a technical person here. There is no

NAVFAC presently in Jacksonville. So there is really no consolidation to bring from Jacksonville to Charleston.

I think that might have been a misconception from our slide, as a public works facility there and Regional Commander who was only a customer. I hope that clears it up.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER GEHMAN: For both of you, you both are capital working funded organizations, right?

MR. LEWIS: NAVFAC is not. It operates under what is called SIO, which is, that we do not get funds directly. We get six percent off of the workload we execute.

COMMISSIONER GEHMAN: Other peoples' money; your capital working money.

MR. LEWIS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER GEHMAN: In other words, for the uninitiated -- these are like enterprises, they have to go out and get business. And if they get business, they get \$2 billion worth of business; they do well.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you.

General, you have one more comment?

MR. MILKOLAJCIK: One more for Admiral Gehman, the Bruce Allen study that the Secretary of the Navy had, is a huge document that we provided a portion of that to you. We also ask the whole document -- but the Secretary couldn't have done a better job in answering our question and with the most efficiency.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER HILL: Did anybody from the joint services working group ever visit Charleston to look at these facilities? No? Did anybody from the Navy come and look at those facilities as part of the BRAC process that they built for recommendations?

MR. MILKOLAJCIK: We have had a lot of people that have come to visit the facilities, as we have gone through this process over the last four years; none specific to look at the BRAC recommendations.

But a major point, also, that I think has been made is that the recommendations that we are proposing were never run by DoD. Why?

COMMISSIONER COYLE: We understand.
Thank you very much.

Mayor Riley, we finally get to you.

MAYOR RILEY: Commissioners, I am Joe Riley, the Mayor of Charleston. I thank you for allowing us to be present today. And I thank you for your patience and your service to our Country.

I will draw our portion to a close by summarizing the reasons we believe we have presented justification needed for you to question the validity of DoD's recommendations to relocate NAVFAC Southern Division, as well as enough data to run an alternative scenario of moving the information technology positions from Dahlgren, Virginia, and Newport, Rhode Island, to San Diego.

As many before we have stated today, our community understands BRAC from the first-hand experience a decade ago.

Yes, Charleston is recovering. But it was very difficult. Today, our economy is diverse and stronger because of BRAC. BRAC not only took away jobs, but BRAC also brought jobs to our community.

And the outcome of the decision to close the Charleston Naval Base and Shipyard in 1993 was a decision by BRAC. It was not a DoD recommendation. I was seated on the front row when a member of the BRAC Commission made the motion to consolidate

several facilities along the East Coast to Charleston. It is now SPAWAR. SPAWAR Charleston, as you have heard, is the most efficient, cost-effective such facility in the United States Navy today. It has helped transform our economy by providing highly-skilled and highly-technical jobs to Charleston. The impact, therefore, to our community is great. But more important, to the Department of Defense, it's a -- SPAWAR is one of the most capable C4ISR activities in the entire United States government.

It is located, as you see, in a technically advanced, state-of-the-art facility with room for expansion. And most important, SPAWAR Charleston is known for its ability to harvest technology quickly and efficiently and get that technology to the warfighter as soon as possible.

Does it make any sense to move talent and technology to a higher cost area when the synergy already exists in Charleston? We think not. And ask you to take a fresh look at the option that is presented this afternoon.

Second, the decision to relocate NAVFAC Southern Division from Charleston to Jacksonville is not just a substantial deviation from the BRAC

criteria, it is a total deviation.

In today's operating environment where the world of work is virtual in scope, how can a decision that facilities need to be collocated with the Headquarters, and near where the fleet is located make any sense whatsoever, when it looks and sees where the work is done. It is, in fact, performed in 26 states, one-half of our Country.

NAVFAC has a set of methods, which track the performance of all of its engineering commands monthly, not just the Southern Division. So why would DoD not look at NASVAC's own set of performance matrix when evaluating the military value of each facility.

Instead, they made up another set of measures of military value, a set of measures that ranks the facility as having a higher military value when it is located with its regional Headquarters without any regard to its mission, and that makes no sense whatsoever.

We hope your staff has had a chance to review the NAVFAC matrix since your earlier visit to Charleston.

America's large private sector -- the engineer procurement and construction firms

comparable to NAVFAC: Bechtel; Parsons; Kellogg
Drew Brown; Fluor Daniel, and others have large,
central engineering and technical staffs to serve
their clients. They forward deploy, limited liaison
personnel to their customers' locations, but do not
break up or realign their engineering talent to
relocate to the geographic location of their
clients. It would be too expensive. It wouldn't
allow them to build the competent cadre to be
competitive, and their competition would eat their
lunch, if they tried to do something like that.
They do not move their reach-back engine to chase
the corporate headquarters; or, in this case, to
chase the flag.

Does the Navy or the Department of
Defense have some new engineering management
philosophy, some new breakthrough that the CEOs of
America's largest engineering firms have not yet
discovered?

(Applause.)

MAYOR RILEY: Why did DoD combine the
Philadelphia and Charleston facilities for cost
savings estimates? When you remove Philadelphia,
the recommendation to close Charleston cost the
Department of Defense \$57 million. Staying in their

current-leased facility as you see, saves DoD more money than relocating to Jacksonville ,and preserves the valuable intellectual capital of the Navy's most productive engineering facilities command.

And very briefly on intellectual capital:

Those 497 people are extraordinary in what they do. They can't move, many of them can't move. They are civilians. Their roots are too deep. They are looking after elderly parents and raising young children, and they are connected with their church and synagogues and in their neighbors. So many can't -- they can't move. They will take lesser jobs, but they can't move. So the Navy throws away this valuable intellectual capital away. No private company will even think of doing that in the competition for engineers and architects and environmental engineers. As great as America is, the Department of Defense needs to keep everyone that it has, not frittering them away in the name of chasing the flag.

(Applause.)

MAYOR RILEY: These facts alone should cause you to question the validity of the analysis, as we do. But combine that with the option to

locate in a protected DoD facility, the one dollar a year, and I'm sure you will ask these additional scenarios to be examined.

In closing, I would like to remind you that Charleston is a military town. Today, we have over 27,000 active duty Reserve, National Guard and civilians employed in our community.

Why does the military continue to expand in Charleston? Because Charleston -- Charleston Navy, Charleston Department of Defense has been transformed. It is now a 21st Century joint transportation logistics, engineer and training complex; one that leads the way and is a part of DoD's transformation and is well positioned to expand even further.

We are also a community that embraces the military, more passion, I think, than anywhere. I have seen it, been there all my life. I'm a graduate of the Citadel, the patriotism, the love of the men and women who serve our Country, and we have embraced them. These people are leaders in our Boys and Girl Scouts, they are little league coaches, they are Sunday School teachers. And as such, they are the fabric of our community, and have been so for a century.

As a community, we are extremely proud of the significant contributions that all of our local military commands and forces have made and continue to make in the war in the fight on global terrorism and in our Nation's defense.

Charleston is a true model, a national model of joint use and a strategic transportation hub.

We thank you so much for your time. We thank you for your generous service to our Country. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you, gentlemen. I don't think we have any other questions. We will go directly into West Virginia. Thank you very much.

We are glad you are here. Since you're mostly standing, we would ask if you would stand for the oath that is required by the BRAC statute.

GENERAL COUNSEL HAGUE: Do you swear that the testimony you are about to give, and any evidence you might present, will be complete and accurate to the best of your knowledge and belief, so help you God?

ANSWER: I do.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Governor, I think you are starting off for the delegation. And, again, I want to say we appreciate you all being here. You have had to travel the farthest of anyone for this Regional Hearing, so we thank you very much for joining us.

GOVERNOR MANCHIN: Thank you so much. We would like all of you to know we are pleased to join the members of our Congressional delegation, and many others who have traveled from West Virginia to be here today, as they are coming in now.

As Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the great State of West Virginia, I appreciate the BRAC Commission giving us the opportunity to explain, face to face, why it is so important that the 130th Airlift Wing, and all its assets, be kept intact.

First, let me state for the record, that it does concern me that judicial employees formed on location and concurrent with all the other states that are affected.

I have the responsibility, the authority and the duty, to ensure the safety of all West Virginians. And from a governor's perspective, the fact is that we are not safe from natural disasters.

The 130th Airlift Wing is one of our most vital assets, whether it is fighting forest fires or devastating floods or a hazardous chemical leak, the citizens of West Virginia rely on the 130th for their protection and for their rescue.

In addition, from our economic standpoint, according to the Senate for Business and Economic Research at Marshall University in Huntington, the realignment of the 130th Airlift Wing will remove 814 total jobs and \$22 million in annual spending from our State's economy.

While our State has been working hard with regard to growing and diversifying our economy and getting our financial house in order, this would be a loss that our State could ill afford at this time.

And most importantly, from a national defense perspective, as you know, we now have extra worries living in a post 911 world. In what is now a constant threat of more terrorists attacks, West Virginia's National Guard, a location puts her residents and her neighbors at grave risk. In fact, Chief National Guard Bureau's Lieutenant General Stephen Blum has included West Virginia in all National Guard Homeland Defense Planning, naming

West Virginia as the East Coast site for National Homeland Defense Training Center, due specifically to its proximity and support for the national capital region.

However, while all the above facts are important for you to be aware of, as is the wealth of addition information you will obtain during the remainder of this hearing, there is one point that I would like to make above all else, West Virginia's consistent contribution to upholding our Country's military and our Nation's principles of democracy.

As one of the most patriotic states in the Nation, West Virginia historically has sent a high number of its men and women into battle when the Country is called.

In fact, our State was born during the Civil War because it was created by Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War. We are the only state to come into being during that period of time. Since that time we have never, ever not answered our Nation's call, not once.

In fact, during the Vietnam War alone, West Virginia lost more soldiers per capita in the line of duty than any other state. The Mountain State and its soldiers have made the ultimate

sacrifice to our nation time and time again without ever uttering a word of dissention.

In my lifetime, I cannot remember a moment when West Virginia did not greet its returning soldiers with appreciation and respect, only then to prepare ourselves to send a new generation off to do their duty, as well, which is why West Virginia has some of the highest recruitment levels, if not the highest, in the country.

The bottom line is that our state has always come together during times of crisis to support our Nation, no matter what the circumstances, just as it has come together today to support the 130th.

If you look around this room and all of us here today, Major General Tackett, we have our entire delegation, Congressional delegation, from our Senior Senator Byrd, Senator Rockefeller, Congressman Mollohan, Congressman Rahall and Congressman Capito.

We have the Mayor of our city, we have the airport representatives. We have people from everyday walk of life in West Virginia. We have all come together, and we are speaking as one voice, the

voice of a state that has given its all for its Country and continues to be ready for action at a moment's notice.

I sincerely believe that after hearing from our State's panel, this Commission will reconsider the findings of the original report and recognize the real and immeasurable value of this installation, the 130th in West Virginia.

I am confident that the facts are definitely on the side of the 130th Airlift Wing and should be allowed to continue its mission.

But most important of all, I am confident that the heart and soul of America is with and on the side of the 130th, as well.

I ask for your kind consideration. We await your decision eagerly, and we think the facts will support that West Virginia has always been there and will continue to be there for this Nation. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Governor, we appreciate your remarks. Thank you very much.

MAJOR RAY: Thank you for hearing us today. I am Major Ray, and I will be giving the presentation. And, of course, the reason we are here today is because the 130th Airlift Wing has

been recommended for realignment to relocate our H-130 Airlift Wing to Fort Bragg, with the only justification provided being that we cannot support more than eight C-130 aircraft.

This information is not correct.

Therefore, this is a basis for the 130th Airlift's Wing to the Commission to reject the realignment recommendation of the Department of Defense, and instead to evaluate the 130th Airlift Wing based on our true military value as a potential receiving location for addition aircraft.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. And I will be moving rather quickly due to time restrictions. If you need me to slow down, please say so.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: We are fine.

MAJOR RAY: Now, military value should be the primary consideration in recommending a unit for realignment. Indeed, the Air Force said they did. As you can see, capacity information is the key quantitative component as a building block throughout the entire BRAC process. Therefore, it is critical to have accurate capacity information for a valid recommendation to the Commission.

Next.

In fact, the Air Force strategy throughout this process was to consolidate its fleet of fewer aircraft into installations that it determined to be high military value. For mobility aircraft, 16 aircraft was the ideal size for a mobility unit; and 12 aircraft was an acceptable size for a Reserve component squadron.

Next.

Now, you see here the Air National Guard capacity information that was provided to the Air Force. And it states the current configuration for a unit is eight C-130 aircraft. But, of course, the future evaluation is based off of a 16-aircraft squadron. And they want to expand while staying within current boundaries of the land currently owned or leased.

Next.

Now, here is the detailed information provided by the Air National Guard to the Air Force. And it shows correctly that we have eight C-130 aircraft assigned. But it shows incorrectly that we only have eight parking spaces and none unused with a land restriction preventing expansion to 16 aircraft.

Next.

The correct information is that we, in fact, can park 12 aircraft and have four unused parking spaces and no land restriction to expanding to 16 aircraft.

Next.

Here you can see a picture of our current parking configuration showing 12 aircraft all located within our existing property boundary and meeting all Air Force requirements for parking aircraft.

Next.

And you can see here that the future information provided by the Air National Guard is also incorrect, stating again that we cannot park more than eight C-130s. Here you can see by obtaining three additional parking spots, all within our existing property boundary and meeting all Air Force requirements, we can base 16 aircraft, and we can do so at a cost of less than \$3 million.

Now, this information is what made it into the Air Force capacity analysis, which was the basis for our realignment recommendation.

Here you can see that we have eight aircraft assigned equaling one-half of an active duty squadron of 16 aircraft.

But the shaded block, what it indicates is that is a partial squadron that cannot be expanded. And this is not correct.

In fact, as I have stated, we can expand to base 16 aircraft at a cost of less than \$3 million.

And over on the theoretical capacity column, it states we have no room for expansion and continue to have only one-half of a squadron in the future.

In fact, we can expand at a cost of up to 24 aircraft at Yeager Air Base, which is one-half, 1.5 active duty size squadron. This is the correct capacity information that should have been in the Air Force analysis.

So, the DoD capacity information at the beginning of the process was not correct. This was the primary basis for the realignment recommendation of the 130th Airlift Wing. The true capacity information is that we can park 12 C-130s today, and we can expand to 16 for a cost of less than \$3 million.

We can do all this while remaining within our existing property boundaries and meet all Air Force requirements for parking aircraft.

Therefore, the 130th Airlift Wing is relevant to the future force structure, and this is the primary basis to the Commission requesting it to overturn and reject the DoD recommendation and instead consider us as a potential receiving location for additional aircraft.

Next.

The primary basis for that should be our military value. And now let's take a look at each of the military value criteria. Now, of course, the Air Force attempted to quantify military value by creating a point system out of 100 points, and a weighted value for each of the four military value criteria.

Here you can see the scores for the 130th Airlift Wing, and also the weighted values for each of the different criteria.

Keep in mind that the 130th Airlift Wing, when compared to other C-130 units, being aircraft, scored higher than several other units in three of those four criteria.

There was one area where we scored particularly low, in criteria number two, and we will take a closer look at that.

Next.

First of all, let's take a look at Criteria No. 1. The current and future mission capability and the impact on joint warfighting, training and readiness.

Now, the 130th Airlift Wing is located adjacent to the Joint Forces Headquarters for the West Virginia National Guard.

In addition to that, we have significant joint capability that was not considered in any of the BRAC analysis.

For example, part of the realignment is to relocate our aircraft to Pope, in order for them to continue the unique joint mission that is accomplished with the 18th Airborne Battalion. But the 130th Airlift Wing currently performs this exact same mission from Yeager Air National Guard. We could fly to Pope in less than 45 minutes and accomplish all of the exact same missions as we do today.

And when you consider the significant amount of reserve component aircraft that goes into supporting the 28 active duty C-130s at Pope, after the realignment, you can see a significant reduction; 67 C-130s reduced in supporting this joint mission at Pope Air Force Base with only 16

active duty C-130s based in. Therefore, 12 additional C-130s based at Yeager conveniently located to continue this joint mission would be critical.

And, in fact, the West Virginia National Guard, the 130th, also has a significant impact on the readiness of the West Virginia Army National Guard. They have been rated number one in readiness for the last eight years. And the 130th Airlift Wing provides critical support by serving as a training platform for jump -- for their qualified special forces units, and by providing troop movements to and from locations that are only available outside the State of West Virginia.

By doing so, we provide valuable time that is used for training and thereby increases readiness rather than being spent on the highways as convoys going to and from each location.

Keep in mind that the majority of airfields that we use for this mission only support C-130 size aircraft.

Next.

Now, another critical mission that was left out of the BRAC analysis regards our civil support to the Nation for Federal Homeland Defense.

The Air Force focused on the air defense aspect, but completely ignored this particular part.

Charleston is strategically located centrally among many of the major metropolitan areas throughout the Eastern United States. Therefore, we can respond in any direction rapidly in the event of a terrorist attack.

Indeed, the West Virginia National Guard has Joint Federal Homeland Defense responsibilities throughout all of the Region three, five, including the National Capital Region, which includes Washington, DC. Therefore, if there was a terrorist attack anywhere in these regions, we are required to respond in a timely manner.

Next.

Now, we are talking about the 35th Civil Support Team, which is a weapons of mass destruction rapid response team. They have to be en route to an incident within one and one-half hours. We also have a team that compliments that, that we call the CERF-P team. And our team was the first to be certified in all areas in the Nation, and they remained the only to do -- only one to do so.

They have to respond to an incident and be en route within four hours. And, indeed, our CST

and CERF were on call for the Presidential Inauguration. And our CERF was the only CERF on call for this activity. And they had a required response time of one hour.

Therefore, with these critical response times, you can see the importance of having rapid air transportation readily available.

The loss of the 130th Airlift Wing's aircraft, and the loss of the aerial port squadron which prepares and loads these teams' equipment, would have a significant negative impact on the joint forces of the West Virginia National Guard's ability to perform a Federal Homeland Security mission.

Next.

Another aspect that was not considered anywhere in the data regards our response to disasters.

The 130th Airlift Wing has performed joint support in support of 16 FEMA-declared disasters and ten non-FEMA declared disasters over the last nine years.

The impact of this on the joint forces of the West Virginia National Guard was not considered in this realignment.

Next.

Another aspect of the Air Force strategy is to base aircraft of like configuration together to increase operational efficiency and effectiveness. And one of the other aspects of this realignment is to base 12 C-130 H2s from Pittsburgh along with the -- correction, the eight C-130 H2s from Pittsburgh with the eight C130 H3s from Charleston at Fort Riley.

What this does is, this violates the very principle that the Air Force stated they wanted to use to achieve increased operational effectiveness and efficiency. It creates the very inefficiencies that they stated they wanted to achieve through these realignments.

A more improved recommendation would be to locate 16 H2s, which are exactly compatible at Pope Air Force Base, while locating 12 H3s at Yeager. This would achieve all of the increased effectiveness and efficiencies that the Air Force hopes to achieve.

Here is an illustration of the two different cockpits between the C-130H2 and H3 -- just to make the point that these are not aircraft of the same block or configuration, yet these are

what they intend to base at the same location.

On to criteria number two. This deals with the infrastructure, the availability of land facilities and air space at existing and potential receiving locations; and, of course, the 130th wants to be considered as a potential receiving location. So that is how we want to approach this.

But whenever you look at the actual military value assigned by the Air Force using their criteria, the 130th Airlift Wing did not score very high at all for criteria number two. But one point to note is that -- notice the installations on the far left-hand side, with the highest value, far higher than everybody else. These are your large active duty installations with large ramps and long runways.

So what we did, we wanted to take a closer look at this particular criteria, to see why we scored so low. And what we found was that many of the matrix used to evaluate the infrastructure are irrelevant to Air National Guard operations.

In fact, the Air National Guard C-130 units are not authorized many of the minimum size requirements to score any points in this entire criteria. And we have some of those listed here.

But when you consider that the weighted value of this criteria was nearly half of the overall military value, you can see the importance of a high score in this grid. And, indeed, your large active duty installations with long runways and large ramps scores exceptionally well. Your smaller Air National Guard installations at joint civil military facilities did not score very well.

And the Air Force Base Closure Executive Group actually identified this as a negative in their meeting minutes. They stated that: "The overstated apron requirements were having a negative impact on the scoring for a smaller, right size installation."

The 130th Airlift Wing is a right-sized installation.

So, now that we can more accurately interpret the data, what you see is the 130th Airlift Wing on the far right. But what the data measures is the size of the installation, the size of the infrastructure, not necessarily the value.

And over on the right is a small installation, the 103rd Airlift Wing. On the left is a large installation, an active duty base. In between are units of varying physical sizes.

So what the data actually tells us is that if the 130th Airlift Wing on the right-hand side with its small infrastructure can accomplish its mission today with no limitations, then the other units should also be able to accomplish their mission, as well, and yet they have excess infrastructure beyond what we have.

So what this data is actually telling us is that the 130th Airlift Wing has the most cost-efficient infrastructure, and the other units have excess infrastructure that results in higher costs.

And yet, that is the whole purpose of BRAC, to reduce infrastructure, to reduce costs and maximize efficiency.

It's one thing for me to stand here and tell you this, but we have actually done the research. And we have the data to back it up.

In fact, when we compared our unit to other similar Air National Guard C-130 units, our unit has the lowest operating and maintenance costs. And it carried over into the cost for flying.

Our unit, when compared to Air National Guard C-130H unit aircraft, our units had the lowest cost requirement.

Well, what is the difference between our units and these units? It's the excess infrastructure that we just showed you on the previous slide.

Next.

Now, also the Air Force claims to reduce a significant amount of leased space through these recommendations. And, in fact, the 130th Airlift Wing is a leased facility. But when you consider that it is leased at the cost of \$1 per year, you can see that the savings here is not very significant.

And when you consider that the airport has offered expansion of another 130,000 square yards of ramp space for the additional cost of only \$1 per year, and the joint civil military benefits that the unit has based at this airport, such as 24-hour air traffic control provided at no cost, runway operations and maintenance provided at no cost, now you begin to see the true value of the infrastructure for the 130th Airlift Wing.

And another aspect that was not included in the BRAC analysis includes future improvements to infrastructure.

The 130th Airlift Wing has funding

approved this year for a new fire department. And we have funding programs for land purchases to expand and incorporate some of the Joint Forces Headquarters of the West Virginia National Guard. We also have funding programmed for a new maintenance hangar. None of these were considered in determining the future military value of our infrastructure.

Another aspect for criteria number two deals with air space. The DoD wants to maintain their units within close proximity to training air space.

Indeed, the 130th Airlift Wing is centrally located with 26,000 open squares miles of low-level training area with very few restrictions, centrally located among many of the training resources needed. But one of the main tools used to evaluate air space was military training routes. And military training routes, both instrument and visual, do not apply to C-130s. So we are being evaluated and graded on a criteria in a matrix that does not apply to our operations.

Now here, this is an illustration. On the left-hand side you see the 26,000 square miles of low-level training area with minimal restrictions

available to the 130th. On the right-hand side you see a comparison for Pope Air Force Base, for example, of 11,000 square miles of air space built with restrictions resulting in numerous corridors that aircraft have to fly through in order to minimize restrictions and noise complaints.

But the 130th Airlift Wing, with our training air space, we can accept four additional aircraft. And by flying random routes, even down to 300 feet above ground level, we can minimize noise complaints and train and fly exactly how we deploy our aircraft in Iraq and Afghanistan today.

On to criteria number three. This deals with the ability to accommodate contingency, mobilization and surge operations.

Here we want to take a closer look at surge operations. Our primary disconnect with this is, that if you use incorrect capacity data at the beginning of the process, then the capacity data used to assess our surge capability is not accurate, and it needs to be reassessed.

And whenever you consider that the major command suggested and assumed that 25 percent of units' aircraft are gone at any point, the Air Force chose not to use that, but we can tell you that is a

valid assumption based on our performance in global warfare.

And, in fact, in both Desert Storm and Iraqi Freedom, C-130s are the first units to deploy. That leaves behind empty ramp space to be available for surge operations; and that, too, was not considered.

Now, you might think being a small facility, we might have limitations. But, in fact, we have operating C-5s and C-17s regularly out of our facility with no limitations ever, since we started the global war on terror. In fact, I flew on a C-5 out of that base over to Saudi Arabia for an Iraqi briefing, and I just returned on a C-17 a couple of weeks ago from Operation Raised Exercise. So our size does not limit our capability.

And, in fact, whenever you also consider that the airport has a joint agreement, and through our close working relationship with the airport, we can make use of the adjacent taxiway and runway at any time at no additional cost. What this does is, this gives us significant surge capacity outside of our existing property that was not considered.

Here you see an illustration of 12 C-130s on the ground and multiple C-17s. Here you

see an illustration with 12 C-130s on the ground and multiple C-5s. This is significant surge capacity available at any time at no additional cost to the Department of Defense, and yet was not considered in calculating our surge capacity.

Now, criteria number four. This deals with the cost of operations and manpower implications. Our primary disconnect with this is the fact that it was only worth two-and-a-half percent of the overall value.

And when you consider, as I already mentioned, that this unit had the lowest operations and maintenance costs compared to other C-130s, the lowest costs for flying, and the fact that when you compare our cost of living to other units gaining aircraft, that you have the second lowest cost of living.

What this means is, wherever you move the mission, the aircraft or the personnel, it's going to cost the Department of Defense more money.

And when you consider that the total number of personnel in the Air National Guard does not change in this process, then if you realign the unit and drop us by 600 personnel, those 600 personnel are going to be added elsewhere throughout

the Country in the Air National Guard.

But if we have the lowest cost of living, wherever you add that personnel, is going to be at a higher cost to the Department of Defense.

So we have to ask: What would be the payback period for such a realignment?

Next.

Well, according to the Department of Defense data, never. There would never be a payback period. The Department of Defense would never save any money by doing this realignment. That is using their own information.

Indeed, they stated a payback period of never, without a very strong argument or justification would threaten the credibility of the BRAC process, and that is exactly what they are recommending here, realignment based on incorrect capacity data was not significant justification.

Indeed, the BRAC Red Team even pointed out it appeared the Air Force was only moving aircraft and trying to gain additional funding, not reduce personnel and infrastructure costs. And this is a perfect example of that.

BRAC actions should result in savings in installation of personnel costs, and yet this

particular recommendation results in no savings in any area with a payback period of never.

Now, another important aspect with personnel involved recruiting and retention. The BRAC law and the Department of Defense regulations require a demographic study to be completed to analyze the recruiting impact of these recommendations.

Now, other than documentation stating that the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserves was involved, we, to date, based on the data that has been released so far, we have not found any recruiting demographic study involving our particular realignment.

What we do know is that approximately 600 full-time and part-time positions will be eliminated, and what will be left will be an expeditionary support enclave.

And honestly, we don't know what that is, it's an undefined, unverified concept at this point, that has more questions than answers. So we don't really know what's going to be left behind.

But what we do know is there are no other active duty installations within the State of West Virginia. There are no active reserve

associate units. And therefore the question has to be: Where will our personnel go to serve?

When you consider that the total active duty population in the State of West Virginia makes up less than one percent of the total active duty population of the entire Country, and especially when you consider that to our adjacent states, look at the significant different in the numbers of active duty personnel in neighboring states compared to West Virginia. And yet we have no other active duty installations, no reserve installations and only two Air National Guard installations.

Now, one of those is going to take a significant negative impact. Involved in that is the loss of 25 active Guard and Reserve personnel, further reducing the already minimal number of personnel within the State.

So the question is: Where will these personnel go? Eighty-six percent of our personnel live within 100 miles of our base and already commute an average of 62 miles one way beyond the 50-mile recommended distance. It is a four- to six-hour drive in any direction to reach any other Air National Guard installation.

So the question is: What will these

personnel do? Most likely, they will end their military service as a result of this realignment.

But what do these personnel give you? Well, they give the Department of Defense one of the highest C-130 mission capable rates. These personnel had an average of 22 years of maintenance experience. And when you look at the chart, two of the three units higher than us have newer aircraft. And many of the units below us don't even meet the Air National Guard mission capability rate. And yet they are gaining additional aircraft, and our unit is scheduled to lose ours.

We also have the highest strength when compared to these other Air National Guard C-130 units having aircraft.

Our current strength is over 103 percent. And whenever you compare that to our population base used BRAC data up to a recruiting base of approximately 175,000, this is compared to other units who are below 100 percent strength, yet are recruiting from a population of nearly two million.

We asked the question: Which unit best demonstrates the capability to accept additional aircraft?

Now, we have been making a lot of claims and presenting a lot of data. But what we want to make sure you understand is, we have provided all of the raw data and sources of all the recommendations to our analysts. And this just illustrates some of the raw data. And this is what we see whenever we look at it. This is the raw strength data provided by the Air National Guard. What you see is that the number ten unit in the Nation is the 130th Airlift Wing.

And what we have done, we have highlighted the other Air National Guard C-130 units who are gaining aircraft. You have to scroll down pretty far in order to start seeing some. You see Louisville, then some of the other units. In fact, you get down -- the Air National Guard considers their strength so low, that they grade it yellow, or even lower all the way to the bottom their strength is red.

Their strength is so low that it impacts their ability to accomplish their mission today with eight airplanes, and yet they are gaining additional aircraft, while all the way back at the top is the 130th with the highest strength and scheduled to lose our aircraft.

In addition to recruiting these people, we also retain them at one of the best rates. At the end of April, we had the second highest retention rates among comparison of the same units, that was just by one/tenth of one percent.

To illustrate the importance of recruiting, all you have to do is look at the realignment recommendation of the Fort Wayne Indiana Fire Department. The Air National Guard said even though they had a low military value score, they recommended to retain this unit primarily because of their strong recruiting and retention record.

So we compared our recruiting and retention statistics to theirs. What we found is they were comparable. Yet the difference is, we are being realigned to lose our aircraft, and our personnel will have nowhere else in the immediate vicinity to go to continue service. The likely result is, these personnel will leave the service.

And yet, we would agree completely with the Air Force Chief of Staff when they stated these people are our most valuable asset. But we can't explain the disconnect, why it only accounts for less than two-and-a-half percent of the total overall military value scores.

And, of course, we already mentioned on criteria number five, a payback period of never -- there is no justification -- there is no justification for a recommendation that does not save any money for the Department of Defense.

So, we started off with incorrect capacity data, which was used as the basis for the entire process. And when you consider that, when you look at military value, our Joint Homeland Defense and disaster response mission impact was not considered, the infrastructure data was significantly skewed in favor of large active duty installations and did not apply; and, indeed, was irrelevant to small Air National Guard installations.

The surge data that was on criteria number three was based on the incorrect capacity data at the beginning of the process. And our cost efficiency and personnel strengths were not considered at all. It all resulted in a payback period in time of never.

This is why we are asking the Commission to reject the Department of Defense's recommendation to realign this unit, and instead what we are asking is that you use our true military value to consider

us as a receiving location eligible for additional personnel. And when you do that, what you will see is that we scored higher in three of the four criteria than other units gaining aircraft.

Criteria two with our infrastructure, we can take that same infrastructure, support more aircraft at \$1 per year with no additional cost and no limitations on performing our mission. And we can do so at the lowest operating maintenance cost, the lowest cost per flying hour, the second lowest cost of living, with the highest personnel strength, the second highest retention, generating the highest mission capability rates in some of the least congested air space.

This is our true military guide. And this is what we ask to be used as the primary basis in evaluating our unit for realignment.

Therefore, the data confirms that the Department of Defense substantially deviated from BRAC criteria one through five when it recommended our unit for realignment.

We can support 12 aircraft, and we can do so more effectively and efficiently than any recommendation made to the Commission. Keeping these C-130s at Yeager Air National Guard Base

provides the Department of Defense, the community, the State of West Virginia, and the Nation the highest possible military value at the lowest possible cost while performing the most diverse types of missions.

Thank you for your time.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you.

GENERAL TACKETT: Commissioners, I would like to make one point. I'm General Tackett from the 130th Airlift Wing. It shows we're going to lose 25 people. We're actually going to lose, with technicians and everyone, over 600 personnel. We can't identify the exact figure.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: I understand.

GENERAL TACKETT: Military value, gentleman, for those of you, General Hill, Admiral Gehman, that putting combat power on a combat field at the lowest possible cost. It wasn't by accident that General Schwarzkopf chose the 130th Airlift Wing to be the lead C-130 unit to plan and execute all of the Airlift responsibilities for the famous Left Hook in Desert Shield/Desert Storm and awarded them the Presidential Unit Citation With Valor.

It wasn't by accident the 130th Airlift Wing was chosen to operate in a remote base in Saudi

Arabia supporting the Special Operations Forces during the Iraqi Freedom. And they flew the most dangerous missions in the entire Iraqi war.

Military value, there's units that are being added aircraft who have failed their operational readiness inspections. Members from this unit have had to go to those units and to help them just to pass an operational readiness inspection. Some of them are only 80-percent strength. If they can't support what they have now, how can they possibly support additional aircraft?

This unit has maintained over 100-percent strength for years. The entire State of West Virginia is 104 percent of its assigned strength. There are states beside of us who cannot meet their readiness goals. This is a time when almost every service is having difficulty meeting its recruitment goals. There is not a recruitment problem in the State of West Virginia.

We can maintain the additional aircraft and put them on the battlefield with the cheapest and most effective members of the entire Air Force.

Gentleman, you know, I would hate to be sitting in your chairs, because you have an absolute monstrous job. But I think the Air Force staff put

you in even a worse condition, because they used the BRAC process and turned it into something else. I think they are outside the BRAC wall, and they, in turn, utilize the BRAC to do future total force and to promote their future force.

I would recommend to you that you turn everything pertaining to the Air National Guard back to the Air Force, and take it out of the BRAC, because it's not part of the BRAC process. BRAC is about the best facilities to accomplish the mission at the cheapest cost, and that was not done.

REPRESENTATIVE CAPITO: Thank you, Commissioners. I am Shelly Moore Capito, the Representative of the Second Congressional District, which includes Charleston and the 130th Airlift Wing. I can do this in 30 seconds:

The men and women of this Airlift Wing are my constituents, my friends and neighbors. Our kids have grown up together, and we know each very, very, well. And General Tackett and the Major have done a wonderful job giving you the details of this.

The Commission's review will show how the Secretary of Defense deviated from the establishment of military criteria in recommending the realignment of the 130th Airlift Wing. It's an

incredible honor to represent these folks in Congress. I eagerly await your recommendation of the Commission and urge you to reverse the Secretary of Defense's recommendation and let these guys and gals get back to what they do best, and that is living freedom with courage. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you.

SENATOR ROCKEFELLER: Honorable Commissioners, thank you for your service to your Country in this exercise and throughout your lifetime.

I will shorten mine enormously.

I'm the Vice-Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee. I would like to specifically emphasize what I believe is the most important function of the 130th Airlift Wing. It's a special mission helping to ensure that our Nation is prepared in the event of another attack.

As you know, Washington, DC is within our parameters. I'll explain that more. The most likely target of all from any other groups that wish to do us harm. The men and women of the 130th stand prepared every day to ensure that they can respond adequately in the event of an emergency in the National Capital Region.

If we have another 911, or worse, we are going to need all the help we can get to help clear out leaders of Washington, as well as citizens and bring in medical supplies and emergency teams and all other kinds of material.

The 130th drills and drills and drills and drills to be ready for any emergency that might arise in Washington. Part of the BRAC Commission mandate is to strengthen our ability to respond to such threats.

As you know, West Virginia has one of the 12 CERF-P teams established by the National Guard to respond to events across our Nation in support of civil authorities.

This team was certified last August the first one of 26 MIG (ph) areas. West Virginia is one of the 32 operating National Guard civil support weapons of mass destruction, CSGWNT, and that's -- they're another joint part of this.

The people of the 130th work closely with the members of the West Virginia Army National Guard to ensure that the CERF-P and CSGWNT teams would be dispatched to Washington as soon as humanly possible. If the eight C-130th were moved to Pope Air Force Base, then planes would have to fly to

Charleston, West Virginia. They would have to do that, and then load on what is it that we have ready for them in order to get to the Capital; equipment, supplies, the rest of it.

In the event of a major incident, I don't think we can afford to take that chance. I urge you to reverse this decision and to preserve the special mission fulfilled by the 130th. Thank you, gentlemen.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you, Senator Rockefeller. Senator Byrd, I think the rest of the time is yours.

SENATOR BYRD: Gentlemen, I do not envy you -- your task. Whatever the requirements are, I will live with them, within those requirements. The case has been made. It has been made well by our Governor, our Adjutant General, our delegation and the men and women of the 130th.

How much time do I have?

COMMISSIONER COYLE: The clock says you only have six minutes, but that is a terrible thing to do to a Senator.

SENATOR BYRD: Thank you, thank you. Mr. Coyle, Mr. Skinner, Admiral Gehman, General Hill, the testimony you have heard this evening has

been presented on behalf of the men and women of the 130th Airlift Wing.

They are some of the finest service members in the entire National Guard. The 130th Airlift Wing has served our Country in all corners of the world, from Germany to the Persian Gulf, from Uzbekistan to Panama, from Rwanda to Charleston, West Virginia.

The service of these National Guardsmen has been magnificent, and for that I give each one of them my heartfelt thanks for their courage and their dedication.

I recognize that the task before the BRAC Commission is not to decide which military units are the bravest or most committed to the defense of our Country. That would be an impossible mission. Instead, the BRAC Commission is charged with seeking the greatest possible efficiency from our military infrastructure. In carrying out that task, I urge the Commission, and I do so respectfully, to take a careful look at what the Defense Department Base Closure and Realignment recommendation would do to the Air National Guard, not just in West Virginia, but also around the Nation.

The Secretary of Defense has been given the responsibility to look at aircraft from 28 Air National Guard bases across the Country. As you examine the Pentagon's recommendation, I know you will not forget that the citizens and soldiers of the National Guard serve not only our Country but also the states in which they reside. The National Guard is more than a reserve force for our military, it is also the militia of the United States. And I say that with full regard to the Second Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I thank the BRAC Commission for calling a special hearing on Thursday to hear additional testimony on the Defense Department's recommendation for the Air National Guard. The Pentagon base closure recommendations really, really represent a body blow to the National Guard.

Congress had twice enacted laws intended to deter the Federal government from imposing closures upon the militia of the states. One of these provisions of law Title 32 United States Code Section 104 states:

"That no change in the branch, organization or allotment of a National Guard unit located entirely within a state may be made without

the approval of its Governor."

The Supreme Court ruled that the Governor of the State has the power to veto certain National Guard deployments if the mission would substantially impact the Governor's ability to respond to local emergencies. If the Pentagon's BRAC recommendations were implemented, the loss of the eight C-130th aircraft from Charleston would have a dramatic impact on the ability of our Governor and the West Virginia National Guard to respond to local emergencies.

State Governors are in the best position to assess the readiness of the National Guard to take on the full range of local emergencies including disaster recovery, Homeland Security and restoring segment order.

We should listen when a Governor believes that the Federal government is hampering his role as Commander-in-Chief of the militia of his state.

On May 31, 2005, Governor Joseph Manchin wrote to Secretary Rumsfeld to advise him that he, Governor Manchin, objects to the realignment of the 130th Airlift Wing, in part because the BRAC recommendations completely ignored the important

roll of the 130th Airlift Wing in support of the State of West Virginia during periods of emergency.

I respectfully ask the BRAC Commission to heed this call from Governor Manchin to reject the reassignment of this important unit.

And as you review the data for the 130th Airlift Wing, again, I respectfully ask the Commission to remain focused on its primary mission; namely, to seek greater efficiency within the defense establishment as directed by law.

As General Tackett has pointed out in his remarks, the 130th Airlift Wing at Yeager Field is a highly efficient organization that is capable of immediate expansion. Compared to similar units, the 130th Airlift Wing has the lowest operation and maintenance costs. Compared to units that are gaining aircraft, the 130th Airlift Wing has the lowest cost per flying hour and the second lowest cost of living for personnel.

According to General Tackett's analysis, moving these eight C-130 aircraft will actually increase the expenses for the military.

I do not believe that that is the result which the BRAC process intends to achieve.

The 130th Airlift Wing is one of the few

National Guard units that is not experiencing manpower problems. It is staffed at nearly 104 percent of its authorized strength, and has a retention rate of 95 percent. These numbers are among the best of all the units of the National Guard.

In contrast, bases that are receiving aircraft already have personnel shortages and lower operational readiness rates. Moving aircraft from top performing units to units that are already in trouble just does not seem to make sense.

Mr. Coyle, Mr. Skinner, Admiral Gehman, General Hill, the fact is that there are significant discrepancies between the Pentagon's BRAC recommendations and the real military value of the 130th Airlift Wing. The data provided to the BRAC Commission by General Tackett and the West Virginia National Guard show that this fine unit presents a very strong case for gaining aircraft. It is no wonder that General Steven Blum, Chief of the National Guard Bureau has told the BRAC Commission, Chairman Anthony Principi, that he, General Blum, considers the 130th Airlift unit to be one of the best, if not the best, units in the National Guard.

For many years the men and the women of

the West Virginia National Guard have made us proud. They have flown across the globe to support American Armed Forces. They have served bravely in Iraq and Afghanistan and Bosnia, in Kosovo. They have saved lives at home battling fires and blizzards and storms in so many West Virginia communities. The face of the 130th is more than the faces of the men and women who honor you proudly. It is their husbands and wives, their sons and daughters. The face of the 130th is the face of its neighbors and friends and coworkers and employers.

All of West Virginia is part of the West Virginia National Guard, because the West Virginia National Guard has been a part of all of us. I implore you, all of the distinguished members of this illustrious Commission, to make the right decision, recheck the realignment of the 130th Airlift Wing in Charleston, West Virginia.

Members, I thank you for your courtesy. I thank you for the service that you perform. You don't get paid for it, but I thank you. The men and women of this Country appreciate your problems, and they thank you for your service, and so do I, and so do the other members of this delegation; the Governor and the Congressional members, the General

and all of the men and women of the 130th. Thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you, Senator Byrd.

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Before I ask if the Commissioners have any questions, I just want to comment, I think you know that there are some 30 governors who are impacted by the proposed Air Guard changes. We have heard from a couple of dozen senators about this issue. And I believe you know we have a special hearing just with the TAGS the day after tomorrow. I don't know if you will be that day, also, General Tackett. We are certainly glad you were here, whether you are there the day after tomorrow or not.

It strikes me, Governor Manchin, that West Virginia has a somewhat unique situation. In one sense you are -- you face a potential change that could impact your state as many other governors do. But on the other hand you have -- you and General Tackett have this special responsibility to support the National Capital Region with its CSTs and CERF teams. And so you have an extra responsibility that other governors might not.

Any questions from any of you?

COMMISSIONER HILL: I do have one question. Where is the CST and the CERF located?

GENERAL TACKETT: The CST is located in St. Aubins, West Virginia, which is about 15 miles from the actual airport, itself.

COMMISSIONER HILL: Okay, thanks.

GENERAL TACKETT: Almost in any kind of weather conditions, we can deploy those units.

COMMISSIONER HILL: You have done your CST the way almost all the other states do, where you keep a small portion on at one point, because they are not always 24 hours on call, but you rotate them through there?

GENERAL TACKETT: Yes, sir. Our CERF team, 25 percent of that CERF team is made up of the 130th Airlift Wing. Another 25 percent is the AIROPNET section. If the C-130s go away, the AIROPNET section goes away.

COMMISSIONER HILL: You would have to reorganize your CERF team, then, too.

GENERAL TACKETT: We would lose 50 percent. We are the only qualified CERF team in America today.

COMMISSIONER HILL: Thank you.

GENERAL TACKETT: One of the things I didn't say, there are other missions this Wing has. In case of an emergency in Washington, there are agencies that will come to the State of West Virginia that requires transportation from these C-130s to continue working the government. And I will just leave it at that.

COMMISSIONER HILL: Let me ask one other question, General Tackett. Regretfully, I'm not going to be here Thursday afternoon. I had this discussion of several other TAGS, and I wanted to ask it of you. Why didn't the Air Force work this issue in the same thoughtful way that the Army did, to where there is significant agreement among all the Army TAGS, and so much unanimity and disagreement on the Air Force TAG. What is your personal thought on that?

GENERAL TACKETT: I can only tell you what General Heckman said he came down, he didn't want our input; there was no way to get 54 Adjutant Generals to agree to anything.

COMMISSIONER HILL: Did they talk?

GENERAL TACKETT: Yes, sir, they did. And we sat down and worked everything out. But the Air Force did not want input from the Governor or

the Adjutant General. They told us. It was top driven. And I mean, you served on the staff. And what has happened is, that there are senior officers who have said: "Here is what we are going to do. You figure out the formula, you make it happen; here is what we are going to do. We are going to use BRAC to do it."

And so they went to work, done their job, and this is what we have.

COMMISSIONER HILL: Thank you.
Governor?

GOVERNOR MANCHIN: My office was not contacted one time. We had no communication whatsoever. It has just coming through the news. We heard it the same way everyone else heard it. The other governors I deal with had the same type of experience. So we appreciate very much, on behalf of all the people of West Virginia that come today, we are united. We are a small state, but we are a mighty state, and we are willing to serve, we want to continue to serve.

COMMISSIONER HILL: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: I'm going to be chairing the committee on Thursday afternoon. General Gehman will be here and several of the

Commissioners. One of the issues -- and we don't have to get into it today, General, but one of the issues on the 130s in particular is the utilization rate of 130s and the quality of 130s the Guard provides -versus- the quality of the 130s and availability, I guess, and the reliability of the active duty.

And I would guess we will probably get into some kind of discussions and questions on that. Because, as you know, many of these 130s are being moved to active units. And the argument is being made by some that the reason they are moved to active units is because the active unit duty ones are worn out and have to be brought -- have to be brought back to depots and things like that. So we don't need to get into it today, unless you want to opine on that.

But, as you know, this does drive, to some degree, the 130s into the active duty.

GENERAL TACKETT: Yes, sir. And I will tell you, you can look at the safety analysis that is out there: For every 100,000 hours that C-130s fly on active duty, they have 16 accidents, major accidents for every 100,000 hours of flying. In the National Guard, you have one.

COMMISSIONER SKINNER: You have a
23-year record.

GENERAL TACKETT: This unit has been
there for over 30 years, flying C-130 aircraft
161,000 hours of accident-free flying.

COMMISSIONER HILL: Can I make one other
statement? In the comment is just this, that I have
been around listening to a lot of staff. And your
Major Ray did an incredible job standing up here
under very difficult circumstances, so however we
do --

(Applause.)

COMMISSIONER HILL: -- it would have
been better if he was a sergeant.

GENERAL TACKETT: That is the kind of
people we have in the West Virginia National Guard.

COMMISSIONER COYLE: Thank you. Ladies
and gentlemen, this concludes the Charlotte, North
Carolina Regional Hearing of the Defense Base
Realignment and Closure Commission.

I want to thank all of the witnesses who
testified today, especially those who came from long
distances.

You all have brought us very thoughtful
and valuable information. We 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 and community members who have assisted us during our base visits in preparation for this hearing.

In particular, I would like to thank Senator Elizabeth Dole and her staff for their wonderful support that was provided to us for this Regional Hearing and this fine site.

Finally, I would like to thank the citizens of the community represented here today.

Again, those of you who especially traveled long distances that have supported the members of our armed services for so many years, making them feel welcome and valued in your towns.

It is that spirit that makes America great.

This hearing is closed.

(WHEREAS, the hearing was closed at 6:15 PM.)