

CQ CONGRESSIONAL TRANSCRIPTS

Congressional Hearings

March 7, 2012 - Final

House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Holds Hearing on the Proposed Fiscal 2013 Appropriations for Military Installations, Environment, Energy and Base Realignment and Closure Programs

[LIST OF PANEL MEMBERS AND WITNESSES](#)

CULBERSON:

In the interest of time I will pass to my good friend, Mr. Bishop, of Georgia, for any opening remarks he'd like to make.

BISHOP:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I would like to welcome this distinguished panel. I view this hearing as a continuation of our budget overview hearing with a few more topics.

As you know, last week we had the military BRACs (ph) before us and today we have the civilian leadership. Last week I thought we had a good hearing that shed some light on some difficult issues that are facing the Department of Defense. Some of these issues include ending two wars, starting a force drawdown, and dealing with lower budgets. And as you can imagine, the department has a full plate.

In addition to those issues let's not forget that sequestration is looming due to the Budget Control Act. It would be harmful to our national defense if we have sequestration, but I'd like to also say that it'd be harmful to all the federal agencies and I don't want to give the impression that I'm only concerned about the Department of Defense, because I'm concerned about all the agencies.

But there's one more item that concerns me, Mr. Chairman. As you know, the F.Y. '13 budget request has not one but two BRAC rounds, and as I said last week, the department should practically consider taking further reductions in the overseas bases before initiating another BRAC round for bases in CONUS.

The witnesses before us are dealing with some of the serious challenges that we face, but I want to show them that -- that our subcommittee will do all that we can to make sure that our military has everything that it needs to accomplish the mission and take care of our men and women in

uniform and their families. Thanks for the opportunity to share my concerns, and I look forward to the discussions and the challenges that -- as we hear from the panel this afternoon.

I yield back, and I'm going to run and vote, Mr. Chairman.

CULBERSON:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Sanford.

This committee, as I know each of you are aware, works arm in arm. Perhaps the only real distinction between us is geography, and even then we're working arm in arm.

Delighted to have you here, and -- each one of our witnesses. You've all got written statements, which will, of course, be made a part of the record, and we invite you to summarize -- summarize them.

We're sort of in a bind here because I'm going to have to slip out to go vote. What we'll attempt to do is as soon as one of my colleagues comes in that I can pass the gavel to I will slip out briefly in order to go vote and then we'll just rotate so that in the interest of time, because everyone -- I know how busy you all are and we're delighted to have you here.

And if I could, I'd like to start with the Honorable Dorothy Robyn, deputy undersecretary of defense for installations and the environment, and I would encourage you to please summarize your statement. And of course, it's -- will be made a part of the record in its entirety.

ROBYN:

Thank you, Chairman Culberson, Ranking Member Bishop, and other -- other members of the subcommittee who are not here. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on the president's budget request for military construction and environmental programs. I want to touch on three issues very briefly: our MILCON and family housing budget, our request for two new BRAC rounds, and environment and energy.

First, on MILCON: The Budget Control Act reduced defense spending over the FYDP by \$259 billion. That, together with reductions in force structure, has led us to cut sharply our F.Y. '13 request for MILCON as we reassess our infrastructure needs for the new, leaner force structure.

We're asking for \$11.2 billion for MILCON and family housing, of which \$9.1 billion is for pure MILCON. That's a reduction of between 25 and 45 percent from F.Y. '12, depending on the department. The exception is F.Y. -- is the defense-wide MILCON accounts, which are up by 6 percent over F.Y. '12, and that reflects support for high priority improvements in hospitals and DOD-owned schools. We are requesting another \$14 billion to sustain, restore, and upgrade the condition of our existing facilities.

Let me highlight one thing we are not asking money for: family housing here in the United States. That's because we have now privatized nearly all of our 200,000 units of family housing. Using the power of the commercial market we have leveraged a \$3 billion investment of DOD dollars to generate \$27 billion worth of high quality, well maintained homes, and that has done a lot to improve the quality of life of military families. It's an extraordinary success story and the most successful reform my office has carried out, and something we should be looking to do more broadly.

The second issue, BRAC: We need another BRAC round, ideally two. The math is straightforward. Force reductions produce excess capacity; excess capacity is a drain on resources. Only through BRAC can we align our infrastructure with our defense strategy.

Let me say two things in anticipation of -- of criticisms, and one apropos of Congressman Bishop's comment. First, we have already made significant reductions in our European footprint and we will do more. I describe in my statement both what we've done and the BRAC- like process that we will follow looking -- looking forward. But even if we make a significant cut in our footprint in Europe we will still need a domestic BRAC.

The second point I want to respond to: Critics point to the 2005 BRAC round as evidence that BRAC doesn't produce savings, or at least not in a reasonable period of time. But unlike the first four BRAC rounds, which paid off in two to three years, the 2005 round was not about savings and eliminating excess capacity. Carried out in a post- 9/11 environment when the department was at war, it was about transformation.

The Army, in particular, used BRAC 2005 to carry out major transformational initiatives, such as the modularization of BCTs -- initiatives that would otherwise have taken decades to achieve. That said, a 2013 BRAC round would look more like the BRAC rounds of the 1990s, where the focus was on savings, because that's the priority now.

Issue three: the environment and energy. There is an enormous amount to say on this topic. I have a very long statement. You will hear from my colleagues about the wonderful things that we're doing in the energy area. We're making a robust investment to continue our efforts in the environment.

I want to highlight just one thing in the interest of -- of time, and that is technology. Technology has been the Department of Defense's comparative advantage for 200 years. The Department of Defense is a technology agency. It is an innovation machine. Although we tend to talk about technology in the context of weapon systems it's important to harness that advantage for what we are trying to do with respect to both the environment and energy.

Let me give you an example from the environmental area. A decade ago the two environmental technology programs that I oversee, SERDP and ESTCP, took on a challenge: defending technologies that could discriminate between scrap metal and hazardous unexploded ordinance, UXO -- in other words, distinguish beer cans from bombs.

The existing technology, which we still use today, cannot make a distinction between those two. The false positive rate is 99.99 percent. As a result, the contractors must dig up literally hundreds of thousands of metal objects in order to identify and -- and remove a handful of pieces of UXO. And contractors are paid for every hole they dig up.

Because this process is so labor-intensive the bill is very high. Our estimated UXO cleanup cost is \$14 billion. Remarkably, 10 years of investment have yielded technologies that can discriminate between UXO and harmless metal objects with a very high degree of reliability.

We are now doing live site demonstrations of this new technology on an accelerated basis and we're working with the cleanup community and state regulators to get them comfortable with what is a fundamentally new approach -- one that we believe can save billions of dollars. That's the power of technology.

Similarly, in the energy area we can leverage high technology. The same folks who brought us the -- the UXO technology run something called -- that I oversee -- called the installation energy test bed, and the rationale is similar. In the energy area, as in the environmental area, emerging technologies offer a way to significantly reduce DOD's cost and improve its performance, but because of fundamental market failures those technologies are very slow to get to market.

As the owner of 300,000 buildings, it is in the Defense Department's direct self interest to help firms overcome the barriers that inhibit innovative technologies from being commercialized and/or deployed on our installations, and we do this by using our installations as a distributed test bed to demonstrate and validate them in a real world, integrated environment. And we have about 70 of these going, and I hope I have an opportunity to talk about some -- some of them.

In short, as budgets tighten we need to invest more smartly. Using the market, as we've done with housing privatization, and leveraging advanced technology, as we are doing with our installation energy test bed, are critical.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your questions.

CULBERSON:

(OFF-MIKE)

HAMMACK:

Thank you very much. Chairman Culberson, Representative Bishop, and other members who may join us later, on behalf of soldiers, families, and civilians of the U.S. Army I want to thank you for the opportunity to talk to you a little bit about our budget for F.Y. '13.

The budget request supports an Army that is in transition, yet we are still at war. We know the fiscal challenges that the nation faces and are planning accordingly to implement what was asked us by the Budget Control Act.

The committee's continued support will ensure that the Army remains ready, manned, trained, and equipped to face the challenges of protecting this nation.

CULBERSON:

(OFF-MIKE)

HAMMACK:

Understood.

(RECESS)

CULBERSON:

The subcommittee will come back to order. We thank you for your patience in light of these folks. I apologize for the interruption.

Secretary Hammack, I want to ask you to please continue with your statement. Thank you very much.

HAMMACK:

Thank you very much, Chairman Culberson.

The Army's budget request reflects the nation's current fiscal reality and is a 32 percent reduction from prior year. Pending the strategic decisions on Army's end strength reductions, force structure, and stationing across the country has required the Army to review our facility investments and to defer some of those investments that could be impacted by force structure changes.

The active Army MILCON budget, in particular, has been reduced to defer while we have not taken similar cuts in National Guard or Reserve. Once a total Army analysis has been completed the Army will then rebalance the fiscal year 2014 military construction budget to meet the needs of a realigned force.

The Army has implemented a Facility Strategy 2020, which is a facility investment strategy to provide quality, energy-efficient strategies while taking down some of our more inefficient

buildings. This strategy is a cost effective and efficient approach to facility investments that reduces unneeded footprints, saves energy by preserving the most efficient facilities, and consolidates functions for better space utilization. It also, as I mentioned before, demolishes failing buildings and uses appropriate excess facilities as lease alternatives.

For fiscal year '13 the Army's budget is \$3.6 billion, 103 projects, of which \$1.9 billion is active Army, \$614 million National Guard, and \$306 million for the Reserves. I want to talk a little bit about base realignment and closure, echoing a little bit that Dr. Robyn said, that the Army met our BRAC 2005 obligations within the six-year implementation window.

BRAC 2005 was very different for the Army in that it was a transformational BRAC -- transformed how the Army trains, deploys, supplies, equips, and cares for its garrisons -- and garrisons its soldiers, families and cultures (ph). We shut down 11 installations, 387 reserve component sites, realigned 53 installations and their functions at an investment of almost \$18 billion, which included 329 major construction projects.

As of January 2012 the Army conveyed an unprecedented 47 percent of our BRAC 2005 total excess acreage of over 35,000 acres, which is higher than we had in any other BRAC round. Other BRAC rounds waited until the BRAC date of closure and then transfers started. But we were able to, in this BRAC round, transfer land during the BRAC process.

For F.Y. 2013 the Army is requesting about \$100 million for BRAC 2005, and of that there is a significant portion -- about 50-50 split for BRAC 2005 to handle environmental and caretaker. The 48.4 is a caretaker. But we also are requesting \$79 million for prior BRAC rounds. The prior BRAC rounds -- more significant portion is for the environmental cleanup; only \$4 million is for the caretaker status.

The Army does support the DOD request for BRAC authority for 2013 and 2015 because changes in force structure will necessitate evaluation of our facilities to optimize usage and capability. We have listened to Congress and have followed your guidance to reduce costs and footprint in Europe and in Korea.

In Europe, over the last six years we've closed 97 sites and returned 23,000 acres; in the next four years we plan to close another 23 sites and return 6,400 acres, primarily in Germany. In Korea, over the last six years we've closed 34 sites with 7,300 acres returned; and in the next four years we plan another 20 sites and 9,400 acres. And so we are implementing a BRAC-like base realignment and closure overseas similar to what has been done in the United States.

BRAC 2005 also greatly benefited the Army Guard, and Reserve, in that they consolidated on a three-to-one basis out of failing facilities into newer facilities, returning that land in communities for greater economic use and taxpaying use.

On energy, the Army has a comprehensive energy and sustainability program. We do think energy at Army facilities is mission-critical to us, as we have seen energy challenges due to recent weather events. The tornadoes that we have seen over the last 12 months have had an

impact on some of our installations in reducing access to energy as power lines go down and causing us to rely on generators.

So we recognize that energy is mission-critical to us. It's also operationally necessary while at the same time it's a fiscally prudent use of funds. Since 2003 the Army has reduced our installation energy consumption by 13 percent while at the same time our number of active soldiers and civilians has increased by 20 percent.

The Army also, instead of developing our own high-performance building code, we adopted a national standard, ASHRAE 189.1, which is a peer reviewed, publicly available standard, something that is used by contractors in the private sector, as well. And that simplifies working with the Army. It also has developed or returned to us a 40 percent savings in energy and water for new construction.

We have implemented in the last 12 months a Net Zero Initiative, which focuses on reducing energy, water, and waste on our Army installations. We have 17 pilot installations that are looking to get to a Net Zero point by 2020. We also have implemented an Energy Initiatives Task Force that is focusing on large-scale alternative energy production to give us the energy security on our installations that we so desperately need.

At the same time, we've accelerated the use of energy-saving performance contracts. These are contracts where the private sector invests in energy efficiency projects and puts the capital up to install it on an Army installation and we pay them back out of energy savings.

In the first quarter of fiscal year '12 we implemented \$93 million of contracts for energy-saving performance contracts, and that was more than we did in all of fiscal year '11, which was that \$74 million. So the Army is on track if not ahead of schedule to meet the goal set by the president of high-performance contracting in the military sector.

At the same time, though, we've been working on our process time, which has been a challenge historically in getting contracts signed, and we've cut our process time in half, down to 12 to 14 months in contracting.

And with that, I would like to thank you for your attention, and I look forward to your questions after the other secretaries have a chance to introduce.

CULBERSON:

Thank you very much, Madam Secretary.

And now my pleasure to introduce Secretary Ptannestiel. We're delighted to have you here -- assistant secretary of the Navy for energy, installations, and environment. And we welcome your testimony. Thank you, ma'am.

PTANNESTIEL:

Thank you, Chairman Culberson, Representative Bishop, and members of the committee. I'm pleased to appear before you here today to provide an overview of the Department of Navy's investment in shore infrastructure.

The department's fiscal year '13 budget request includes \$13 billion of investment in military construction, facility sustainment, restoration and modernization, previous rounds of BRAC, family housing, environmental restoration, and base operating support. The military construction request of \$1.8 billion supports our combatant commanders, new warfighting platforms and missions, facilities recapitalization, and service member quality of life initiatives for the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps.

Military construction projects in Bahrain and Djibouti support high-priority missions in the region, enhance our forward presence, and provide stability for U.S. interests. Two projects in Spain support the forward-deployed naval forces and a project in Romania supports the European phased adaptive approach infrastructure. Equally important are military construction programs that invest in support facilities for the Joint Strike Fighter and MV-22B, infrastructure improvements, training and education facilities, and the safety and security of nuclear weapons in the United States.

I would specifically like to emphasize that we remain committed to establishing an operational Marine Corps presence in Guam. We know Congress is concerned about the execution of the Guam military realignment and we are taking the necessary steps to address those concerns and move the program forward.

The U.S. government is currently meeting with the government of Japan to discuss adjustments to the 2006 Realignment Roadmap agreement. As Secretary Panetta has testified, Guam is an important part of the U.S. effort to reposture our forces in the Pacific. We believe the adjustments being discussed will address execution concerns, increase our flexibility, and strengthen our presence in the region. This is an important year for the Guam realignment. We will continue to work with you and our partners on Guam and in Japan as more information becomes available.

As for the 2005 BRAC round, the -- the department met our legal obligations by the statutory deadline of September 15, 2011 and successfully implemented all required realignment and closure actions, as has been previously specified in our business plans. Our fiscal year '13 budget request of \$18 million enables ongoing environmental restoration, caretaker, and property disposal efforts.

For prior BRAC rounds, our fiscal year '13 budget request of \$147 million will enable us to continue disposal actions for the remaining 7 percent of real property and meet the legal requirements for environmental cleanup.

The Department of the Navy fully supports the secretary's proposal for additional rounds of BRAC to improve the alignment of our shore infrastructure with our force structure.

Finally, we intend to meet the energy goals set forth by Congress and the secretary of the Navy. We recognize that energy is a critical resource for maritime, aviation, expeditionary, and shore missions. We must strengthen our energy security and reduce our vulnerability to price escalations and volatility.

With this in mind, the Navy and Marine Corps continue to reform how we produce, procure, and use energy. Our budget request includes \$1 billion in fiscal year '13 and \$4 billion across the FYDP for operational and shore energy initiatives.

To help meet Congress' renewable energy goals and our own goal of producing 50 percent of our shore energy from alternative sources, we will develop a strategy to facilitate the production of large-scale renewable power projects on naval installations. We will use third party financing mechanisms, such as power purchase agreements, joint ventures, and enhanced use leases to avoid adding costs to rate-payers -- to taxpayers.

Currently, our bases support about 300 megawatts of renewable energy, 270 megawatts of which is produced by a geothermal power plant at China Lake. We have awarded contracts for three solar projects in the Southwest and are finalizing a similar contract in Hawaii.

The three awarded power purchase agreements at China Lake, Twentynine Palms, and Barstow will save the department \$20 million over 20 years. In all three of these places we are paying less per kilowatt hour for electricity than we would for conventional power.

In closing, your support of the department's fiscal year '13 budget request ensures we can build and maintain facilities that enable our Navy and Marine Corps to meet the diverse challenges of tomorrow.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify here. I look forward to answering your questions.

CULBERSON:

Thank you very much for your testimony.

And it is now my pleasure to call on Secretary Yonkers. Of course, your written statement will be made part of the record; we welcome your summary of your written statement. Thank you, sir, for your service and for your testimony today.

YONKERS:

Thank you. Thank you all, Congressmen Bishop, distinguished members of the subcommittee.

I really do appreciate being here today and being able to talk to you all about the Air Force's installation, energy, and environmental programs. And let me just say from the get-go to thank you, again, for your unwavering support of our Air Force and our airmen and their families.

Our fiscal year '13 budget request responds to two main drivers: the Budget Control Act that the Congress passed last year and the new Strategic Defense Policy that the president and Secretary Panetta announced in January. As we prepared our fiscal year '13 budget we looked across the entire Air Force portfolio and made difficult decisions to achieve the Air Force's share of that \$487 billion in defense savings mandated by the Budget Control Act. In our installations, energy, and environmental portfolio we are focused on investments in the critical infrastructure needed to sustain our air bases the quality of life improvements for our airmen and their families.

We are requesting funding to meet the COCOMs' most critical facility requirements and facility modifications to bed down and sustain the Joint Strike Fighter, the MC-12 surveillance aircraft, plus the standup of an additional B-52 at Minot Air Force Base. We are ever cognizant of the smart investments that will drive down our costs of doing business and we are requesting \$215 million this budget year to reduce our energy footprint by demolishing old, energy- inefficient buildings and upgrading systems like HVAC and other high energy use systems, investments that will have a tangible payback over the FYDP.

Moreover, we're reevaluating the policies and contracting mechanisms in the areas of military construction and environment with the primary objective of reducing construction and environmental restoration costs. As funding for the military construction becomes more austere we've made a deliberate effort to build only where existing capacity is not available or where the cost-benefit analysis validates demolishing the aging facilities and construction of more efficient and fundamental replacements.

Our fiscal year 2013 budget request also contains \$2.9 billion for military construction, family housing, facility sustainment, and restoration and modernization. For military construction we are requesting \$440 million this year, and that's \$900 million below fiscal year 2012. As you've heard in testimony before, the deliberate pause in our program is prudent in light of the force structure decisions that are stemming from this new defense strategic guidance.

Also, in our fiscal year 2013 budget request we'll continue to emphasize first-class housing and strive to improve the overall quality of life for our airmen and their families. Our new dorm plan for 2012 to 2016 will guide our future investments for sustaining existing facilities and recapitalizing those which are inadequate.

As we progress through 2012 we're nearing completion of our efforts to privatize family housing in the continental United States and to upgrade family housing overseas, especially in Japan. Our fiscal year 2013 budget request for military family housing is \$580 million.

On September 15, 2011, like the other services, the Air Force successfully completed its 2005 base realignment and closure program on time and within the original \$3.8 billion budget. This up-front (ph) BRAC investment has resulted in \$1.4 billion in annual savings to the Department of Defense and we're reinvesting those dollars today in missions in fiscal year '13.

However, with that being said, I almost (ph) say that BRAC 2005 fell short of the Air Force's expectations and goals to reduce our overhead and operational costs by reducing excess installation capacity. Today, seven years later and almost 500 fewer aircraft in the inventory, the Air Force continues to maintain large amounts of excess infrastructure. It's costing us hundreds of millions of dollars a year, and those are dollars that we need to invest in other areas. The excess capacity that we have at these installations can effectively only be eliminated by closing installations, and so we fully, also, support the secretary of defense's request for two more rounds of base realignment and closure.

Let me close by just touching briefly on our environmental programs. This budget year we're asking for \$1.1 billion to meet our environmental compliance and cleanup requirements at our installations, a funding amount that's been relatively stable for a number of years.

Specifically, we're asking for \$484 million to meet our ongoing compliance commitments. This includes \$46 million in pollution prevention -- again, dollars that will be invested to reduce our hazardous waste streams (ph) and reduce our environmental liabilities and future costs.

We're requesting \$642 million to continue our environmental cleanups at both BRAC and non-BRAC bases. Last year we implemented a new cleanup policy that relies on firm fixed-price performance-based contracts to achieve closure of sites, and employing this new method we've already found that it reduces our cost by nearly 20 percent and we're moving sites to closure three times faster.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, we all recognize that we are operating in challenging financial times and if sequestration takes effect that's going to be even more difficult. We continue to look at every aspect of our operations and aggressively pursue efficiencies to reduce our cost of doing business without sacrificing either readiness or quality of life programs. We will continue to make these strategic investments that have the tangible returns that I talked about and do our part to try to hit the financial obligations of this nation.

I also thank you, again, for your time and look forward to your questions.

CULBERSON:

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

I know that we -- we've all got questions. I'll be as brief as I can to ensure time for my colleagues. But I have to hit on a -- on a couple of things that are particularly pressing in my mind, and highly relevant to the work of this subcommittee.

You have about \$3.9 billion worth of projects. I know the Air Force, Secretary Yonkers, you're presenting about \$3.9 billion worth of recommendations to us today?

YONKERS:

\$3.9 million for military construction, sustainment, restoration and modernization.

CULBERSON:

The result of folks abusing a privilege, like a lot of privileges, lost you here temporarily with this -- the earmark thing, and it's a great example, I think, for all of us to -- I hope the whole subcommittee will work arm in arm. We've just got to fix this. I hope it's just a temporary problem.

For example, I just had -- circling back to military construction, the Army Corps of Engineers came in to see me and they'll probably be -- Arizona may not have this directly, Jeff, but you'll certainly see it, or obviously in Kansas may not be as big a deal, but the -- the -- the Panama Canal -- this is -- I'm going to tie this right back into what we're doing here today, folks, because it just struck me -- I just -- just -- I didn't realize how bad this problem was.

The Panama Canal -- they're about to open the third Panama Canal that will be, in the next 12 months, open for business, and they're going to be able to bring supertankers across the Isthmus of Panama. They're all -- those giant ships -- deeper than 48 feet. The Port of Houston, the Port of New Orleans, all the ports in the Gulf of Mexico -- Mobile might be deeper, I think, but almost all of them are 45 feet or shallower, so I asked the Corps -- how deep are you all?

(UNKNOWN)

(OFF-MIKE)

CULBERSON:

Forty-five feet? So all those giant ships -- how do we bring them into -- how do we bring all that -- all that cargo, all those jobs, all that economic growth into the Gulf of Mexico, and the Army Corps said -- bless you -- Army Corps says, "You can't do it." I said, "We can't do it," I said, "Why?" Because we would have to authorize them -- the Army Corps is only authorized to dredge the Ports of Savannah, the -- New Orleans, Houston, all of them to 45 feet.

So, but it's something we've really got to fix, members of the -- all -- we've really got to fix this. So for public works projects I hope we'd all work together so we could do public works projects for federal, state, or local government that are obviously absolutely transparent and in which we do not increase spending and that we don't, obviously, have any conflict of interest ourselves, because we're dead in the water. We cannot expand any of the ports to handle all that cargo.

Another one that came to mind is, circling right back into the work of this subcommittee, is I had a chance to visit Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and God bless them for the work they're doing. If you guys get a chance to do it, Jeff, when you get to the Senate I hope you'll go see what they're doing at Wright-Patterson. It's extraordinary and highly classified.

But I will say that we all know that the -- and the name of the facility, Secretary Yonkers, it's called -- what is that called out there? The Foreign Material...

YONKERS:

It's the NASIC (ph), and it's the Foreign -- or the Foreign Military Laboratory, in particular...

CULBERSON:

But there's a name for the -- what is it, the Foreign Material Acquisition...

YONKERS:

I thought it was a laboratory, sir.

CULBERSON:

Oh, excuse me. OK. Well, the work that you all do there is extraordinary and unique in the United States. They've got multiple customers.

And remembering that England almost lost the war because of the German U-boat menace in the Gulf, and what finally turned the tables was a -- a German U-boat was partially sunk and the crew got off the ship so fast before it sank and the British were quick enough to go onboard and they captured the Enigma, and the British parliament was able to -- oh, here it is. I'm sorry, here it is. This is out in the open. The Foreign Material Exploitation Lab. Listen carefully to that name.

Now, I really want to make sure we all are focused on this because the testimony we have here before us today is a perfect example of why we've really got to fix this problem to restore a fundamental obligation of the Congress, as -- as stewards of the Treasury, as guardians of the Treasury, and to do so in a way that, obviously we don't want to increase spending; we want to make sure it's transparent and there's no conflict of interest, but we have got a responsibility.

When the British captured that U-boat and captured the Enigma the British parliament was able to invest in a massive new facility to take advantage of that and they broke the German codes and won the war. That's what saved England is because they we're able to intercept Admiral Donitz's messages to the U-boats and send out destroyers exactly where the U-boats were and nail them. That saved England, which won the war.

Now, we're handicapped. We can't help the Air Force. The Air Force -- when is that facility scheduled to be expanded, Secretary Yonkers, in -- at Wright-Patterson?

YONKERS:

Right now, sir, it's in the fiscal year '16...

CULBERSON:

'16.

YONKERS:

... military construction line (ph).

CULBERSON:

So we're sort of an -- as Mr. Moran, who served so many years, and I defer to -- so many of you all have got so many more years experience at this than I do. The extraordinary work -- I hope you've been out there to see it, Jim -- incredible work that they're doing.

But we are in the position, Judge, as you as a -- in the courtroom. I know judges are limited. They have to just sit there passively like spectators with a catcher's mitt and they can only handle with what drops into their lap, and it's just a violation, I think, of everything that we are -- as policy-makers, as stewards of the Treasury our constituents entrust us with this extraordinary privilege to -- to use our good judgment. And as the Good Lord said, if they lie about the big -- if they lie about the little things they'll lie about the big things. Well, conversely, if you can trust us with the big things you can trust us with the smaller ones.

Long conversation leading up to some discussion with the secretary, and I really hope we will all work together, guys, on fixing this so we can do public works projects -- federal, state, or local -- absolutely transparent, no conflict of interest that don't increase spending. Because it's just incredible. If I attempt to move -- if any of us on this committee, for example, for any of the projects that you all are working on attempted -- for example, Mr. Yonkers, I hate to keep picking on the Air Force, but the list that you've given us, Mr. Secretary, if we were to attempt to move a project that you had listed further down to move it up could we do that? That's prohibited by the earmark ban. It just doesn't make sense.

It's highly relevant because the Israelis are going to probably have to deal with Iran sometime in the months ahead, and God bless you all for what you're doing, and I won't say necessarily where it's being done but the extraordinary work that's being done by our men and women in uniform is going to become even more relevant if the Israelis have to take out the Iranian nuclear reactor, and because of the earmark ban we can't, as policy-makers, do what the British parliament did when they captured the Enigma machine. We can't make the policy judgments and move a project up on the list. That's nuts and we've got to fix it.

And I want to ask specifically about, if I could, the -- Mr. Secretary, in -- actually, to each one of you, an open-ended question, and then I'll pass it to my good friend from Georgia. And I just had this -- here we go. One of my big concerns in the hearing that we just had with the -- with the chiefs that really concerns me, and I didn't express it as well as Senator Levin did, and I just want to quote from a -- in today's CQ that Senator Levin, at one of their hearings on Wednesday, said to the -- let's see -- I guess he had -- who did he had in front of him? I'm not sure who he had in front of him, but he said, quote, "I am surprised and disappointed to hear our military commanders are focused on Afghan force size based on what they think might be affordable instead of the number of Afghan security forces they believe will be needed to maintain security. It strikes me as extremely unwise to base decisions on the future size of the Afghan army and police exclusively on projections of future affordability instead of military requirements to secure the gains that have been made at great cost to America," obviously to our soldiers, men and women, "and to prevent a Taliban return to power."

That's one of the things, I wanted to ask each one of you to please comment, to what extent are the recommendations that the Air Force, the Navy, each one of the Army are making to this subcommittee and to the Congress based on what is affordable rather than military requirement and mission? That's a real source of concern.

YONKERS:

In the context of military construction, or...

CULBERSON:

Yes. Obviously, with the sequestration we've got this asteroid entering the atmosphere we've got to deal with, and deal with the mandatory programs are what are really killing us. We've got to make sure we protect our extraordinary defense capability. We've got to deal with sequestration down the road and deal with, obviously, balancing the budget. That's, I hope, going to come out of mandatory, primarily; it needs to.

But to what extent are the recommendations you're making to us here today -- for example, there is no new construction, Mr. Secretary -- Secretary Yonkers. The Air Force is not proposing any new construction. We talked about this in my office. I'm just concerned that there's no -- are we - - are the recommendations you're making driven by what you think is affordable more so than by what our mission requirements are and the needs of the nation's security?

YONKERS:

Well, certainly, you know, the recommendations that -- or the requests that we're making here are reflective of what we're trying to do under the Budget Control Act and \$487 billion of cost reductions. But we think we've fine-tuned it to the point where we've hit on all of the high notes

with regards to meeting the requirements that we have to support our COCOM commanders and support our forces.

Would we like to have more money in the budget to -- to buy more MILCON? Obviously. But right now it's about tightening situations, so I -- I think we've got it right.

CULBERSON:

You're not concerned about risk at this point with this recommendation?

YONKERS:

Not at this point in time. I am not concerned, overly, about risk in our military construction or the SRM program.

CULBERSON:

Did anyone else want to comment, and then I'll pass it on to my friend, Mr. Bishop?

PTANNESTIEL:

Mr. Chairman, I would echo what Mr. Yonkers has said, that this was based -- the budget request is based on the strategic review of meeting our military mission, and what we have put in front of you does meet that mission.

HAMMACK:

Thank you. From the Army's perspective, we looked at quality and capacity, and when we looked across our portfolio and across the list of MILCON requests we looked to spend our money where we had failing facilities, buildings that were in what we call a Q4 condition, or the worst condition where the needed replacement, or where we did not have the capacity that we needed in order to do the primary mission.

And so we rate things on a one to four scale for quality and capacity. So when we prioritized the projects in our list of requests we prioritized those that were correcting quality and capacity issues, which we considered to be most mission critical.

CULBERSON:

Well, I thank you. And I've taken too much time but I'm really exercised (ph), as you can tell. My concern is that our responsibility as legislators is to make sound policy decisions based on our best judgments and I think we've almost, by this -- by the abuse of people in the past, and even the earmark ban, which really is a temporary situation, I hope -- we need to fix it -- we're sort of reduced to the situation of judges where we just have to deal with what's dropped in our lap, and that's very, very frustrating.

Thank you for the indulgence, members, and we're going to pass to Mr. Bishop.

BISHOP:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to thank all of the panel members for your appearance and for your -- for your service. I guess I'll go service by service, starting with the Army.

Ms. Hammack, what types of projects were deferred from the F.Y. '13 program as a result of the force drawdown and how much of an impact did the lack of a finalized brigade combat team structure have on the '13 program? And when the brigade combat team structure is decided do you think that the Army will need to make some changes to its F.Y. '13 program or will the problems be addressed in 2014?

HAMMACK:

The projects that were deferred were primarily barracks or brigade combat team centers, and we deferred those out and will reprioritize them for fiscal year '14. We do not believe that there's anything in the total Army analysis or the force structure change that would have any impact on our fiscal year '13 priorities.

BISHOP:

So you anticipated having to do that in '14 because you don't have a brigade combat team structure in place now?

HAMMACK:

That is correct. And we did not want to be in a position where we built property that would become excess, so we deferred projects, and again, we're going to conduct a gap analysis once a total Army analysis comes out. But at this point in time we do not believe there is anything in the fiscal year '13 budget that would be impacted and we will reevaluate the projects in '14 based upon the force structure decisions.

BISHOP:

Thank you. Can you take a few moments and explain what the Army Facility Strategy 2020 is to the committee and what metrics were used when developing the Army Facility Strategy 2020, and explain how the Army used that strategy when putting together the -- the '13 program?

HAMMACK:

The Facility Strategy 2020 is taking a look at what our capacity is currently and is -- is directly in line with the total Army analysis, so as we are evaluating our future force structure requirements we are evaluating that in concert with the current capacity and availability on installations so that when the force structure analysis is complete we will preserve the most efficient facilities, we will consolidate functions for better space utilization, and then we will demolish failing buildings directly in line with what Secretary Yonkers said, in order to save cost -- those facilities that are costing us more to sustain than is viable. So we will be consolidating operations.

BISHOP:

Thank you, ma'am. I think my time is probably about...

CULBERSON:

(OFF-MIKE)

BISHOP:

OK. Good, good.

CULBERSON:

(OFF-MIKE)

BISHOP:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me move to the Navy and the Marine Corps construction, then. Secretary -- how do you pronounce it? Ptannestiel.

PTANNESTIEL:

Ptannestiel.

BISHOP:

Ptannestiel, approximately 30 percent of the Navy's construction program is for overseas projects. Can you explain the importance of these project requirements? And then I'd like for you to talk about the Homeport Initiative -- what type of progress has been made, and is the goal for reaching -- for E1 to E4 ranks by 2016 a realistic goal, given the fiscal climate that we're in?

PTANNESTIEL:

Certainly, Congressman.

Taking the first question about the overseas MILCON, that is in -- much of that MILCON is in direct support of the combatant commanders' requests there. In Spain, in -- in Djibouti, in Bahrain we are enhancing what the -- the combatant commanders have -- have needed there.

As well, the military -- the construction that is being done overseas, and it's laid out in -- in detail in my written statement, is supporting different missions and different platforms that will be moved around, both in -- in Europe and in Japan.

BISHOP:

We're looking a lot at the -- to improve the quality of life of the junior sailors that are living on ships. Given the reduction in end strength that is coming, are you having to reevaluate the Homeport Ashore Initiative?

PTANNESTIEL:

The Homeport Ashore Initiative is -- is an attempt to get the -- the younger sailors off of the ships and have everyone have a bed on -- on shore. And we had anticipated that that would take until about 2016 to do that; we are on track to do that still. When we have finished it will have created about 5,000 spaces for the sailors to get off of the ships and give them a bed ashore, so we are on track for that.

BISHOP:

OK. And the final question is, the United States has consistently taken a position that the realignment at Okinawa is contingent on progress toward the Fatima replacement facility. Now that that replacement facility and the move have been delinked, is this the beginning of the Marine Corps moving away from a new facility in Okinawa?

PTANNESTIEL:

Not at all. We are still moving towards the -- the Marines have a presence -- an operational presence on -- on Guam. That's still our intention and discussions are ongoing related...

BISHOP:

Still committed to the relocation in Guam as opposed to other locations like Australia?

PTANNESTIEL:

We are looking at the entire Pacific posture in a lot of different areas, but Guam will be one place where we will move Marines -- something fewer, perhaps, than we had originally thought, probably fewer than 5,000 Marines, but we will still have a presence of Marines on Guam.

BISHOP:

OK. We hadn't been able to confirm that by -- from anybody in DOD. We've been getting all of the information from the Japanese press...

PTANNESTIEL:

The...

BISHOP:

... and so we try to get some...

PTANNESTIEL:

Well, let me confirm that we are still intending to move Marines to Guam. It will be in the order of 5,000 Marines.

BISHOP:

But you don't know about -- you said you had lowered that number, which is what they've been reporting in the Japanese press, and possibly disperse them to other locations like Australia throughout the Pacific.

PTANNESTIEL:

We have announced that there will be Marines moving to Australia, and so it's -- it's really a question of -- of Marines coming off of Okinawa and -- and where in the Pacific, in a number of different places, where will they be? And those are decisions that we're -- we're making now, and then there are discussions going on with the Japanese government about...

BISHOP:

But you don't have the plan finalized for the construction for the Pacific because...

PTANNESTIEL:

That's absolutely the case, yes.

BISHOP:

Mr. Chairman, thank you.

CULBERSON:

Thank you, Mr. Bishop.

And of course, if it was the considered judgment of the Congress that actually we needed a facility in Australia we couldn't do that, could we? We've got to fix that problem.

Mr. Carter? I recognize my friend from Texas.

CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And let's don't pick on judges anymore today.

Secretary Hammack, General Odierno met with us a while back and he -- I believe it was last week, in fact -- and he said the Army -- their \$3 billion, \$4 billion, and \$6 billion request for MILCON support is for our most critical needs, and I understand that. I understand the drawdown and what we've got to do. I'm not especially happy about it. I worry about our end strength, but I certainly respect it.

But is it prudent to ignore current MILCON needs in hope of a BRAC solution? And one of the things that you just said is -- is -- I think I picked it up. Maybe I missed it; I was listening for it. We haven't actually completed the '05 BRAC yet have we, completely?

HAMMACK:

The Army has completed an '05 BRAC, yes.

CARTER:

But the overall BRAC process for all the services is not complete. And I think you said -- someone said something about \$100 million for the '05 BRAC.

HAMMACK:

What is complete is the construction process and the moving of people. What is not complete in this BRAC round, nor any of the other BRAC rounds, is the closure, and the closure...

CARTER:

And that's the environmental impact that -- that my friend Mr. Farr is always talking about in California?

HAMMACK:

Absolutely. That's the environmental cleanup that is a tail -- the prior BRAC rounds had a much larger environmental cleanup bill associated with them than the BRAC 2005 round.

CARTER:

Just from remembering what my friend, Mr. Farr, has talked about, it's almost a never-ending story in some places, right? I mean, it just...

HAMMACK:

It can be a challenge...

(CROSSTALK)

CARTER:

... almost, right?

HAMMACK:

We have a program to clean up, but as you're cleaning up you can find things that are unexpected that could change your cleanup plan.

CARTER:

For me, this is a military construction committee but it -- it's really, when we're looking at the military I view the Defense Committee as the big-picture warfighters and I view us as the people-protectors. And at Fort Hood, at least, we have -- we have -- we have some of our barracks that are substandard and they don't meet the goals that we've set for ourselves in -- in housing our soldiers. And so as these warfighters come back and, at Fort Hood, at least, we're in, like, a fifth or sixth deployment of many of the troops at Fort Hood. I mean, these guys have done their job.

And as they come back some of them are becoming second-class citizens, yet they've been promised that these barracks are going to be -- and it's not a big -- big push, but it's something that I wonder if that's really prudent for the morale of our troops, these people who have given us 10 years of their lives fighting these wars for us to have them come back and still be in substandard housing.

And is it actually a cost savings over the long run, because at least from my experience in the private sector when I used to build things, every year they get more expensive. So if you don't build it this year it's going to cost more next year, it's going to cost even more the next year after that, and unless something really strange happens it never seems to drop down a whole lot, it just always seems to get more. And do you feel this is prudent? Because what you're really doing is passing the ball, or laterally the ball from our current reduction to the BRAC process.

The BRAC process doesn't always save us any money. In fact, sometimes it costs us money. Would you argue with that?

HAMMACK:

I'm going to let the BRAC process question be answered by my colleague, Dr. Robyn, but...

CARTER:

Dr. Robyn would be fine with me.

HAMMACK:

As it goes for barracks, we have two processes. One is new construction and the other is using our restoration and modernization. And many of our older barracks that have gone through the refurbishment we're finding our soldiers like better because we're taking a room that used to be designed for two people to live in it and it's being reconverted to a one-person room. So they have a little more space in the older barracks than they do in some of the newer ones.

CARTER:

We have some of those barracks.

HAMMACK:

And so we do have a program to continue to restore and modernize our barracks. What we have delayed is some of the new construction because we don't want to build excess capacity. So we've looked and we got racking and stacking and building a list of barracks projects, and we're fixing those that are in the worst condition or replacing those that are in the worst condition first and working our way through.

CARTER:

And I ask the question because I've talked to soldiers who have come back from deployment and they've said, I had better quarters in Baghdad than they got at Fort Hood. So I raise that issue for that (inaudible).

ROBYN:

Can I answer your question...

CARTER:

Yes, ma'am, please.

ROBYN:

... on BRAC? All BRAC rounds yield savings. The payback period is different. And in my opening statement I distinguished between the 2005 and the previous four rounds, and there's a lot of misunderstanding about that.

The first four rounds focused, by design, on eliminating excess capacity and generating savings. The 2005 round was different by design. And you heard Katherine describe the Army transformation. That was why it was different. It was set out to be a BRAC round that was largely about transformation and largely Army.

So the payback period on the 2005 round -- there are savings -- \$4 billion a year -- but the payback period is a longer one than for the earlier BRAC rounds, which paid back within two to three years. For the 2005 round it's -- it's -- we won't -- we won't cross that line until 2018.

CARTER:

I hope so (inaudible) but I'll take your word for it.

I think my time is up, Mr. Chairman.

CULBERSON:

Thank you, Mr. Carter.

I'm going to recognize the gentlelady from Minnesota, Ms. McCollum?

MCCOLLUM:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I wanted to thank you all for being here today, and as has been pointed out, thank you for the service to our country.

Our drive to achieve energy security by decreasing our dependence on -- on foreign oil is an issue Americans all agree on, and I know that it's part of the mission of the Department of Defense. And, you know, it even becomes more important -- we've all watched gasoline prices

go up, oil prices -- we watch what happens with -- with fuel oil in my part of the world. As oil is sold on an open market it's supply and demand. Doesn't make any difference who generates it, who's pumping it, who's refining it. It's supply and demand for the cost. So I think making a long-term investment in clean domestic energy makes a lot of sense for a lot of reasons.

There was a Pew report on national security, energy, and climate, and it highlights the Department of Defense and the work that it's doing to increase spending on renewable energy investments by 300 percent between 2006 and 2009. The report also goes on to say that these investments will reach more than \$10 billion annually by 2030. That's a lot of money.

But there's a reason why you're going that way, and so I'll -- probably won't have the time to hear from everyone, so I would ask Secretary Hammack, your leadership in this has been outstanding, and the Army is the largest energy-user in the federal government, so when you make a difference you make a difference to taxpayers in reducing energy costs and keeping things down lower as well as making our national security objective of using less foreign oil move forward. So in your testimony you discussed the Energy Initiative Task Force and how it's going to make the Army a leader in the use of renewable energy, so I'd like you to elaborate a little more on that, but I'd also like you to point out to this committee how this is nothing new to the Obama administration, that this has been a decision that was taken by the commander in chief of a previous administration, the Pentagon has seen the need to do this because it's -- it's part of the Pentagon's mission. This isn't, you know, trying to be green or friendly. This is trying to be smart, and efficient, and a good use of the taxpayers' dollars.

So could you maybe give us just a little bit of the history of how you've come to be here? And the other -- with the energy efficiency program -- and the other thing that I've seen in public entities and our schools, they make the investment, they are recouping the dollars. So even though we're putting a lot of dollars in, if you have a cost-benefit analysis you could share with the committee I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

HAMMACK:

Certainly. Thank you for your comments. The Army has been working hard on this and for a long time.

The Energy Initiative Task Force was stoop up to augment our garrison staff to help come up with large-scale energy projects over 10 megawatts. We've come to the realization that that's something that is beyond the capability of the garrison staff, who's focused on working with soldiers and families and providing them the quality of life and running the garrison. So installing and developing a large- scale renewable energy project is beyond their capabilities.

The Energy Initiative Task Force currently has about 10 projects that they're reviewing that could generate up to one Gigawatt of energy. Currently we're scoping the projects and the intent is for those to go out to bid to the private sector for the -- using the authorities Congress has given us -- enhanced use lease or power purchase arrangements -- so that we are not coming to Congress and asking you for the \$7 billion investment that it would take to put the renewable

energy project on the Army installations, we're going to the private sector. And it's got to make financial sense for the private sector; it's got to make financial sense for our nation. It has to make good financial sense for the Army.

These projects are going to give us more energy security by relying on natural resources. It is going to give us the ability to reduce risk and reduce vulnerability. It's going to also incent the private sector to invest in American-made alternative energy equipment because it is going to have a requirement to comply with the Buy American Act, so the -- we put out a multiple award task order contract for \$7 billion. An RFP was released last week and we are receiving responses right now.

So it's a way of leveraging the authorities you've given us to do what's right for our nation and what's right for energy security.

MCCOLLUM:

Mr. Chair, I think that this would be something that would be interesting to find out what more we can do with thermal (ph) energy and that. I am not anti, you know -- oil's going to part of the mix, but it needs to be part of the -- the mix in a very smart way. So I thank you for your work.

CULBERSON:

Thank you, Ms. McCollum.

And in particular, natural gas is a terrific option. The United States has got vast reserves of natural gas and it can be burned safely and cleanly, and basically in a -- in a way that -- in fact, it puts out almost more water vapor than anything else, so I'd love to see you guys moving more to natural gas.

Yes, ma'am. Did you want to comment on that?

ROBYN:

(inaudible) because I think there's a lot of misunderstanding about why we -- why the Defense Department is putting up solar arrays and wind turbines. Over the weekend Washington, D.C. lost 9/11 tower -- its 9/11 system for a half hour. It was a Pepco issue, and the backup generator failed, the -- and two other backup systems failed. So for 30 minutes over the weekend Washington, D.C. did not have 9/11 service.

We have that same concern about our military installations. They're 99 percent reliant on the commercial grid. Our backup system is generators and diesel fuel. We need to do better than that.

Renewables doesn't get us there entirely, but that's the beginning, and if you combine that with storage and micro-grid technology that gives us the ability to continue critical operations for weeks or months at a time if -- if the grid goes down. That's why we're doing renewable energy.

CULBERSON:

Thank you, ma'am.

I'd recognize my...

CARTER:

Would the gentleman yield...

CULBERSON:

Certainly.

CARTER:

... question just a minute?

CULBERSON:

Certainly.

CARTER:

I have a question that I -- I'm concerned about, just what you just said. What do you envision has alternative energy -- envision it to be at the base -- at the established base level in the country? You don't envision erecting solar panels to power our soldiers in the field as they fight wars, or certainly not going to put up wind towers...

(CROSSTALK)

CARTER:

... how are you going to keep the enemy from knowing your -- where you are, you know, putting up a wind tower?

ROBYN:

We're doing them in both, both tactical -- for tactical reasons and on our installations, and the strategy is very different, and third party financing refers to what we're doing on our installations. But I'll let one of my service counterparts talk about what we're doing in theater.

CARTER:

I just don't -- I have -- we actually have more wind towers in Texas than any state in the union...

PTANNESTIEL:

Congressman...

CARTER:

... and I can promise you that you can go to the plains of Texas and you could see a wind tower for 200 miles. Now, how are you going to tell -- keep the enemy from knowing where your troops are if your power source is going to be wind towers?

PTANNESTIEL:

Well, we'll move off of wind towers and talk about some of what we're doing with solar power, where the Marine Corps has found and developed a number of applications for solar power that they've actually brought into theater, as has the Army. And so a number of applications that are not about being green in any way; rather, they're being more effective in their warfighting. They have to carry fewer batteries because they have these small solar arrays that charge the batteries. They can...

CARTER:

I can understand that. I can understand small solar arrays like you can use to charge cell phones...

PTANNESTIEL:

Correct.

CARTER:

... things like that, radios -- small radios.

PTANNESTIEL:

But in a wide variety of different technologies that have become now more standard than they were even -- even five years ago.

CULBERSON:

If I could -- excuse me -- we're going to lose -- Mr. Moran has a 4 o'clock -- has to leave at 4, and Mr. Yoder graciously agreed to allow Mr. Moran to go first. And we'll circle back to this, Judge. I just want to make sure Jim's got a chance to ask questions.

I recognize my friend from Virginia?

MORAN:

(inaudible), Mr. Chairman, and I'd be the first to recognize, it's no big deal if you lose me, but I do want to take the -- thank you, Mr. Yoder -- I do want to take the opportunity to say something nice.

We could have had chaos in Northern Virginia in terms of traffic congestion for 200,000 commuters due to a BRAC-related building. But we now have very thoughtful, responsible traffic management and I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Ranking Member Bishop, and your excellent staff, and particularly Mr. Washington, and Ms. Hammack, and particularly Dr. Robyn, and her staff, John Conda (ph), who used to work for the former chair of the committee, Mr. Edwards, and Colonel Troy Moore (ph). Look, your team really made it happen, and it's -- you know, oftentimes our questions are critically oriented. All I can do is to heap praise upon you, and I'm not sure all of my constituents realize what you did, but boy, you saved the day. So thank you very much for that.

I have only one other question, and it's not meant to be critical, but DOD has anti-force protection standards that are at variance with GSA. They're more expensive, and in some cases they're somewhat less rational. In some cases it's as though because one building or agency is near an earthquake fault line every other building in the country has to meet the same standards to protect against an earthquake falling -- you know, we've got a lot of civilian agencies that might also be under attack but GSA manages their force protection.

So I wonder if you would just tell us for the record what you're doing to come more in line with GSA to exercise some judgment to save some money and to enable metropolitan areas like mine, Mr. Farr's, and probably others from having to -- rather, from not being able to compete when you have to have, you know, 82-foot setback from the sidewalk, you can't have parking underneath, you can't have any kind of public access, you can't be near a metro station, and so

on. Those things don't work in a metropolitan area, and I trust we're making progress on -- in that area.

Dr. Robyn?

ROBYN:

I think we are. I don't want to pop the -- the cork yet on the champagne, but our standards are not different just from GSA's; they're different from the entire rest of the federal government...

MORAN:

Basically the whole world, I think...

ROBYN:

The rest of the federal government uses Interagency Security Committee, ISC, standards that were developed by a 21-agency group led by the Department of Homeland Security, updated in 2010, and they are -- they are sensibly risk-based, so the standards for each building are based on the risk faced by that individual building based on location, number of employees, symbolic value, critical missions. Our standards are different in that there is -- it is -- it is one- size-fits all. So for even buildings that are not high-risk we require certain minimum -- minimum standards.

So we have been going through a fairly elaborate process within the department -- began with six very detailed case studies, what -- what -- what's the difference in outcome, depending on whether you use ISC or DOD standards? We are letting the -- the -- the security folks have the -- the final say. I think it's a good -- it's a good process. We focused initially on leased -- leased space. Once we make a decision on whether to adopt the ISC approach on leased space we will then look at buildings within -- buildings on an installation.

Right now we treat a building in the middle of Fort Hood the same as a building in downtown D.C. We don't treat them differently in terms of their requirements, and that seems -- it seems irrational.

So I think it's -- it's an important area. The costs are significant, obviously. You know, there are - there are -- it's a policy judgment as well as a technical one. But I think we're -- we're -- I think we're making good progress.

MORAN:

Thank you very much.

And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CULBERSON:

Certainly, Mr. Moran.

And I want to reiterate to all of you, if any member of this committee -- frankly, any member of Congress, but particularly this subcommittee -- contacts you, they've got a problem with a -- with a facility you're building, that request certainly is as though it is coming from me, because each member's district they know them better than -- than certainly any of us do, and I'm -- I'm really glad that it worked out for Mr. Moran. Thank you for working with him.

And let's be careful. Jim, ride herd on it. Let us show what else we need to do.

MORAN:

Well, I really am appreciative...

CULBERSON:

Thank you.

Mr. Yoder, from Kansas?

YODER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thanks to all of you for being here today. This is certainly an important hearing, as we deal with the critical component of our responsibilities to our nation's military, our men and women in service, the facilities we utilize, and so this committee does some really important work and special work, and I'm pleased to be part of it.

It's also a time, as we determine how we're going to solve our national debt crisis, that we have to look at where we're reducing expenditures, and I want to commend all of you for the tough, tough work that goes into a lot of the BRAC decisions that are made and a lot of the heartbreak in communities when things change and, you know, in many regards the things you've done in -- related to BRAC have been held up in state legislatures and local communities as really models of how things can be done in a way to reduce expenditures. And that's the way we hope we can go.

And so as we're dealing with the importance of -- of supporting our military, men and women in service, and reducing spending, and we're also looking on these committees at how we can help promote and support the private economy and job creation to get the economy rolling again, which ultimately, those jobs that are created fund the ability for us to be able to fund our military. So it's all kind of intertwined.

And I note in a lot of the expenditures that we are encumbering related to our operations here, the BRAC are mostly dedicated to environmental cleanup surplus real property in preparation for transfer of titles to non-DOD entities. That certainly is a consumption of a lot of energy and time, and we have such an area in Kansas called the Sunflower Army Ammunition Plant you may be familiar with that was not part of BRAC but was closed prior to that, or outside of the BRAC commission, that has had to endure environmental cleanup in -- in -- probably in many cases this is a situation where you're partnering with private industry, and ultimately to transfer title, as both sides work together to finance the cleanup, and it's one of those great, I think, examples where public-private partnerships work, and our goal, ultimately, is to get places like Sunflower all across the country back into a -- a situation where it can be put back into productivity. Homes, schools, parks, whatever that are planned for these areas, what a great thing, and we can turn these into job-creating areas.

So, knowing that that's all of our goal, I wanted to ask you some questions about how that's been going across the country, and certainly it's been a -- been a challenge locally, that we have some - - some challenges regarding the EPA, and when we get into agreements with private industry and we get into agreement with local communities to clean up sites based upon assumptions, I think, Ms. Hammack -- is that -- there are -- I think your statement was there are unforeseen challenges that occur later down the road.

Some of these are unforeseen and then some of them are challenges that are created because of an unexpected decision that a regulatory agency might make -- not just a challenge, but that -- that was maybe unforeseen when something was uncovered but maybe a different regulatory approach. And we deal with this in the private sector, in the public sector, is this sort of regulatory uncertainty.

I'm sure all of us here have talked to small business owners and folks. I just talked to a whole group of folks in waste water treatment that are dealing with -- they mentioned specifically regulatory uncertainty from the EPA.

So we're trying to do everything we can here to create regulatory certainty so that the economy can recover. This is an area where I think we need to work together to find a solution, because I - - I guess I want to know, is this happening elsewhere in other areas in the country where later decisions that -- by the EPA or other regulatory agencies are coming in to dramatically increase the expected cost of the cleanup, thereby making the public-private partnership and the financing of that essentially unworkable, and now the military branch is out of the resources that they had expected to pay, the private industry is out of the resources they expected to pay, and in many cases we have an unusable plot of land that is -- we've already put good money into, and the question is, do we continue to throw good money after bad, and what do you -- what -- what can we -- is this -- is this a prevalent problem across the country? What's the cost to taxpayers when

these after-the-fact regulations come in after agreements have been made and that sort of thing? What can we do in -- in -- in Congress to combat this? And how do we fix these particular situations?

HAMMACK:

Well, let me answer that in question. First of all, is it a prevalent problem? We probably have a handful of these occurring right now where the regulatory rules have changed while we're in the process of cleanup.

So we have a plan for cleanup that is well underway. It is funded, it is planned, it is scheduled, and then there's a new set of regulations that are dropped in and all of a sudden we have to go to a plan B and completely change.

We're also having issues where regulatory agencies are revisiting situations where environmental cleanup had been complete, had been closed out, and they want us to go backwards and revisit the problem.

So the question is, how much of this recirculation can you do? It would be great if when you started a project under one set of rules you were able to complete it under that same set of rules. I do not know if that is possible, and certainly from an environmental perspective I think we discover new things every day or find things in our environment that are causing health hazards or other problems to the environment. I don't know if there is a solution.

What is the cost to taxpayers? That's hard to determine. There is a cost to taxpayers when you're operating in an uncertain regulatory environment where the regulations change and you might -- we have gone in and followed the plan completely; the regulatory agencies have checked us every step along the way, and we get to the closing table -- the closing desk -- and they hand over a new set of regulations, which is essentially start over at the beginning.

That is not good for the economy. That is not good for the taxpayer. And I question whether it's good for the environment at that point in time.

With that, I'll let Terry Yonkers comment.

YONKERS:

You read my mind.

First of all, EPA has done some unbelievable and miraculous things, and so have the state agencies that regulate air and water and hazardous waste. In my mind, and building on what Katherine was talking about, there's -- there's a couple of things that -- that have kind of gotten out of balance here.

First of all, the processes that we follow are tremendously complex and elaborate, and they don't necessarily lead you to a quick decision. And it's more of an art than it is a science. As Katherine is articulating, you may find out that you think you've got a site -- a groundwater TCE plume or something -- pretty well characterized only to find out that when you -- when you put in another well somewhere or somebody starts looking at the -- at the water that you're drinking that you've got, you know, TCE in the water, so you -- you have to deal with it. So site characterization is also the problem.

But I think one of the things that we're seeing here, and it's going to have a fairly substantial impact, I think, are the changing of the standards. So, for example, EPA right now is contemplating a change in the TCE standard from five parts per billion to one part per billion.

If that happens there is going to be a substantial cost growth in our environmental cleanup programs. Our guy's back-of-the-napkin looks like \$2 billion or \$3 billion. We've already spent \$25 billion in our environmental cleanup program to date. So where it will go, and -- and it is kind of like a frustration that if we had a set of rules that we could -- that we could count on and move towards that end point we could get there faster with greater certainty.

YODER:

Well, I certainly appreciate your -- your comments, and I appreciate the -- the -- it seems like the combined frustration many of us feel.

Mr. Chairman, these are examples of our own -- we -- we deal often in our communities with complaints about regulatory agencies making it harder for our small businesses to create jobs. This is an example of -- of one hand of the federal government driving up the cost of another area of the federal government, which comes back to this committee that we have to pay for.

And so we have land around the country that could be put into a usable format, put people to work, build houses, put on the tax rolls, growing the economy, that we have after-the-fact regulations coming in that essentially make it impossible for these folks to plan. They're partnered with private agency -- private businesses to clean up the sites in an agreement that cost will be covered in a certain way, that now there's a whole new cost factor that nobody knew about when they went into the site. The site hasn't changed; the regulations have changed, or -- or someone's come in later and said, "Hey, we should have brought this up."

And so ultimately this affects our national debt, it affects the -- the ability for these folks to get their job done in a timely fashion, and it affects the economy because we can't get these pieces of property back into usable form. So I'm frustrated. I think that this is something that ought to be of paramount importance for Congress to look at, and it's -- it's just useful for me to know this is a common challenge and one that we need to get a hold of here in Congress.

HAMMACK:

I might want to add that we are in dialogue with the EPA voicing our concerns very loudly, and, matter of fact, tomorrow I have several EPA regulators coming in, and it is a joint with the Air Force because we're seeing some of the -- the same challenges on a particular environmental...

YODER:

Well, let's work together and try to fix this.

HAMMACK:

Thank you.

YODER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CULBERSON:

That's really interesting. I was just double-checking with Sarah (ph) to find out if we could do anything in our bill specific to that facility and we cannot because of the earmark ban -- something we have to fix.

A public works project that in our -- you, you know, obviously identified a sound policy reason. There's a real problem here. The EPA's, like you said, left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing. Another great example of why we have really got to fix this so we can do public works project, transparent, no conflict of interest, don't increase spending.

Anyway, I'm just on a tear this week because I -- I'm so upset about the Army Corps of Engineers, about what I've discovered with the Air Force and these incredible facilities with great opportunities dropped in our lap and we can't make a policy decision to move things up on the list. We can't help your deal in Kansas either, so we'll hopefully work on that together.

Mr. Farr, my good friend from California?

FARR:

Thank you, Mr. -- I've been on this committee longer than anybody -- I think 12 years now -- and been through this, and frankly, it's really difficult to change these regulations. A lot of them are Congress-driven.

What I did was created what we call the Smart Team, so we got all the regulators in one room and they went out and looked at the site and there, on the spot, decided what was going to be done. So once you had that plan it didn't take a lot of, you know, meetings, and then you released that plan and you've got everybody saying, essentially, "If you do this it's a green light and we can give you the permit." So I think that's a faster way to get it done than trying to rewrite the regulations, but I -- I think we need to keep pushing on it.

Mr. Chairman, I know you -- how much you and I love our daughters and appreciate them, and I'd just like you to know that this is National Women's History Month, and today we see history in this committee. Never before has there been three women in such powerful positions.

And I congratulate you and congratulate the president for making wise decisions in putting you in those positions...

(CROSSTALK)

CULBERSON:

Because the smart man knows that women actually run the world anyway, so we're...

FARR:

Well, our daughters run our lives, so...

CULBERSON:

... true.

FARR:

I also note that, you know, everyone of you have the word "environment" in your titles, and three of you have the word "energy," and we've had a lot of discussions here about environment and energy. And I want to -- I want to drill down -- I -- I -- I think I've been through more BRAC issues than any member of Congress -- the biggest base ever closed, most issues of cleanup, every single thing you can imagine. We're not very far along and that closure happened in '93.

The only probably good thing about it was that it trained our new secretary of defense, who was my predecessor, about base closure, because if you'll hear him talk about Fort Ord, and -- and he handed it off to me. And I want to just say a couple things, one on the cleanup, and this is -- the testimony entered (ph) accordingly on last week, and before the Budget Committee, and Mr. Blumenauer was asking questions and his response was, frankly, the only way to ultimately achieve savings when you do BRAC rounds is to be able to have the cleanup and do it

expeditiously (ph) so communities can reuse the property and not be stuck with holding the property that can't be reused.

The problem is, that's the last thing you want to do. That mission statement of what your responsibilities are does not talk about environmental cleanup; it talks about preparing warfighters, and providing lift, and getting -- getting to theater, and we trained (ph).

So what happens is in the budget priorities it's the last one, and I would like to compliment you. At least you got a little bit more money in this year for the BRAC.

But I'm also a little bit worried by what I see and hear in this committee. It sounds like you're approaching this sequestration process by pre-doing BRAC. We'll just take the FYDP list, then we'll not implement it.

First of all, we have to decide whether we're going to do BRAC, not you -- not the department. If we are going to do BRAC then we -- your responsibility is to make recommendations to the president as to what ought to be in the commission, as to what ought to be closed, realigned, or -- or reinvested in.

And it seems that your -- your delaying the FYDP list. I mean, I'm very upset about that because, frankly, you know, you've delayed a barracks project -- the DLI. We're not going to give up training -- you're not going to close the Defense Language Institute. It's just not going to happen.

I went there one before and learned all the reasons why we shouldn't happen, and that was before we even realized how important languages are (ph). So I'm concerned that -- that you're using -- you're -- you're administratively doing a pre-BRAC before Congress has even gotten around to it, and I -- and I resent that.

And I want to -- I want to ask my friend Dorothy Robyn, Dr. Robyn -- I think you're one of the outstanding human beings in public service. You've really spent of life of committing to really professional -- but I want to know, because you have the ability to do this, do you intend to reevaluate the manner in which we use the BRAC -- the COBRA model? Is that going to be used again?

I mean, the problem with the COBRA model: one, there's no transparency. It's totally subjective. It's just numbers. It can't put any value, and that's what's happened in the past when the commission -- for example, the Defense Language Institute, suggests that we just move it, and the -- in the -- I guess the COBRA model says, yes, you're going to save money, but when you found that none of the faculty would move and you found that there was no capacity to taking it in what you could (ph) -- there wasn't the water, there wasn't the infrastructure. I mean, it was all these things that aren't measured in the COBRA model.

And it seems to me that why we get into so much trouble in the -- in that process is because we rely on this damn procedure to give -- just think that a computer can -- can tell us the best judgment. Now, perhaps there's merit in having some of that, but the using it so strongly and defending it, I think, is all wrong.

So I want to know if you're going to continue to use that. In fact, I asked that last week in the hearing with Comptroller Robert Hale and he said to ask you when you got here, so I hope he told you you were going to be hit with this.

ROBYN:

OK. Let me respond first to your -- your point about doing a pre-BRAC. I don't think we're not -- I mean, we're in a very constrained budget environment. We have to cut \$259 billion over the -- over the FYDP. And if you look historically, MILCON drops disproportionately when -- when there are cuts in the defense budget.

We are taking cuts in force structure. We're reducing force structure. Given that, it makes sense to pause to look and see how those force structure cuts are going to play out before we embark on a lot of new MILCON.

Now, force structure is -- that's the major reason we're asking for -- for more BRAC rounds, is because there are going to be cuts and we want to cut the tail as well as the -- while we're cutting tooth. But we're not holding back on MILCON waiting for BRAC. We're waiting to see how the force structure cuts play out.

You probably know more about -- about COBRA than -- than I do. I think it is a tool for comparing alternatives. It's not a -- I mean, the major criticism is that it -- it -- the number that it generates for what BRAC is going to cost is not a budget-quality number, and people tend to treat it that way. It's merely a tool for comparing alternatives.

And it may not be -- I mean, GAO, actually -- I've been reading all the back GAO reports on BRAC and they -- they defend it. They say it's a reasonable approach, which is about as positive as GAO gets...

FARR:

... my concern isn't that you don't use it as part of your tool in your tool -- BRAC decisions. I think it's too heavily relied on...

ROBYN:

Yes.

FARR:

... because what you miss in that is all the -- and they are difficult to measure -- the quality of, for example -- you know, we put together, because I've been through all this BRAC, of how to get smart, this Team Monterey.

ROBYN:

Yes.

FARR:

None of the services knew what the others were doing. These are all services in Monterey County. I want to give you all a brochure.

This is remarkable. I have seen more reform in that county. We had no idea that they were all there. We had no idea all the capacity they had.

When all of the heads of all the missions got in a room they couldn't believe it. They said, you have it here next door? We've been trying to get access to that for years.

We just did a whole changeover on the computer thing for DLI that would have cost you millions of dollars. It was all done in house with just borrowing the talent that was, you know, (inaudible). And if you did this in every county in the United States...

ROBYN:

No, it's a -- I've asked OEA to do -- to replicate that other places. It was a model.

FARR:

What's happening now, it's now becoming a recruiting tool, so instead of just -- I mean, a recruiting tool for the private sector. They're moving in and saying, (inaudible) you had all these assets here? We want to be next to you. So I'm...

ROBYN:

I think your...

FARR:

... I think you have to put this kind of a value into your assessment as to what -- what we're going to -- how we're going to close and where we're going to move people and...

ROBYN:

The key thing are the criteria, and those are set out in statute. Four of them are military -- have to do with military value, including cost of operations, and four of them have to do with things other than military value.

I think there is a tension between trying to make the process transparent and auditable, which -- for which you want to use some sort of a tool like COBRA, and then on the other hand, you want to take into account a lot of things which don't lend themselves well to -- don't reduce well to numbers. So I think there -- there's a tension there.

But I think the key are the -- the criteria. And we put forth the same criteria that -- that Congress modified last year. You haven't gotten the bill yet, but you'll get it soon. And, you know, maybe - - maybe that's -- maybe that's something worth looking at.

FARR:

Well, we'll look forward to that, and I'm -- I'm going to be working on it.

I want to ask two other questions -- one about cleanup and one about energy. I mean, having stated what you've heard in this room and -- and what the secretary said, it warrants that we put some more money into cleanup now. You can't shortchange cleanup on the eve of asking Congress for another BRAC round...

ROBYN:

Yes.

FARR:

... because every one of us who have been shortchanged in cleanup are going to say, "Hell no. Don't do another BRAC round. Make sure they spend money on it right." You'd be coming in right -- I don't know what it was -- \$26 million more this year than last year? I mean, I have to thank you for doing that because it's...

ROBYN:

Yes.

FARR:

... the first time we've had an increase. But \$26 million for these -- I mean, it is -- it's embarrassing. And you have communities like, you know, Fort Ord, and 28,000 acres that still has a significant amount of land to be cleaned up. It's cost \$100 million to do it because we waited so long and we had to go through all these regulatory process. But it's not clean and the base was closed in '93.

So 20 years later we're not -- we're not there yet, and that's the kind of message that I think I'm hearing from a lot of my other colleagues. You know, where you had the Smart Team, where you got in there and -- course, Smart Team didn't do with UXOs. Had to do with all the other kinds of cleanups.

But if we put UXOs and -- and -- and all the other kind of cleanups together and figure out what the real cost is and start asking for that money, that's where you're going to build some credibility for BRAC. But without it...

ROBYN:

I think that's a fair point.

FARR:

And we need -- and I -- and I really want you to figure out how we can get some more money for -- for the -- for that account. Sitting behind me is my staff, Rochelle Dornatt, and she's the world expert on unexploded ordinances. We've even created a caucus here in Congress, and we're trying to make sure that we can do this in a modern way.

ROBYN:

Congressman Farr, you weren't here for my opening statement, but I did talk about our terrific new UXO technology, which I think will allow us to save billions of dollars in UXO cleanup, which means we'll be able to do UXO cleanup faster.

FARR:

Well, I've suggested to the Naval Postgraduate School, because we have such a big cleanup at Fort Ord, which is right next door, that they actually implement a course in UXO technology and cleanup, because that's where they're trying it all out. It's amazing.

ROBYN:

That's a good idea. Well, the gentleman who runs the program that came up with that, SERDP and ESTCP, Jeff Marcus, he is at the Naval Postgraduate School this week talking about some other stuff, but that's a good -- that's a good conversation to have.

FARR:

Well, they're looking at how to come up with an academic curriculum...

ROBYN:

Yes.

FARR:

... that could warrant...

ROBYN:

That's great.

FARR:

... academic credits.

Let me just close, and Katherine Hammack, probably, a couple of issues. In discovering the assets in our district we discovered -- we knew about them, but -- I mean, I knew about them but they didn't know about them -- there's two properties. One is Fort Hunter Liggett, which is now under the command of the Army Reserve. It's the largest Army Reserve installation in the United States. And next door to it is Camp Roberts, under the command of the National Guard. Obviously these aren't the first people you speak to, but that Camp Roberts is the largest West Coast training facility for the -- West Coast training facility for the -- between them it's over 205,000 acres.

I mean, if you look at military properties -- training properties -- that's got to rank right up there near the top, and they're right next to each other. Now they're starting to talk to each other.

And I have a couple of issues there. One is that I think that Camp Roberts, which is probably the most forgotten base, and that's probably why they gave it to the National Guard, and now but

SATCOM (ph) is right in the middle of it. And SATCOM (ph) is there because that's a geophysical spot -- you're not going to move that or close that. It's going to be there if -- you've got to have a -- you know, a secured communications around the world you're going to need that relay station.

And it's right in the middle of Camp -- what we're doing is trying to improve Camp Roberts so it can be -- serve the base -- the needs of SATCOM (ph), because, you know, there's no meals, there's not -- it's in the -- these bases are both in the middle of nowhere. You've really used Fort Hunter Liggett, the Army Reserve, as a test site for your new energy initiative, and I thank you for that.

I think you ought to use Camp Roberts, which is right next door, as kind of just a -- a scope (ph) works of energy savings, because it's -- it's in a -- it's weather perfect for you. It's very accessible. You know, there's a freeway going right through it even in the middle of nowhere.

But I think if the Army and the -- and the -- and the Defense Department's really going to get into these savings, and it was all stated -- and Ms. McCollum stated it really well about being the biggest to -- to -- to you is -- is energy cost. The Air Force, I know, it's just huge when the price of gasoline goes up; it's just outrageous.

So, I mean, a one-cent increase in aviation fuel is billions of dollars to -- to United Airlines. I don't know what it is to the Air Force, but you're bigger than United Airlines so it's got to be huge.

And we've got to find these -- we ought to be the leader, because frankly, the military has the ability to, with kind of your command system, to make these decisions. If you do it everybody else will follow.

I used to be really critical of the Navy about being environmentally sensitive -- ships, and paint, and all that, because of my keen interest in the ocean. And I always said, "Well, you know, the Navy ought to follow what the private sector does." We got into this, the Navy was meeting the private sector. All the shipping industry was coming around and saying, "Well, what are you doing?"

So you were the first ones to recycle, to make sure that your waters weren't contaminated, you're dumping that spoils into the -- into the -- into the ocean, and the non-fouling paint and all that other stuff is fantastic. So I think that you're -- on your energy areas you can be the leader -- all of you -- for -- for it, and I'm just suggesting there is a -- there is a trial site.

And the last thing, on this Camp Roberts -- I mean, Fort Hunter Liggett, we're in a bind because you, the Army, BRACed that property, and miraculously, several years later, just snuck back and un-BRACed it, which I still haven't figured out how you did that, but in BRACing it there's a piece of property way outside the cantonment area that's not used but it's under your title, and on top of it is one of the most historic buildings in California, an old hotel that was used in the 1800s, and it's on the National Registry of Historic Properties. It's owned by the County of Monterey. You own one acre under that property.

And it's taken us a decade to figure out how to transfer that one acre to Monterey County that can put it to some economic use, which is -- everything we want to do is -- is find with the command at -- at Fort -- can you make this happen? It's just nuts. The amount of money they wanted to charge to do appraisals, to do economic -- the value of the land's got to be nothing because you don't own the building, and it's in the middle of nowhere, and it's not zoned for commercial -- it's not going to have any -- if it hadn't been, you know, an, you know, historic property it wouldn't be there.

So one acre. My God. Make it happen.

HAMMACK:

And I know you met with the Reserves yesterday. My apologies I couldn't attend. But it's something that we're looking at to see what we can do, and I think there are several options on the table that we're investigating but I will follow up with you on that because I think I agree with you that it's something that we can make happen; we've just got to figure out what the restrictions are in transfer of land and the restrictions...

FARR:

I've been through all those. You've transferred -- Dr. Robyn knows -- at Fort Ord you've transferred about 18,000 acres without cost, free -- whole cities, whole communities without a cost. There's no reason you can't transfer one acre of land that you don't own the building on...

CULBERSON:

Yes. I want to stress my good -- you've got my full support on this and I -- I hope you'll do more than just look into it and get back to him because it just makes good sense. Each one of us know our districts better than anybody else. It's a good suggestion, and as with Mr. Moran, I want you to know Mr. Farr has my full support in this and I hope you'll do more than just look at it. Can you give me a little more assurance than just look at it?

(LAUGHTER)

HAMMACK:

I can tell him he has my full support to evaluate options and get back to him.

CULBERSON:

Let us know how the -- how I can help.

Thank you very much.

(UNKNOWN)

(OFF-MIKE)

CULBERSON:

That's an important thing to remember as we deal with this.

Mr. Nunnelee, thank you for your patience. Recognize my good friend from Mississippi?

NUNNELEE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Yonkers, Air Force released the 2013 force structure. Are you going to be releasing any data relating to military construction costs associated with force structure changes?

YONKERS:

Sir, we really don't have that many in the budget. I mean, when we sort of noodled through all of this stuff we look at -- at some of these things. There were some things that were early to need, for example with the Joint Strike Fighter and with the T-46, and you know, those aircraft have -- have -- have slowed down a little bit, so we pushed some of those military construction projects out of the '13 into the '14 and '15. We canceled some of them, like the C- 27, that when we made the announcement on force structure we no longer needed the facility upgrades that we had planned.

So, I mean, we could -- we could go through and -- and let you know specifically, sir, what -- what's changed, but there really hasn't been too much change in the '13 program with regards to that.

NUNNELEE:

But what I'm really looking for is the assurance that the Air Force, if -- if you do make force structure movements and you're moving aircraft from one site to another that you're going to take into account military construction projects at the receiving site that may be required in order to -- to complete the force structure change.

YONKERS:

We will, absolutely. And we know the sensitivity of not only this committee but every other committee in terms of the cost of doing business, and so a paramount criteria any time we look at a new basing, cost is right up there next to a military value and operations.

NUNNELEE:

And I would just ask you to report back to this committee on that issue if it becomes -- becomes an issue.

YONKERS:

Yes, sir.

NUNNELEE:

Thank you.

That's all I've got, Mr. Chair.

CULBERSON:

Thanks very much, Mr. Chairman -- Mr. Nunnelee.

I really appreciate the time to just spend all this time with us here this afternoon, and I -- I did have a specific question about -- that really affects the Gulf Coast that I'd like to ask you about, if I could, Secretary Yonkers. I've gotten a little more clarification on the question that you and I discussed, the movement of the C-130s out of Fort Worth.

I want to stress in the most emphatic terms possible that I'm strongly opposed to that move; I want to make sure that we're not moving -- the Air Force is not using any -- because that was apparently -- that is apparently underway. There is apparently, from the information that I've got, a plan to -- those airplanes are being moved out of Fort Worth on -- by -- by October 1, 2013, that we may see that in next year's MILCON proposal. I just want to make sure that there's no money -- that the Air Force is not going to use any money out of the '12 MILCON bill -- appropriation -- to do anything either to enlarge hangars or -- either in Montana, or do anything to move those airplanes.

YONKERS:

Sir, right now there was a wedge, if you would, put into the '13 program to look at what it might cost to move the C-130Hs out of Carswell Forth Worth to Great Falls, up in Montana. Corollary to that are the NC-12s (ph) that would -- would come in to Fort Worth. That's a great mission -- more aircraft, and actually, as I talked to General Bud Wyatt, who is the director of the Air Guard, about this, based on our conversation recently, and -- and mission set that had already existed there at Carswell. So the Guard has NC-26s (ph), which were another surveyant (ph) platform...

CULBERSON:

These are intelligence-gathering assets...

(CROSSTALK)

YONKERS:

Yes, sir. And their support of Customs and Border Protection, that's a primary mission as Custom and Border Protection ask for that assistance. But it's also a mission that supports deployed forces when we go to war, and that ISR platform is a critical asset to COCOMs.

CULBERSON:

Yes, sir. I understand (inaudible) in the strongest possible terms that -- our strenuous opposition and my determination to make sure that we block the move of those planes. I want to submit for the record a letter from the governor of Mississippi, joined with the governor of Texas, governor of Louisiana -- I've never even seen a letterhead like that before -- the governor of Alabama, and the governor of Florida, all unanimously asking the president and this Congress not to move the aircraft out of Fort Worth because of their essential role in disaster relief in the -- we -- we had a whole slew of hurricanes here over the last several years and those C-130s were vital in flying supplies. You got hammered in Mississippi, and Gulfport, and these C-130s were vital in supplying -- in flying in food and supplies to people in Mississippi, people of Louisiana, and Texas, and the Florida panhandle, and Alabama.

We all suffer from -- and for some reason this year we just didn't get -- you know, this last year - hit as we did bad as before. So would you assure us that there's not going to be -- none of the money -- I want to make sure -- and that's also, Kay Granger is going to be taking care of it on the other end in her subcommittee.

YONKERS:

We'll lock it down for you, sir...

CULBERSON:

Thank you. Thank you very much.

YONKERS:

.. but to my knowledge there is nothing in the '12 program.

CULBERSON:

We're going to make sure they're not moved. You'll help us make sure of that so we don't have to do it in our bill?

YONKERS:

Sir, if I could -- if I can respond to your concern with regards to emergency assistance, there is an agreement amongst the governors of almost every state called an EMAC -- it's an emergency management assistance compact -- that allows that governor to pull up any asset from any state that has a C-130 to provide support to a governor of another state. It's a paperwork exercise that takes only a few days to consummate.

There is also, under the Defense Authorization Act last year, that you all had a hand in, the same wherewithal to call up both Reserve and active duty assets. So when the question was asked whether or not we have enough C-130 lift or other kinds of assets to respond to natural disasters the answer is, by all means, we do.

CULBERSON:

Where are those C-130s?

YONKERS:

There are some in Dyess and there are some throughout...

CULBERSON:

Dyess is in Abilene?

YONKERS:

Dyess is in Abilene. We have 130s in the active duty and the Reserve and the Guard all over the 50 states.

CULBERSON:

Well, I look forward to working with you to make sure we don't move those aircraft. Thank you.

And let me ask about a subject that is near and dear to my heart. I didn't get a chance to ask -- I do get to mention DOD schools and charter schools to you, Ms. Hammack, and to you, Mr. Yonkers, when we met, but the -- I -- I really want you to please follow up. I know that the Air Force has one at Andrews, and the -- but you mentioned there were none in the Army, to your knowledge.

The people of, I know, Fort Hood do a great job of supporting those men and women at Fort Hood -- great local schools there. Judge, I understand they really do a good job.

That may not be true in other parts of the country. What can you do, Ms. Hammack, and also -- on -- on behalf of the -- of the Navy -- can be done -- what could this committee do to help encourage the creation of charter schools as needed on bases around the country where enlisted personnel feel like they need them?

HAMMACK:

I think we would ask that Dr. Robyn respond for the DOD. I think that it is something that goes across all...

CULBERSON:

It really does. Thank you, ma'am.

ROBYN:

You know, I didn't realize until we got together to prepare for this hearing that DOD had charter schools. Two of the Air Force charter schools were a product of housing privatization, so the housing privatization partner, I think, worked to -- to create them.

I like that model myself. It really is a -- a P&R decision -- personnel and readiness -- within the office of the secretary of defense rather than -- than an installations issue. But I'd like to -- to take it up with them.

CULBERSON:

Thank you.

ROBYN:

Yes.

CULBERSON:

I bring it up because I gather from everything that I've seen and heard that you already have the authority to do this, that where there's a state law authorizing charter schools and an interstate compact exists that would allow for the grades to be transferred -- because obviously that's important with a mobile population of service men and women -- you already have the authority to do it, so I'm bringing it to your attention to help, if I could, encourage you to do so. There are none on any Army base; I don't know whether there's any...

ROBYN:

We're actually looking at some, at least in one instance that I know of right now, on a Navy installation. I don't know of any others.

CULBERSON:

And if it weren't for the one at Andrews those men and women that are stationed there would really be in trouble because the local schools are just not really very good and it's a real problem, and I'm grateful for the Air Force having done it.

YONKERS:

We actually have four, sir, and one of them at Vandenberg, Little Rock, Davis-Monthan, and Andrews. And as Dr. Robyn mentioned, two of those were at the generosity of the developers that are building our military family housing, and one of the reasons they're doing it is if they keep quality schools and quality education right there on the installation that they will have a high occupancy rate, and that's cash flow for them.

So the thing that sort of occurs to me is that as we think through these other housing privatization deals that we're about ready to finalize maybe there's another opportunity. But we're also finding in some places that the schools systems are -- are good enough and they're not something that our military members and families are particularly concerned about, so it's not one-size-fits-all.

CULBERSON:

I'd particularly appreciate it, Dr. Robyn, if you'd make this a priority. Obviously it's important to all of us on this committee and -- and the work that you do to ensure that the men and women in uniform have a high quality of life, they have peace of mind, they don't have to worry -- they have to worry as little as possible about their home life. Nothing more important to any of us that have children than the quality of our kids' education, and if you would please make this a priority.

In addition to the charter schools, also the DOD schools is needed, and certainly the committee has been very supportive. We've funded the request that you've sent to us for the improvement of DOD schools, or simply to build new ones. It's a real problem. I know, for example, at Fort Bliss they've really got, you know, a problem out there.

Let me, if I could, ask a -- a question that -- and we'll submit most of these for the record, but for all of you, circling back to what I opened with, and it's a real source of concern for me that the requests that are being submitted to Chairman Young's subcommittee and certainly to this subcommittee, I'm just concerned may be a reflection more of what we can -- what you think can be afforded rather than the mission requirement that faces the nation in terms of national security and what threat you see over the horizon and the threat right in front of us with the -- particularly what's going on in the Middle East and I think the imminent and very real possibility that the Israelis are going to have to take out the Iranian nuclear reactor, and I expect and hope -- would expect the commander in chief to support the Israelis 110 percent if they have to do so. They're our best friend in the world and they have an absolute right to defend themselves and to do so preemptively, as President Bush saw the need to. The Israelis really have a need to do so with the Iranians, who have promised that they'll use a weapon as soon as they get it and they'll use it on Tel Aviv, and that's going to trigger a whole string of events.

So we've got a whole variety of threats, and I'm just concerned, as Senator Levin was in his comments, as I said at the beginning, that we're -- in his -- it's his impression, it's certainly my impression, it's a concern of a lot of my colleagues that the budgets we're seeing -- the drawdown in forces we're seeing, the -- for example, there's no new MILCON that the Air Force is proposing, you know, we see a significant drawdown in the Army's MILCON. Talk to us a little bit about, for example, specifically as DOD has been asked by OMB, and obviously we've got to deal with the sequestration, but the DOD's been asked to reduce the defense budget by about \$450 billion over a 10- year period, and as I mentioned, we're already seeing a real trend of reducing significant MILCON budget reductions from the services.

Where do you see the most risk, if I could ask each one of you to talk to us about the risk of cuts of that magnitude, of reductions in your military construction requirements, and reductions in facility sustainment, restoration, maintenance? Where do each one of you see the risks associated with those drawdowns of that magnitude?

(UNKNOWN)

Mr. Chairman?

CULBERSON:

Yes? Sure.

(UNKNOWN)

Remember that we asked -- we ordered these risks. We put them into statutory law. We didn't order...

CULBERSON:

Particularly with the...

(UNKNOWN)

... any specifics, just ordered the cuts.

CULBERSON:

With the sequestration, in particular, that's coming, we -- all of us need to get our arms around the scale of the problem that the sequestration creates for the Defense Department and what that does to our nation's security around the world, so that's why I wanted to ask you to talk to us a little about the risk associated with the \$450 billion reduction over a 10-year period.

HAMMACK:

The budget that you have in front of you for F.Y. '13 MILCON does not take into account sequestration. We would have to completely redo our F.Y. '13 budgets if we were subject to sequestration. It would have a dramatic impact and subject us to dramatic risk to readiness and responsiveness if we had to take into account sequestration.

CULBERSON:

Help us understand what that risk looks like. That's why I'm asking the question. What do you envision would happen in that scenario, so we can help -- talk to our colleagues, our constituents, and the nation -- hey, we'd better pay attention to the mandatory spending side, guys. Medicare,

Medicaid, that's what's killing us. Social Security. We've got to obviously save money in the Pentagon, but cuts of this magnitude mean X. What does X look like, Madam Secretary?

HAMMACK:

We would have to significantly reduce our manpower in order to account for a budget under sequestration and that would have a dramatic impact on the bases, their employment...

CULBERSON:

Could you quantify significant and dramatic to the best of your ability?

HAMMACK:

Right now General Odierno said it would take into account another 100,000 soldiers out of the Army. That's what he envisions the risk would be. If we took another 100,000 soldiers out of the Army on top of the 80,000 that we are taking right now that would require us to close bases, lay off civilians, and take dramatic cuts to MILCON, SRM, and any other budget that we have right now.

CULBERSON:

So another 100,000 beyond the 80,000, what kind of reductions does that mean to California, to Texas, to our colleagues around the country? How many bases -- is there any way to just general...

HAMMACK:

Sir, I would say everybody would equally feel the pain.

CULBERSON:

You know what that means at Fort Hood, Judge?

CARTER:

I don't think anybody's given a directed spot at your post right now. There is another issue on the sequester that I think these secretaries will agree. They've all got ongoing contracts and there's going to have to be an 8 percent cut in every contract, which means every contract that's ongoing

has got to be renegotiated. It's a nightmare at that level because it's basically -- you've got to rework everything you're doing in every one of these services. That, in couple with -- in the Army, in which their biggest asset's soldiers, 100,000 soldiers is a whole lot of folks.

CULBERSON:

This is very helpful. So about 100,000 reduction beyond the 80,000 for the Army. Any other information...

HAMMACK:

That's what General Odierno projected and testified in one of his posture hearings -- I can't even remember which one at this point in time. So those are not my numbers.

If I were told that I had to account an installation budget for a reduction of another 100,000 the only thing I can say at this point in time is that every installation would equally feel the pain. It would be another huge round of BRAC.

CULBERSON:

Could I ask the Navy...

PTANNESTIEL:

Mr. Chairman...

CULBERSON:

... what would -- what would that mean to the Navy...

PTANNESTIEL:

We have not done the strategic analysis that would be necessary. The budget you have before you is based on our analysis of meeting our military mission at the -- the level that we believe it needs to make. It has some risks -- the fiscal year '13 budget has some risks, but largely they're in sustainment, not so much in...

CULBERSON:

Sure.

PTANNESTIEL:

... in -- the -- the MILCON. I think you'll see our MILCON from '12 to '13 was maintained pretty close to where it had been.

If we had sequestration clearly there would have to be another examination -- a strategic examination -- of what makes sense. We have not done that examination at this point and would not be able to project what that might look like.

CULBERSON:

I'd encourage you to do it as soon as possible. It's important for us. It's a part of this debate in helping to understand what the impact would be that we can talk to our constituents and our colleagues to help understand the scale of the problem that creates...

PTANNESTIEL:

Absolutely.

CULBERSON:

... for our nation's security.

PTANNESTIEL:

I believe Secretary Panetta said that starting this summer we would have to start doing the -- the analysis of what would happen with sequestration.

CULBERSON:

OK. Thank you.

Secretary Yonkers, you have...

YONKERS:

Mr. Chairman, same situation with the Air Force. I mean, we haven't put pen to paper yet and tried to look at what the impacts from a sequestration might be, but it's a sort of, again, back-of-the-envelope. When you look at the \$487 billion and we're pulling 300 aircraft and we're affecting every state and every territory with regards to personnel reductions, and force structure reductions, and -- and the military construction program, and the other kinds of things across the budget, another half a trillion dollars would at least double that impact if not more.

CULBERSON:

It's important information for us to hear and see.

If I could, let me ask -- tell you what, let me go to my -- my friend, Mr. -- Judge Carter.

CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I've been in meetings where this has been -- just kind of give you a gut estimate, it's frightening. The gut estimate they gave us was 100,000 soldiers from the Army, a full carrier group from the Navy, and a Joint Strike Fighter from the Air Force. That's gone. The numbers.

That doesn't mean that's what they'll get rid of, that means that's an example of what you -- and when I say a full carrier group I don't mean just a carrier, I mean all the ships that sail with the carrier. That's a whole bunch of them. And of course, the Joint Strike Fighter we've been trying to get in place for a long time and we've already spent a ton of money getting it there, and we desperately need it, and we are under-gunned by all of our enemies.

I'm going to have to go back to the mundane stuff, but it's kind of important to -- I'm going to spend my next Tuesday all day in Albuquerque, New Mexico discussing with the regional director of -- of fish and wildlife some issues that are going on in my county, and I think you're pretty -- you're probably aware of this, but due to a settlement made by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife with the -- with the WildEarth Guardian group we are -- we are required to determine whether 252 candidates for endangers species lists are to be placed upon that list, and the overwhelming majority of those 252 various species lie in the southern tier and the western tier of our country. The estimates that we've got that Florida we have about 28 candidates; California and Washington -- that's Navy and Air Force -- California and Washington would have -- Air Force, Navy, and Army would have 23 candidates; Texas, again, in all three -- has all three services and would have 21; New Mexico would have 16.

And many of these things are rolling off the drawing board fairly rapidly and the -- first, I guess the question is -- I'm sure you're aware of this, but it's been our experience at Fort Hood that one species shut down all the training ranges at Fort Hood and we had to negotiate a set-aside, which we -- I commend the -- the fish folks for being willing to do it. We did some creative thinking; we set up a conservatory area to preserve this species and we were able to start firing on our

firing ranges. But if you're an armored post and you can't shoot your weapons you're not a very effectively trained post.

And I understand that some of the amphibious work in California was shut down for the Navy and Marine Corps because of species on the coast. We've got this all coming our way.

First, I guess, the question -- and really, I would address this to Dr. Robyn, but -- because she's DOD -- but it's all of you got -- going to have this issue. Are we prepared to be able to protect realistic training as we deal with this? Is DOD and the services prepared to get involved? Because this is really a fast-track situation.

The other question, I guess, is have you come up -- there's a -- there's a Sikes Act, and it is set up to assist us in dealing with this, is it sufficient in your analysis to deal with these issues, because 252 species coming at you one at a time can be extremely expensive and extremely onerous in time and talent. In Sikes is there enough help there or do we need to try to get you more help in dealing with this issue? Because I'm very concerned about these things that are coming down rapidly.

ROBYN:

Thank you for your -- your support. Let me just put this in -- in perspective. We do have on our installations roughly 440 threatened and endangered species, and of -- of those, 40 are found only on military installations. Our installations have become a haven as population has developed up around installations that were at one time fairly isolated. They've taken refuge.

It is something we manage very, very carefully and -- and aggressively, and the Sikes Act and our Integrated Natural Resource Management Plans are -- are key to that. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has to evaluate these 251 candidate species by 2017. Of them, 60 are sufficiently prevalent that if they were listed it would have some impact on our mission, so it's -- so 60 of the 251 could create an issue...

CULBERSON:

Would the gentleman yield just for a quick question?

CARTER:

I'd certainly yield, Mr. Chairman.

CULBERSON:

Do you have a voice in the settlement? If 60 of those species go on a list will have an impact on your mission...

ROBYN:

We...

CULBERSON:

... do you have a voice?

ROBYN:

Well, no. We work...

CULBERSON:

Do you object...

ROBYN:

We have a partnership with -- well, by law, under the -- the Endangered Species Act, we're -- we work very closely with U.S. Fish and Wildlife. We have a partnership which we've doubled down on to share data and -- scientific data and to discuss what kinds of natural resource management actions we can take. We've told the services to be managing very aggressively using these plans that the Sikes Act makes possible.

I don't think we're -- we're not panicking at this stage. I think I liked your question about what can -- are there things that -- ways that we can amend the Sikes Act, and I -- I have two suggestions from my staff but I'm not sure I can do them justice. One has to do with being able to pool resources with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior so that when our land is adjacent to their land and they're managing -- so Fort Belvoir and the Prince William Forest, and we've got the bald eagle and they've got the bald eagle, and if we could join forces we could more effectively manage that...

CULBERSON:

Could you object to a settlement like that, Judge? Normally...

CARTER:

Well, no. It's a very unusual act, and one of the things you -- at least, this is what I've been told and I've been working on this for Highway 195 for three years. Got the money, everybody's ready to go except for one cave beetle, and I'm having to buy caves. And if you own a cave hold on to it. It's worth at least a million dollars, OK, because I've bought three now and I've got to buy one more. \$4 million we're going to spend for a cave beetle.

But this is more important. It's a catch-22 to this extent: Once the -- once the -- the court has declared a scientific study shall be made there's a year to make that study. They can delay ordering the study, but once it's ordered you've got a year. There's 252 of them and they've all got to be done by '16. Add it up. That's a whole lot of scientific studies.

And if they come as fast -- we've got three salamanders. That's three studies we've got to do just in one county, and we're coming right back with two or three species of sweetwater (ph) clam, or something like that. Those six studies out of two counties in the state of Texas that have to be -- that could potentially have to be done before 2016, and it's not very long until 2016. And the consequence is if the study is not done the court calls the court to order and says, "May I see the study, please?" "Sorry, your Honor, the study is not done," it's placed on the endangered species act -- list.

It's your burden to have the study done, and Fish (ph) can't do them. They'll tell you they can't do them.

In protecting our training mission on all of our posts and bases that we've got in the country you've got to stay on top of that catch- 22. If they don't do the study you've either got to have one to present to defend your side -- and that will cost you about a million bucks apiece -- but they won't let -- contract out those studies. I've already asked that question. Will you contract to the private industry to do the study because you can't do it? You tell me you don't have the resources.

No, we won't, because at the (inaudible) when it reaches that judge if they don't have a study it goes on the list. And that's what you've got to be looking at. If I'm wrong I'll be glad to hear I'm wrong, but I don't think I am. And that really needs to be fixed in the act, but that's a -- that's a whole different story.

But this is serious stuff.

ROBYN:

Yes. No, I agree. We're...

CARTER:

It's shutting down the entire western half of two counties in my district, which are the two fastest growing counties in the United States, and it will stop...

(UNKNOWN)

(OFF-MIKE)

CARTER:

Actually, it's salamanders -- three salamanders.

ROBYN:

I will follow up with a -- a more thorough answer on whether we think there -- first of all, what we're doing in terms of those studies, and then what we're...

CARTER:

You've done wonderful work, at Fort Hood, with the golden-cheeked warbler...

ROBYN:

Yes.

CARTER:

... you guys came in there and put together a conservation tract (ph) of land. Our comptroller is a big assistant for that in Texas. She's got a lot of trustworthiness; people trust her. And she's doing a great job.

But I'm afraid that, like you say, 252 by '16, that could very quickly become overwhelming.

CULBERSON:

Yes. And it does seem like you could work out some reasonable mitigation that can help...

CARTER:

We should be able to compromise this.

CULBERSON:

Right.

CARTER:

(inaudible)

CULBERSON:

Judge, I just don't understand how you could enter -- how parties can enter into a settlement agreement and affect the rights and...

CARTER:

Read the...

CULBERSON:

That's the way the act works?

ROBYN:

Yes. Yes.

CARTER:

The subject...

CULBERSON:

Even though you're not a party...

ROBYN:

What we have been able to do is in many cases -- most cases -- avoid critical -- what's called critical habitat designation. If they designate Fort Hood or Belvoir a critical habitat for a threatened or an endangered species that severely limits our flexibility to -- to do training and other operational activities. We're able to avoid that in many if not most cases through this Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan...

CULBERSON:

Well, I know we need to wrap up, and I know Sam needs to step out, too.

Sam, do you have any follow-up questions you want to do before you leave, my friend?

FARR:

Thank you.

CULBERSON:

Thank the judge.

FARR:

One suggestion, if you really want to do some savings this interagency agreements -- I mean, base op (ph) agreements with local communities -- if you'd ask the Congress for the authority to do that...

(UNKNOWN)

(OFF-MIKE)

FARR:

Well, I think it's very important that you -- you seek it and seek it with passion, because I don't know how many bases you could do, but, you know, you've said just in little old Monterey, with the Defense Language Institute and Naval Postgraduate School, the savings of millions and millions of dollars. And I think you project that in all the services all over the United States it's just a smart thing to do.

ROBYN:

It's a wonderful model. There are some impediments to doing it elsewhere, and I'd -- I'd -- I would love to hear your thoughts on how -- how best to go about getting that authority. We would like to get it at a minimum on -- on a pilot -- renew the pilot authority.

I'm working with the Air Force and -- and Army on this. I think Army has been very supportive, as -- as you know, on this. We would like to get that authority more broadly...

FARR:

You have the ability to give us all of the bases that would be subject if you had open authority who might want to engage in and at least I could talk to the members of Congress from those communities.

ROBYN:

OK. All right, good.

FARR:

As you know, it's a big educational process.

ROBYN:

Yes.

FARR:

Potentially what this does is it allows your municipal government to provide all the base operations. They contract with the city, who already has a fire department, public works department, you know, utility, parks department, so whatever the base needs -- because we have federal -- I mean, it's -- the unions push back but those are usually union jobs in the states.

ROBYN:

Right.

FARR:

But the communities are already doing these services and they can provide them at the base for a little additional cost -- not as expensive as having our own operations.

(UNKNOWN)

(OFF-MIKE)

FARR:

Yes. So it's worked very well for Monterey and the facilities there. In fact, they all get better attention. Things get fixed faster, people are very -- it's just a very happy relationship.

CULBERSON:

(OFF-MIKE) in uniform have as few worries as possible when it comes to their -- their safety, security, and the quality of life for themselves and their families. Thank you for your service to the nation.

And the hearing is adjourned.

CQ Transcriptions, March 7, 2012

List of Panel Members and Witnesses PANEL MEMBERS:

REP. JOHN CULBERSON, R-TEXAS CHAIRMAN

REP. C.W. BILL YOUNG, R-FLA.

REP. JOHN CARTER, R-TEXAS

REP. STEVE AUSTRIA, R-OHIO

REP. JEFF FLAKE, R-ARIZ.

REP. ALAN NUNNELEE, R-MISS.

REP. KEVIN YODER, R-KAN.

REP. HAROLD ROGERS, R-KY. EX OFFICIO

REP. SANFORD D. BISHOP JR., D-GA. RANKING MEMBER

REP. SAM FARR, D-CALIF.

REP. BETTY MCCOLLUM, D-MINN.

REP. JAMES P. MORAN, D-VA.

REP. NORM DICKS, D-WASH. EX OFFICIO

WITNESSES:

DOROTHY ROBYN, DEPUTY UNDERSECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR
INSTALLATIONS AND THE ENVIRONMENT

KATHERINE HAMMACK, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR
INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT

JACKALYNE PTANNESTIEL, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FOR
INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT

TERRY YONKERS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE FOR
ENVIRONMENT AND LOGISTICS

Source: CQ Transcriptions

All materials herein are protected by United States copyright law and may not be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, displayed, published or broadcast without the prior written permission of CQ Transcriptions. You may not alter or remove any trademark, copyright or other notice from copies of the content.

© 2012 CQ Roll Call All Rights Reserved.