

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2012

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 6, 2011.

ARMY HEARING

WITNESSES

HON. KATHERINE HAMMACK, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR INSTALLATIONS, ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY
MAJOR GENERAL JAMES BOOZER, DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS FOR U.S. ARMY INSTALLATIONS COMMAND

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN CULBERSON

Mr. CULBERSON. Good afternoon. I want to welcome everyone to today's hearing on the fiscal year 2010 military construction and family housing program for the U.S. Army.

The Army will continue to execute a drawdown of forces in Iraq, while continuing their mission in Afghanistan for a period of uncertain duration, while roughly one-third of the Army will be changing locations or consolidating commands due to BRAC and the realignment of the global defense posture.

The Army continues to execute billions of dollars in military construction and family housing to accommodate its active duty soldiers and transition the Guard and Reserve to an Operational Force, requiring major changes in the way we train, equip, and build for our citizen soldiers.

Before I formally introduce our witness, I would like to turn to our Ranking Member, Mr. Bishop, for any remarks he may like to make.

OPENING STATEMENT OF MR. BISHOP

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to also say that I am a little disappointed that General Casey was not able to attend the hearing today. As you know, this would have been his last appearance before the subcommittee. But I just want to say for the record that we all appreciate General Casey's service to our country, and we wish him well in all of his future endeavors.

While General Casey may not be here, Mr. Chairman, the Army is still represented by two very impressive witnesses, Major General Boozer and Ms. Hammack.

And I thank you both for your service to our country and for being here today. I suppose that General Casey is like Hallmark.

He cared enough to send the very best, and so we appreciate your coming.

We find ourselves at a very interesting crossroads. Fiscal year 2011, the funding is still not resolved, and in a few years the Army will begin to reduce its end strength, and the 2005 BRAC will be ending. I think that we are all concerned about what effect the delay in the fiscal year 2011 funding is having on your construction programs, and we need to get this taken care of as soon as possible.

I am interested in what actions the Army is taking to prepare for the looming draw down, which is only a few short years away. Our country is facing serious budgetary challenges, and I want to make sure that the fiscal year 2012 requests make the necessary investments for the Army going forward.

I am also concerned about the Walter Reed National Medical Military Medical Center at Bethesda, because right now it is in jeopardy of missing the September deadline. And I would like to hear what steps are being taken to make sure that this transition happens on time.

While these issues are very serious, please be assured that everybody on this committee will do everything in our power to make sure that the Army has the necessary resources to support its mission and its people.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I yield back.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Mr. Bishop.

I would now like to formally introduce our witness. We are joined today by the Honorable Katherine Hammack, who is the assistant secretary of the Army for installations and environment. Ms. Hammack was appointed as assistant secretary on June 28th of 2010 and is now serving as the primary advisor to the secretary of the Army and the chief of staff of the Army on all matters involving installation policy, energy security and management.

Her responsibilities include policy and oversight of sustainability and environmental initiatives, resource management, including design, military construction and base realignment and closure. And prior to her appointment, Ms. Hammack was a leader at Ernst & Young's climate change and sustainability services practice and has over 30 years experience in energy and sustainability advisory services.

Secretary Hammack, we welcome you to the subcommittee. We look forward to hearing your testimony. And, of course, your full statement will be entered into the record without objection. And you can certainly feel free to summarize your remarks. Thank you very much for being with us today, and we thank you for your service.

STATEMENT OF HON. KATHERINE HAMMACK

Ms. HAMMACK. Certainly. Thank you very much, and I am glad to be here.

Chairman Culberson and Congressman Bishop and other members of the committee, I really want to thank you for the opportunity to talk about what the Army is doing in our military construction programs.

The investments provide our soldiers with facilities that they need in order to fight in two wars, as well as the necessary fi-

nances to complete essential Army initiatives. At the same time we are working to reduce our energy footprint and remain good stewards of the environment.

But as Congressman Bishop mentioned, we are concerned about the CR. We are unable to award construction projects requested over a year ago, projects that are needed to continue the momentum to complete our goals. Currently, there is \$1.8 billion of Army military construction projects ready to reward, pending receipt of a bill or new start authority.

IMPACTS OF THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

These 88 projects are located in 22 different states. Bids are expiring, and project costs are increasing. Your constituents are directly impacted by our inability to award projects. Currently, \$300 million in Alaska, \$198 million in Texas, 126 million in California and 109 million in Kansas to date are on hold. These values would almost double under a yearlong CR. This work represents jobs, and I ask for your support to enact legislation so that work may begin.

FY 12 BUDGET

The fiscal year 2012 budget request of 5.3 billion is for military construction, family housing and base closure caretaker requirements. It represents 3.6 percent of the Army's total obligation authority. This request is a 33 percent reduction, a reduction of \$2.6 billion from last year's request. This decrease is attributable to completion of most of the investments and facilities necessary to support the Army's growth to 45 brigade combat teams.

With the conclusion of three of our largest initiatives, which are BRAC, Grow the Army and Global Defense Posture Realignment, the Army's focus is on barracks buyout programs and funding the remaining requirements to transform to a modular force. This includes several important stationing actions such as the standup of new combat aviation brigade.

The Army is committed to implementing efficiencies within all of its programs. As you are aware, we deferred 1.4 billion in military construction projects across fiscal years 2012 to 2016. These projects pose low to medium risk to Army readiness and will re-compete for inclusion in future programs.

We are closely examining all solutions, focusing on O&M funds to modernize and restore existing facilities in lieu of building new, wherever possible. In addition, we are reviewing facility standards and criteria to ensure that the Army is optimizing construction necessary to support as many missions.

Over the past several years, savings between budget and actual construction costs have accumulated as a result of our economic climate. We have returned almost \$1 billion to you over the past 2 years, funding you are able to redirect to other priorities. We are retaining some bid savings to use to ensure our facilities are energy efficient, some to process reprogramming actions, and some to repair storm damaged facilities.

ENERGY SECURITY

In energy Army leadership recognizes that sustainability and energy security ensure that the Army of tomorrow has the same access to energy, water, land and natural resources as the Army of today. We are focusing efforts to reduce energy use both in contingency operations and in the generating force here at home. Through more efficient structures, which would be tents in contingency operations or permanent structures here in the United States, also more efficient power generation and more efficient vehicles, we are reducing costs.

Our energy budget includes investments in energy conservation technology for new construction as well as renovations and investments in alternative energy sources. The Army's net zero strategy focuses efforts to ensure energy security and mission effectiveness. Energy security and conservation not only reduce vulnerabilities, but assure readiness by reducing impacts of disruptions on installations and surrounding communities.

The Army's environmental program needs an investment of 1.4 billion to ensure adequate environmental resources to support the mission. This funding maintains a sound environmental posture while addressing the environmental aspects of stationing actions, including base closure.

We must also address the Army's past environmental legacy, whether it is BRAC or formerly used defense sites. We are committed to meeting our legal requirements and to protecting both our natural and our cultural resources while operating in a constrained resource environment. We are on target to meet our environmental cleanup goals.

Chairman Culberson, Ranking Member Bishop and other members of the committee, I look forward to working closely with you to ensure our soldiers, civilians and our family members have the resources and the facilities necessary to perform their many missions in defense of the nation. I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

RECORD VERSION

STATEMENT BY

**THE HONORABLE KATHERINE G. HAMMACK
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY
(INSTALLATIONS, ENERGY, AND ENVIRONMENT)**

BEFORE THE

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
AND VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

FIRST SESSION, 112TH CONGRESS

**FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2012
ARMY MILITARY CONSTRUCTION
POSTURE HEARING**

APRIL 6, 2011

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

INTRODUCTION

Good afternoon Chairman Culberson, Representative Bishop and Members of the committee. I appreciate the opportunity to explain the Army's FY2012 budget needs and requirements.

The Army's 2012 Military Construction budget request will continue to invest in facilities infrastructure required to support highly visible and synchronized initiatives of Base Realignment and Closure, growth of the force to 45 Brigade Combat Teams with an end-strength of 547,400 Soldiers, transformation to a globally postured and versatile modular force, and the Reserve Components transformation from a strategic force to an operational force. Your committee's commitment to our Soldiers, Families and Civilians and support of the Army's military construction program is deeply appreciated. The Army's strength is its Soldiers – and the Families and Army Civilians who support them. They are and will continue to be the centerpiece of our Army.

The level of investment required to complete Grow the Army (GTA) and Global Defense Posture Realignment (GDPR) and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) is declining and permits the Army to focus on the funding to recapitalize and modernize legacy facilities, construct new facilities to eliminate deficit requirements, such as quality of life, and complete both Permanent Party and Training Barracks buy-out programs. Continued timely and predictable funding is critical as we transition from a period of prolonged conflict to one of increased stability while continuing to focus on re-balancing the force and maintaining a combat edge developed through a decade of war.

IMPACTS OF THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Under the current Continuing Resolutions, the Army is unable to proceed with the military construction projects we requested over a year ago – projects that are needed to continue the momentum required to meet our goals. We have approximately \$1.5B of Army military construction projects – across all components- that are ready to award pending receipt of an Appropriations bill or new start authority. As long as new starts are prohibited, we risk increased cost to re-advertise projects, shortened construction

are prohibited, we risk increased cost to re-advertize projects, shortened construction seasons - especially in northern climes, and delays to ongoing consolidation and stationing actions. So, I strongly urge the Committee to work hard to pass the FY11 budget.

OVERVIEW

The Army's Fiscal Year (FY) 2012 President's Budget requests \$5.3 billion for Military Construction (MILCON), Army Family Housing (AFH), and BRAC, which is \$2.6 billion less or a 33 percent reduction from the FY 2011 request. This represents 3.6 percent of the total Army budget. Of the \$5.3 billion request, \$3.2 billion is for the Active Army, \$774 million is for the Army National Guard, \$281 million is for the Army Reserve, \$300 million is for BRAC, and \$682 million is for Army Family Housing. Although the overall MILCON funding level declines due to completion of BRAC construction and reduced investments in major initiatives such as GTA and GDPR, the Army continued to follow the "Pillars of Priority" in development of the FY 2012 MILCON program which supports Army Imperatives of: Sustain, Prepare, Reset and Transform.

The five pillars of priority are the foundation of the MILCON program. The pillars address all categories of facilities in the Army facilities portfolio for active and reserve component forces. The pillars are:

Global Defense Posture Realignment/Grow the Army (GDPR/GTA): GDPR construction provides facilities to ensure Army forces are properly positioned worldwide in support of the National Military Strategy. GTA supports the FY2013 Army end strength of 1,111.6K (547K Active Army, 358K Army National Guard, and 206K Army Reserve) necessary to increase Active Component dwell time to 1:2 years and Reserve Component dwell time to 1:4 years. Construction provides facilities for brigade combat teams and combat support/combat service support (CS/CSS) units activated as part of GTA. The Secretary of Defense recently announced a reduction of 27K in active Army end strength planned for 2015. Unit level details of this reduction, and therefore impacts to facilities, will not be known for some time.

Transformation: Supports the Army's transformation to a modular force, enables critical force structure initiatives and eliminates inadequate permanent party and trainee barracks. The last inadequate permanent party spaces are planned to be removed after the new barracks are fully occupied in fiscal year 2015, if we have new start authority for our FY11 projects.

Modernization: Supports ongoing investment in recapitalization of Operations infrastructure and Quality of Life facilities.

Training Support: Supports ongoing investment in modernization and revitalization of Army training ranges, training centers, and supporting infrastructure.

Strategic Readiness: Supports the modernization and recapitalization of the Army's industrial base, pre-positioned stock facilities and transportation infrastructure.

The Army is executing a tightly woven plan integrating BRAC, GDPR/GTA, and transformation to a modular force as facilitated by MILCON. The strategy includes aligning facilities to support a US based force structured as an expeditionary Army; completing facilities and moving personnel to comply with BRAC 2005 law by 2011; and completing GDPR/GTA by 2013. Facilities modernization for modular force units converted from the legacy force structure extends beyond 2016. The fiscal year 2012 MILCON request is crucial to the success of the Army's strategic imperatives to Sustain, Prepare, Reset, and Transform the force.

FISCAL YEAR 2012 BUDGET REQUEST

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

The Active Army FY 2012 MILCON request is for \$3,236M (for appropriation and authorization of appropriations) to support the Army Imperatives of Sustain, Prepare and Transform.

Grow the Army (\$164M/5%): The GTA request in FY 2012 funds 4 projects. The total includes \$137 million for operations facilities, \$23 million for a training barracks, and \$3.6 million for one operational support facility. These facilities are essential to support growth in the Army's combat support and combat service support force structure and establish the appropriate training support infrastructure for a 45 Brigade Combat Team Army.

Global Defense Posture Realignment (\$178M/6%): The request includes \$80 million, for barracks, an entry control point and the third phase of the drainage system at Bagram Air Base, as well \$49 million for a Brigade Complex at Fort Bragg as part of the Army Patriot units' global realignment, and \$49 million for a maintenance facility at Fort Leonard Wood.

Transformation (\$1,165M/36%): The FY 2012 request of \$639 million supports the stationing of units in support of weapons systems, Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD), Joint Land Attack Cruise Missile Defense Elevated Netted Sensor (JLENS), Combat Aviation Brigades (CABs), and Enhanced Range Multipurpose (ERMP) unmanned aerial vehicle units. Another \$526 million will provide permanent operations and maintenance facilities and barracks to support the conversion of existing forces into new modular force units for the Active component. The Army strategy is to use existing facility assets to support transformation where feasible and program new construction projects when existing facilities are inadequate.

Barracks Modernization (\$296M/9%): The FY 2012 request will provide for 3,482 new permanent party barracks spaces that will meet Department of Defense "1 + 1" or equivalent standard and complete the permanent party barracks buyout program by FY2013 and beneficial occupancy by FY2015. In addition to the barracks modernization program, additional barracks projects are included in the FY2012 request that support *Grow the Army, Trans-formation, and Modernization* pillars. These projects are located, at Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Forts Bliss, Carson, and Knox, Germany, Honduras, and Korea. The total FY 2012 investment in permanent party barracks is \$562 million.

Training Barracks Modernization (\$59M/2%): The FY 2012 request will provide 1,140 new training barracks spaces for our Soldiers that meet applicable standards. One trainee barracks complex is at Fort Jackson. In addition to the training barracks modernization program, a second trainee barracks complex at Fort Benning is funded under the *Grow the Army* pillar. The total FY 2012 investment in training barracks is \$82 million.

Modernization: (\$685M/21%): The FY 2012 request consists of 30 projects with investments of \$258 million for operations facilities, \$321 million for operational support facilities and \$106 million for quality of life projects.

Training Support (\$340M/11%): Training Support facilities include training ranges to support multiple weapon systems, land acquisitions and other Soldier training facilities.

Strategic Readiness (\$74M/2%): FY 2012 represents the first year the Army will invest in industrial base and deployment facilities under the Strategic Readiness initiative. Prior to FY 2012, these types of facilities fell under general recapitalization and modernization of aging facilities. Five transportation infrastructure projects will be constructed to support railhead, deployment and supply operations, as well as a Maneuver Systems Sustainment Center project at Red River Army Depot.

Other Support Programs (\$275M/8%): The FY 2012 budget includes \$230 million for planning and design. As executive agent, the Army also provides oversight of design and construction for projects funded by host nations. The fiscal year 2012 budget requests \$25 million for oversight of host nation funded construction for all Services in Japan, Korea, and Europe. The budget request also contains \$20 million for unspecified minor construction to address unforeseen critical needs.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The Army National Guard FY 2012 MILCON request of \$774 million (for appropriation and authorization of appropriations) is focused on GTA, Modernization, Transformation, Training Support, and other support programs.

Grow the Army (\$101M/14%): The FY 2012 budget request includes \$101 million for 11 energy efficient readiness centers that will support the Army National Guard's end strength growth and ability to react to high levels of force deployment.

Modernization (\$198M/25%): The Army National Guard budget request also includes \$198 million to replace 11 obsolete, and energy inefficient readiness centers. There are five Readiness Centers and one Armed Forces Reserve Center, one Maintenance Facility, one Army Aviation Support Facility, one United States Property and Fiscal Office, and one Utilities Replacement project that will provide modernized facilities to enhance the Guard's operational readiness.

Transformation (\$198M/25%): The budget request offers the Army National Guard the opportunity to reach higher levels of readiness by equipping Army National Guard units on a comparable level with the active component. The request is comprised of ten projects which include three Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System Facilities (TUAS), five Readiness Centers, one Army Aviation Support Facility, and one Field Maintenance Shop.

Training Support (\$245M/32%): In FY 2012, the Army National Guard is requesting \$245 million for 16 projects which will support the training of its operational force. These funds will provide the facilities Soldiers require as they train, mobilize, and deploy. Included are five Operations Readiness and Training Complexes (ORTC), seven range projects, one Maneuver Area Training and Equipment Site (MATES), one railhead expansion and container facility, and two deployment processing facilities.

Other Support Programs (\$32M/4%): The FY 2012 Army National Guard budget also contains \$20 million for planning and design of future projects and \$12 million for unspecified minor military construction to address unforeseen critical needs.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

The Army Reserve FY 2012 MILCON request for \$281 million (for appropriation and authorization of appropriations) is for Modernization, Training Support, Strategic Readiness, and other support programs.

Modernization (\$216M/77%): In FY 2012, the Army Reserve will invest \$216 million in facilities that prepare our Soldiers for success in current operations. The construction of ten new Army Reserve Centers and one Armed Forces Reserve center will provide the modernized training classrooms, simulations capabilities, and maintenance platforms that support the Army Force Generation (ARFORGEN) cycle and the ability of the Army Reserve to provide trained and ready soldiers for Army missions when called.

Training Support (\$28M/10%): The budget request of \$28 million provides for three ranges that enable soldiers to hone their combat skills. It also provides for construction of the final phase of a Non-Commissioned Officer (NCO) Academy classroom/training billets complex that, when completed, will allow for a modernized training environment for training.

Strategic Readiness (\$5M/2%): The request includes \$5 million for a containerized loading facility supporting mobilization and demobilization missions of the Reserve Component.

Other Support Programs (\$32M/11%): The FY 2012 Army Reserve budget request includes \$29 million for planning and design of future year projects and \$3 million for unspecified minor military construction to address unforeseen critical needs.

ARMY FAMILY HOUSING

The Army's FY12 budget includes \$681.8 million for the Army's investment in and operation of its worldwide inventory of family housing assets. The Army relies first on the local economy to provide housing for our Soldiers. When housing on the economy is not available, the Army provides housing by various means including government-owned, privatized, and leased housing. The Army has successfully privatized 98% of its housing assets inside the United States, while overseas we primarily house Families in government-owned and leased quarters.

Residential Communities Initiative (RCI). In 1999 the Army began privatizing housing assets and RCI continues to provide quality housing which Soldiers and their Families and senior single Soldiers can proudly call home. The Army leverages appropriated funds and existing housing by engaging in 50-year partnerships with nationally recognized private real estate development, property management, and home builder firms to construct, renovate, repair, maintain, and operate housing communities.

The RCI Family housing is in 44 locations, with a projected end state of over 85,000 homes – 98 percent of the on-post Family housing inventory inside the U.S. Initial construction and renovation investment at these 44 installations is estimated at \$12.7 billion over a three to 14-year initial development period, which includes the Army's contribution of close to \$2.0 billion. During the twelve years since 1999 through 2010, our partners have constructed over 25,000 new homes, and renovated another 19,000 homes.

The RCI program for Senior Unaccompanied Housing includes four installations for a total of 1,394 accommodations for senior single Soldiers in grade Staff Sergeant and above including officers at locations where there is a deficit of adequate accommodations off post. The four locations are Forts Irwin, Drum, Bragg, and Stewart.

AFH Construction (\$186.9M/27%): The Army's FY 2012 Family Housing Construction request is \$186.9 million (for authorization of appropriation, and appropriation) to continue our significant investment in our Soldiers and their Families.

This supports our goal to sustain government-owned housing and eliminate our remaining inadequate inventory at enduring overseas installations.

The family housing construction program includes \$76 million for traditional military construction to provide 128 new homes in Germany, and to acquire 10 acres of land in Brussels for future construction so that the Army can eliminate 7 high-cost leased homes that cost the Army over \$1 million annually. The request also includes \$103 million for improvements to 276 family homes in Germany, and \$7.9 million for planning and design.

AFH Operations (\$494.8M/73%): The Army's FY 2012 Family Housing Operations request is \$494.8 million (for appropriation and authorization of appropriations). This account provides for: Operations, Utilities, Maintenance and Repair, Leased Family housing, and management of RCI. This request supports almost 16,000 Army-owned homes, in the United States and in foreign countries, as well as almost 8,000 leased residences and provides government oversight of more than 80,000 privatized homes.

Operations (\$85.4M): The operations account includes four sub-accounts: management, services, furnishings, and a small miscellaneous account. All operations sub-accounts are considered "must pay accounts" based on actual bills that must be paid to manage and operate the AFH owned inventory.

Utilities (\$73.6M): The utilities account includes the cost of delivering heat, air conditioning, electricity, water, and wastewater support for Family housing units. The overall size of the utilities account is decreasing in proportion with the reduction in supported inventory due to RCI.

Maintenance and Repair (\$105.7M): The maintenance and repair account supports annual recurring projects to maintain and revitalize AFH real property assets. Since most Family housing operational expenses are fixed, maintenance and repair is the account most affected by budget changes. Funding reductions result in slippage of maintenance projects that adversely impact Soldier and Family quality of life.

Leasing (\$204.4M): The leasing program is another way the Army provides adequate housing for Families. The FY 2012 budget includes funding for a total of 9,036 housing units, including 1,080 existing Section 2835 ("build-to-lease" – formerly known as 801 leases), 1,828 temporary domestic leases in the US, and 6,128 leased units overseas.

Privatization (\$25.7M): The privatization account provides operating funds for management and oversight of privatized military family housing in the RCI program. RCI costs include civilian pay, travel, and contracts for environmental and real estate functions, training, real estate and financial consultant services and oversight to monitor compliance and performance of the overall privatized housing portfolio and individual projects.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

BRAC 2005

BRAC 2005 is a massive undertaking, requiring the synchronization of base closures, realignments, MILCON and renovation, unit activations and deactivations, and the flow of forces to and from current global commitments. BRAC 2005 encompassed: 102 Army recommendations; affected over 150,000 Soldiers and Civilians, and their family members; 330 construction projects, which includes 125 Armed Forces Reserve Centers; closure of 12 Active Component installations, one Army Reserve installation, 387 National Guard Readiness and Army Reserve Centers, and eight leased facilities; and over 1,100 discrete actions. BRAC 2005 established Training Centers of Excellence, Joint Bases, a Human Resources Center of Excellence, and Joint Technical and Research facilities.

While the Department is facing scheduling challenges in a few cases, we are working diligently to ensure we satisfy our BRAC legal obligations. Army Senior leaders continue to intensely manage these recommendations and are putting in place mitigation procedures to ensure we meet our legal obligations. Currently, the Army has completed 23 of 102 recommendations and awarded 327 military construction projects,

of which 154 have been completed. The Army has initiated 850 of 1,147 actions and completed 393. The Army has closed six Army installations, one Army Reserve installation, 42 Army Reserve Centers, and disposed of 19,067 acres associated with the closures. The Army is on schedule to complete the remaining 754 actions and 173 projects in accordance with the BRAC law.

The Army FY 2012 budget request for BRAC 2005 is only \$229 million. The budget request is critical to the success of the Army's BRAC 2005 initiative and does not contain funding for new construction projects. The funding request includes \$116.9 million in Operation and Maintenance (O&M) to support facility caretaker requirements. In FY 2012, the Army will continue environmental closure, cleanup and disposal of BRAC properties. These activities will continue efforts previously ongoing under the Army Installation Restoration Program and will ultimately support future property transfer actions. The budget request for environmental programs is \$112.3 million, which includes munitions and explosives of concern and hazardous and toxic waste restoration activities.

BRAC 95

The Army is requesting \$70.7 million in FY2012 for prior BRAC rounds. The request includes \$4.6 million for caretaking operations and program management of remaining properties and \$66.1 million for environmental restoration to address environmental restoration efforts at 280 sites at 36 prior BRAC installations. To date, the Army has spent \$3.1 billion on the BRAC environmental program for installations impacted by the previous four BRAC rounds. The Army has disposed of 177,842 acres (85 percent of the total acreage disposal requirement of 209,291 acres), with 31,448 acres remaining. As a result, the Army estimates approximately \$14.5 billion in savings through 2010 – and nearly \$1 billion in recurring, annual savings from prior BRAC rounds.

ENERGY CONSERVATION INVESTMENT PROGRAM

Army installations and facilities require secure and uninterrupted access to energy. Dependence on fossil fuels and a vulnerable electric power grid jeopardizes the security of Army installations and mission capabilities. Investment in renewable energy and energy efficient technologies will help ensure the Army can meet mission requirements today and into the future.

The Energy Conservation Investment Program (ECIP) FY 2012 program includes ten renewable energy projects and three energy conservation projects for \$51.5 million. The estimated average annual savings is projected at \$4 million dollars or 258 billion British Thermal Units (BTU). Although ECIP is an annual Defense wide appropriation (\$135M), the Army is taking a strategic look at requirements and developing an ECIP Future Years Defense Program that will provide the Army the ability to pull requirements forward should such an opportunity arise.

ENERGY SECURITY AND SUSTAINABILITY

The Army is moving forward to address the challenge of sustainability and energy security to ensure the Army of tomorrow has the same access to energy, water, land, and natural resources as the Army of today. The Army realizes that innovative, cost-effective, solutions are critical to success. Addressing these challenges is operationally necessary, fiscally prudent, and mission essential. The Army is ready to lead by example.

Drive Efficiency Across the Enterprise. The Army is working to significantly reduce requirements for natural resources, to include energy and water, both on installations at home and in our combat operations. Reducing demand through efficiency improvements is often the cheapest and fastest way to save funds and reduce dependency. The easiest gallon of fuel to secure and transport is the one that is not required. The need to reduce energy vulnerabilities and associated costs is clear, given

experiences in Iraq and Afghanistan. The approach will require a concerted effort involving a combination of new technologies, changes to user behavior, and conversion of "waste" in resource streams to energy with approaches that convert waste heat or garbage into electricity.

Build Resilience through Renewable/Alternative Energy. Army forces must still prevail, even in the face of disruptions due to enemy action, weather, shifting priorities, or energy availability. Given this, it is prudent that the Army take steps to diversify its sources of energy, particularly to include renewable and alternative sources available both here and abroad. The Army is building resilience and flexibility into force capabilities to continue operating in the face of energy disruption. These disruptions can occur at the national, regional, or local level and affect bases, weapons systems, vehicles, and Soldiers.

CONCLUSION

The Army's FY 2012 MILCON, AFH and BRAC budget requests are balanced programs that support our Soldiers, Families, and Civilians; continued re-balancing of the force; completion of BRAC 2005 by September 2011; continued support to Army transformation, GTA and GDPR initiatives, and investments in barracks buyout programs. The Army's facilities investment strategy will be accomplished through your continued commitment to timely and sustained funding of military construction, BRAC and family housing.

In closing, we would like to thank you again for the opportunity to appear before you today and for your continued support for our Soldiers, Families, and Civilians.

CONTRACTING OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you very much, Madam Secretary.

And, General Boozer, we appreciate so very much your service as well, sir, and we on this committee are arm-in-arm in working, doing everything we can to make sure we get a bill done for the rest of the year for all the Federal Government, but in particular for military construction, because we understand the constraints and the problems that that is causing for every branch of our armed services and the logistical chain.

As you say, it is affecting contracts. Have you lost any contracting opportunities yet, Madam Secretary, as a result of the continuing resolution?

Ms. HAMMACK. Currently, we are having to re-compete some of them in that the bids have expired. Wherever possible, we are asking for bid extensions, and we have been granted those in several cases. But the longer it takes between the bid and the award date, the more at-risk we are to having to re-compete and to experience an increase in the budget.

Mr. CULBERSON. Can you identify for us any projects in the fiscal year 2012 request that will be delayed due to current continuing resolution?

Ms. HAMMACK. At this point I can take out for the record and come back to you with that.

[The information follows:]

No projects in the FY 12 budget request were delayed by the FY 11 CR. Planning and design funds were not impacted by the CR.

We do have projects where a Phase 1 was intended in fiscal year 2011 and a Phase 2 in fiscal year 2012 so that if we are unable to begin a project in 2011, it may delay the action in 2012.

BID SAVINGS REDUCTION

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senate-proposed yearlong continuing resolution reduced funding for the Army by 263 million for excessive bid savings, but how would this reduction affect the military construction efforts at Army installations?

Ms. HAMMACK. We have already returned, as I said, over \$1 billion in the last 2 years. As projects continue to be built, we are experiencing and continue to experience some bid savings. Some of those are needed for reprogramming efforts, whether they are actions that were unanticipated that we have some emergency need for. We do not know yet whether we will be able to return any without impact on our mission, so I don't have a number right now.

TOUR NORMALIZATION

Mr. CULBERSON. General Sharp was in to see me yesterday and talked a little bit about the expansion of the facilities in Korea to allow families to move over there for support and to encourage men and women to stay in Korea longer than a year, which, of course, helps with training.

Could you talk to us a little bit about that and about the size of that investment that ultimately would be needed if we were to extend those facilities in Korea to allow families to move in?

Senator Kirk and I talked about this yesterday on the House floor. He is very concerned, as I am, as we all are, about the cost, but we want to weigh that, of course, against the benefits to the Army and in retention and morale in keeping highly trained people there in that vitally important region of the world, which is really at the tip, those folks and our troops in Korea at the tip of the spear.

And we want to do everything we can, of course, to make sure that their morale is high, that their training is at its peak, and in order to deter the North Koreans and ensure, God forbid that there is ever a conflict, that our folks are in the best possible condition.

So talk to us a little bit about the expansion in Korea and what ultimately that might wind up costing and what are the benefits.

Ms. HAMMACK. Well, I want to first talk about consolidation, because our first phase and our current phase in Korea is one of consolidation. Over the last 5 years, we have closed 34 sites and returned 13,000 acres to the Korean government. Over the next 5 years, we plan to close another 22 sites and return another 9,000 acres to the Korean government.

So currently, our Phase 1 is one of consolidation. Currently in Korea, we have over 2,300 families. So part of the consolidation is to relocate those families to Yongsan, Camp Humphreys. Phase 2 is toward normalization, where we would allow more of the soldiers to bring their families to Korea. And I will let General Boozer talk about that little bit.

General BOOZER. Yes, Mr. Chairman. As Secretary Hammack indicated, what has been approved and what is ongoing right now in Korea on the peninsula is command sponsorship for families. That number was approved by the Army, and that is 3,740 command sponsorship families. Most of the families, and again, we are at about 2,300 right now, are already on the peninsula. And in 2012 that consolidation south to Camp Humphreys Garrison will start to take place.

And what the Army has to do is to figure out how we are going to put quality housing and services in the Humphreys area to provide for those families. And one way we are doing that is with a program that we call HHOP, which is the Humphreys Housing Opportunity Program, to construct 1,400 family housing units on the garrison at Camp Humphreys.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, General.

We have been joined by our ranking member, the gentleman from Washington State, whose devotion to and support for the United States military truly has been extraordinary.

And we are honored to have you here with us, sir, and we would welcome any statement that you would want to make.

DEFENSE ACCESS ROAD PROGRAM

Mr. DICKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Bishop, our new ranking member. I want to compliment you both on the job you are doing.

Let me ask you, the National Research Council Transportation Research Board did a paper on the need that the Defense Department ought to expand the Defense Access Road Program, the only program DOD has to pay for transportation infrastructure off base.

In addition, a January report by the GAO found that the Defense Access Road Program usage has been limited in part by a lack of knowledge about the program—outdated regulations and unclear guidance on how to navigate the program’s complex processes. GAO also found that there needs to be greater high-level federal inter-agency coordination.

And we are very fortunate at Joint Base Lewis-McChord, to have just gotten a Combat Aviation Brigade. It is going to add another 1,400 people, and we have three Stryker Brigades. And I-5 between Tacoma and Olympia is maxed out every single day. As you know, a lot of the soldiers live off of base, so it really affects their ability to get in and out. It affects the local community.

I know we are doing some work at the new Walter Reed and at Belvoir. Tell me what you think about this Defense Access Roads Program. It has been around a long time, but apparently it isn’t being used very effectively.

Ms. HAMMACK. We are looking at the DAR funding and the DAR funding criteria. It is a Department of Defense program, and so we follow guidance that comes to us from the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

The challenges are that the program was originally envisioned for rural installations where you would have a stationing action that would double the traffic on roads and intersections. And so that is some of the base criteria for a threshold for significant impact. That threshold does not apply to urbanized areas, and so we are certainly working to communicate and better evaluate the application of the DAR program.

The other problem is that it doesn’t account for the tipping point effect that our growth can have on the transportation system that may already be at or over capacity. And so those—

Mr. DICKS. I think this is the perfect example of the situation at Joint Base Lewis-McChord. This is the tipping point which is when all the troops, thank God, came back. That means their families come from other parts of the country, and they are back at the base, and they are coming in and out of there.

So are you suggesting that we need to have a change in authorization language on this program in order to make it more relevant or that we should take that up with the Department of Defense or—

Ms. HAMMACK. I would not say that that is needed right now, but there needs to be probably better communication of the program and better education to the installations on how to use it. We are evaluating and working with OSD whether the criteria need some changes, and there are several discussions ongoing right now.

I was just up at JBLM about 3 weeks ago, and so we did have discussions on some of the impacts, and we did talk about DAR criteria and whether there is an opportunity for them to apply for that. I think it is something that needs ongoing discussion, and there may be some opportunities for improvement.

The challenge is, and the real concern is, at what point and how far away from the installation does the military obligation end.

Mr. DICKS. All right.

I will yield to Mr. Bishop, the ranking member.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much.

While that applies to Fort Lewis, it also applies to Northern Virginia. And our ears have been burning for a while since BRAC with the increased load of traffic as a result of BRAC for Northern Virginia and what we expect to be a great increase.

Can you explain to me whether or not there is something written in the statute? You said it was designed to apply to rural roads, but was that something that the Congress wrote in there that said it applied only to rural communities? Or does it apply wherever BRAC impacts civilian communities and civilian transportation or arteries?

Ms. HAMMACK. I can get back to you with more detail on it. I do not know the specifics.

[The information follows:]

The DAR program provides the Department of Defense the means to pay its share for public highway improvements resulting from sudden or unusual defense-generated impacts regardless of location within the U.S. However, DAR eligibility criteria includes the requirement that the DoD action must result in a doubling of traffic. This criteria is more easily met in rural than urban areas. The Office of the Secretary of Defense is in the process of relooking all DAR eligibility criteria with a view to publishing an updated set of criteria.

It is my understanding that the intention, the original intention and envisioning of the DAR program was to apply to a rural area where it may be a two-lane road, and if you are doubling the amount of traffic or more on a two-lane road, then you would have a responsibility or obligation there.

Mr. BISHOP. But if you got a four-lane road and you double the amount of traffic, don't you need to increase it to eight?

Ms. HAMMACK. And those are the questions and concerns—

Mr. BISHOP. As a result of—

Ms. HAMMACK [continuing]. That need to be addressed, correct.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. All right. So—

DAR AND BRAC PROGRAM

Mr. DICKS. Let me ask on your point. Is there a difference for a BRAC situation and the situation where the base has just had substantial growth? I mean, a BRAC is when we are usually downsizing and building new facilities, but is there a difference there?

Ms. HAMMACK. Several of the programs, the BRAC actions, did have road improvement outside the installation. BRAC—

Mr. DICKS. As part of BRAC.

Ms. HAMMACK. As part of BRAC. And for instance, one of those is at the Mark Center, where the BRAC program in and of itself had \$12 million in road construction that allowed for additional turning lanes and widening of roads. So that was part of the BRAC program.

Mr. CULBERSON. If I may, Mr. Dicks, could I follow up?

Mr. DICKS. Yes, sir.

Mr. CULBERSON. Because my good friend, Mr. Moran, we want to make sure to help. You have got a problem, sounds like, in Washington. Mr. Moran has got a bad problem we have got to help solve in his district.

Mr. DICKS. And we have got one up in Maryland, too, right at the new Walter Reed.

Mr. CULBERSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. DICKS. It is going to be a disaster.

Mr. CULBERSON. At Walter Reed. So it sounds like an answer to Mr. Dicks' question is that the BRAC statute is broad enough to allow the BRAC commission to include—when they make their recommendations, they can recommend improvements to the road net around the base.

Ms. HAMMACK. There are transportation studies that are required, and if the transportation studies so indicate that there is a need, then that became part of the BRAC program.

Mr. CULBERSON. The statute is broad enough to give them that authority.

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes.

Mr. DICKS. We will probably have to do an authorization, I would think.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, I think so. It is a bad problem and needs to be addressed. Forgive me. This is Mr. Bishop's time.

IMPACT OF BRAC ON COMMUNITIES

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

In that regard also you are prepared to talk about any BRAC-related matters, I assume.

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. And one of the chronic problems that we have with BRAC is for military communities that have been plused up as a result of BRAC, the impact that it has on the local school systems, which we have been butting our heads up against the wall for now 3 or 4 years, trying to get some resolution between the Office of Adjustment—

Mr. DICKS. Economic Adjustment.

Mr. BISHOP [continuing]. The Office of Economic Adjustment, the education budget with Impact Aid, the Defense Subcommittee budget and the MILCON budget. Everybody seems to be pointing the finger the other way.

We need some strong leadership and some support from the Department of Defense, particularly with regard to BRAC and how BRAC is causing these communities to suffer particularly in these hard budget times.

DODEA SCHOOLS

Ms. HAMMACK. Sir, right now the Army—

Mr. BISHOP. We want to accommodate our young people, the children of our service members who have to go to school. We want to keep them happy.

Ms. HAMMACK. And we agree with you. It is very important that we support our families and our schools, and those are our families and the children, and those are priorities for the Army. But the Army has no specific authority nor authorization to fund or construct public schools on or off the installation.

We can identify land. We can set aside land. We could lease land to the local education authority, but we are not authorized to fund or construct schools.

Mr. BISHOP. There is clear precedent for doing that. For example, with the Kings Bay Submarine Base in Georgia, when that base

was constructed that community did not have sufficient infrastructure to support the base. And, of course, through the Office of Economic Adjustment, the Department of Defense did pour in sizable amounts of money to create that infrastructure.

Why couldn't it be done the same way for these communities that are impacted? And perhaps maybe it would require an additional authorization. I don't know. But if that is what you think we need to do, tell us, and we will go about trying to get that done. But we put language in the appropriations bill for two or three times, trying to get some reaction on it to get some kind of response, and we haven't gotten anything.

The communities are now beginning to feel the impact of thousands of children that are going to be hitting them in the Fort Benning area. They will be coming in in August, and the communities around Fort Benning and other places need to have those schools so they don't have to be in temporary classrooms.

Ms. HAMMACK. Sir, in, and I think it is the 60s or 70s, there was special authorization given to the Army or the Department of Defense to construct schools. And those are considered the DoDEA schools. And I think the Army has—

Mr. BISHOP. The what?

Ms. HAMMACK. DoDEA schools, Department of Defense—

What does it stand for?

Education Authority, or something like that. But they are generally called DoDEA schools.

General BOOZER. Activity.

Ms. HAMMACK. The Army has 122 schools on our installations. About half of those are operated by either DoDEA or the Department of Defense. The balance, 66 of them, are operated by a local education authority. So the Army allows land, but we do not have the authority right now to fund or construct, and that would have to be special legislation.

And I got passed a note. It was special legislation at Kings Bay.

Mr. BISHOP. Yes.

IMPACT AID

General BOOZER. Congressman, I can address the Impact Aid piece that you raised, too. That is another critical issue that is all related to this. I think, as you know, that is a—

Mr. BISHOP. It is after the fact. It is after the fact, though.

General BOOZER. It is, Congressman.

Mr. BISHOP. After the kids are already there, then the Impact Aid is awarded, which has already inconvenienced them and their families.

General BOOZER. Yes, sir. It is. And it is historically—

Mr. BISHOP. And it is a small amount of money. The account for Impact Aid is so tiny, and it comes out of the education budget, that it couldn't even begin to touch a fraction of the cost of satisfying the needs of these kids.

General BOOZER. Yes, Congressman. You made the point that I was going to make right there. It is woefully underfunded.

Mr. DICKS. If you would yield to me just for—

Mr. BISHOP. I would be glad to.

Mr. DICKS. We have been trying to work on this. Secretary Westphal has been involved in this. There have been studies done of the condition of the schools around the country. We have some very old ones at Joint Base Lewis-McChord that we are concerned about. There was a school at Fort Riley and many others.

And sometimes these schools are not owned by the Defense Department. As you pointed out, some of them are owned by the Department of Education, or the ones that were constructed. We talked to Westphal and to Secretary Gates about this. There is no way these school districts are going to be able to afford to do new schools at those places.

So where we are going to do this, if we are going to take care of the soldiers who are over there in combat in Afghanistan or Iraq and have their kids have a decent school to go to, it is going to have to be done by the Department of Defense.

And maybe then you can turn the schools over to the local school districts, but you can't expect them—these are very difficult budgetary times for school districts across the country—to be able to pay for new schools on defense bases.

It is just the same exact situation. We are going to have hundreds of additional students coming in because of this new Combat Aviation Brigade, which we desperately need, to do training, proper training in Fort Lewis. But we have got to figure out a way to take care of this problem so that the kids whose families are serving in the military are not given a second-class education.

We also have the problem in the Puget Sound area of the potential for a very large earthquake, and up to a magnitude 9, in fact. Mount Rainer erupts every 400 or 500 years, and this is right in the area. I would be very concerned if we had a large earthquake whether these schools would survive. They looked pretty fragile to me when I went out and visited with Congressman Smith.

So, Mr. Chairman, I just think this is one of these things that we are going to have to come to. Everybody points the finger at everybody else. Well, go see Department of Education. Well, they haven't got any money.

I mean, the people who have got the money is the Defense Department. I think Westphal and the Secretary in good faith and are concerned about this, but we have to get this into the budget and take care of this problem. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think I was—I hope I was using Mr. Dicks' time. [Laughter.]

Mr. CULBERSON. Well, one thing is, Mr. Dicks, in this committee we don't really follow a hard and fast 5-minute rule. I will make sure everybody gets a chance to ask questions, and everybody is courteous to make sure we are not stepping on other folks' time, so—

Mr. DICKS. We are going to have any time for Civil War battlefields—

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, that is right. [Laughter.]

Historic preservation at some of these sites we see around here, absolutely.

DEPENDENTS EDUCATION

Education is really near and dear to my heart, so I just want to reiterate my strong support for what has already been said and encourage us to think about charter schools. The money that DOD is already directing to some of these bases for education, we have had great success in a lot of states with charter schools, properly run ones.

I mean, there are some out there you've got to watch closely, but by and large there are a lot of very successful programs that the private sector is able to come in and use existing dollars that DOD may already have as directed towards this that can come in and take over an old school facility or an existing building and just transform it and really give these parents a choice, an opportunity for the kids to get a first-class education.

And the other problem, for example, Fort Bliss in El Paso. And I hate to pick on El Paso, but their school district has had problems in the past, so if you are assigned to Fort Bliss and you are sort of stuck either with—I think there is a school on base, or the El Paso school district with their problem with gangs and drugs, or Socorro, which has also got problems.

So this is at the top of my list. I served on the education committee in the Texas legislature. This is one time—I never thought as a 10th amendment Jeffersonian I would ever be talking about education at the federal level—but this is absolutely vital, and I just want to express my strong support for Mr. Dicks, and Mr. Bishop on this issue. They have got my full attention and support on this, and we need to solve this.

It is just not acceptable to let these little kids have terrible educational opportunities when their mom or dads are serving their nation. This is not acceptable. We have got to get all over this.

Ms. HAMMACK. I agree with you. And again, I will reiterate that we need authorization in order to build, construct and operate schools on Army bases.

Mr. CULBERSON. Not charter schools.

Ms. HAMMACK. Charter schools, what is interesting is they are authorized and allowed in 41 states. Unfortunately, Washington State is one of those states that does not have a charter school authority.

So we have looked at the various states. Texas is one that has a very good charter schools system. That is certainly an opportunity and something that could be considered. I know that OSD has stood up a group including OSD, Department of Education and Army constituents that is looking at this right now.

Mr. CULBERSON. Again, I mean, this is anathema to me. As a 10th amendment Jeffersonian I can't believe I am saying this, but federal law does override state law, and if the base commander wants a charter school on the base in Washington State, couldn't he just order it?

I mean, if they have got the authority under federal law to bring them in, why couldn't the base commander in Mr. Dicks' district just say—

Mr. BISHOP. They can do anything they want to on the base.

Mr. CULBERSON. That is right, on the base.

Mr. DICKS. Let us take a look at that.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am ready. I would love to help you with it.

Mr. DICKS. Let me look at that.

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, I think it needs state licensing, and it also needs authority for state funds to be directed to them and authorized to go to the school as an authorized public school.

Mr. CULBERSON. Interesting.

I will help you with it, guys.

Mr. DICKS. Thank you.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Bishop.

Mr. BISHOP. My concern has to do—many of the school districts can operate. They just need additional facilities to accommodate the kids. They don't need for the Department of Defense to operate the schools. They just need the funding to get it built so that they won't have to be in temporary units.

Mr. CULBERSON. Or use existing buildings.

Mr. BISHOP. So that is what the concern is. But, I mean, this has just been kicked down the road. I was on the Defense Subcommittee. I was on Military Construction Subcommittee. This has been kicked back down the road back-and-forth, back-and-forth. And we need to bring some resolve to it, because BRAC is soon to be ending. And we have been talking about it since 2005.

ARMY END STRENGTH

Okay. Let me switch gears for a moment.

General Boozer, you know that the committee has made significant investments in Army facilities to meet the Grow the Army needs. But we know that beginning in 2015 that the Army will begin to reduce its end strength.

How much is included in your fiscal year 2012 requests for Grow the Army? And now that we know that the Army is going to reduce the end strength, is this the last year of Grow the Army projects?

And then for Ms. Hammack, is there any concern that we may have overbuilt or that we will have excess facilities due to the downsizing that will occur in 2015?

General BOOZER. Yes, sir. For Grow the Army MILCON projects, we are on track to complete all of our Grow the Army projects under that initiative in fiscal year 2013. So so we are on the downward slope for Grow the Army projects.

All of those projects, Congressman, are geared toward combat support and combat service support type units and organizations, because we completed all the builds we have in the program, all of the builds and constructions for the Brigade Combat Teams.

Mr. BISHOP. Were they constructed in anticipation of the downsizing that you are going to be accomplishing starting in 2015?

And, Ms. Hammack, will we have overbuilt?

General BOOZER. We do not think we have overbuilt, to include those projects that I just mentioned that would go into and complete the program in fiscal year 2013.

Now, we, quite frankly, Congressman, don't know what we don't know yet in terms of taking down that 27K starting in 2015. We don't know where that spread is going to occur. It clearly will occur across the force, across the Army.

I can't imagine it being targeted at specific installations, but I think we will take that 27K cut across the Army. We just don't know yet, nor have we put together a decision package for our senior leaders to lay out those types of options on how we would bring that down.

Mr. BISHOP. Let me follow that up with—maybe you might want to submit this for the record, if you don't know, because my next line of questioning was whether or not the reductions would fall proportionately on officer and enlisted ranks, if there were critical skills that would be exempted from the draw down, and what kind of adjustments, if any, would be necessary in your construction program that will result from the downsizing, and what kind of projects would we be less likely to see.

27K REDUCTION

General BOOZER. Well, Congressman, again, with the particulars of the grade structure and how we would take down and enlisted, noncommissioned officer and officer ranks associated with that 27K reduction, I would have to take that for the record, because we just don't know yet.

[The information follows:]

No decisions have been made. We do not have anything to submit, because no decisions have been made as to how we are reducing our end strength.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. As of January of this month—of this year rather, you are at 102 percent for recruiting and you had met all of your retention goals. As of March 3rd of this year, the active Army and the Reserve were operating at or near their authorized end strength, and the Guard was experiencing an excess of strength.

Given the strong recruiting and retention that the Army has been experiencing, has this put stress on the current facilities? And does the Army construction program reflect its authorized end strength, or is its over strength factored in? You can submit that for the record, if you want to, or you can respond.

Ms. HAMMACK. No decisions have been made. We do not have anything to submit, because no decisions have been made as to how we are reducing our end strength. And because no decisions have been made, we do not know where the impact could be felt in our facilities.

Part of the decision-making will be where there are facilities that are maybe at or exceeding capacity. That could be one of the decision factors, but again, no decisions have been made on how to take it down, and those are things that are being discussed right now. And I do not have a deadline as to when the decisions will be complete.

I do also want to address your concern as to whether we have overbuilt due to downsizing. What bothers me is—

Mr. BISHOP. Due to expected downsizing.

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, expected downsizing. Right now we have had to meet some of our increase in manpower with relocatables. And we have a lot of relocatable or temporary buildings throughout our inventory, so I do not believe we have overbuilt. And my intention is to work hard to take down and remove some of those

relocatables that use a lot of energy, that take up space, so that we can have an appropriately sized permanent structure facility.

Mr. BISHOP. Appreciate that.

Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Mr. Bishop.

At this time I recognize the gentleman from California. Mr. Farr.

Mr. FARR. Thank you very much.

Let me just ask you, Mr. Chairman. I think these questions raise the issue that we ought to have a special BRAC hearing. We had that. You were going to—you canceled it.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes. We are indeed going to do that. I want to be sure to sit down with you, Mr. Moran, and Mr. Dicks, to visit with you in advance of that hearing and kind of think it through and map it out.

Mr. FARR. Because I have a whole bunch of questions—

Mr. CULBERSON. Absolutely. We are going to do a special BRAC hearing, yes, sir.

Mr. FARR [continuing]. On legacy bases and all kinds of stuff. So I would love to do that. And if you are going to have that hearing, I will put those off to another time.

IMPACTS OF CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Ms. Hammack, you indicated in your testimony that the CR was doing great damage to the ability to manage the MILCON construction budget. Could you tell us what the impact of the CR is on military construction projects in each of our bases here in this committee—I mean, in our districts—or if not, in the states?

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, we can provide you with that information. [The information follows:]

The projects by district of each committee member impacted by the continuing resolution are:

TX-31—Representative Carter. Fort Hood: Urban Assault Course, \$2.5M; Battalion Complex, \$40M; Brigade Complex, \$38M; Company Operations Facility, \$4.3M.

CA-17—Representative Farr. Fort Hunter-Liggett: Hand Grenade Familiarization Range, \$1.4M; Light Demolition Range, \$2.7M; Grenade Launcher Range, \$1.4M; Camp Roberts: Combined Army Collective Training Facility, \$19M; Presidio of Monterey: General Instruction Facility, \$39M.

WA-6—Representative Dicks. Tacoma, WA: Combined Support Maintenance Shop, \$25M.

MS. HAMMACK. As I said, the state that impacted the most is Alaska. We currently have \$300 million in construction that is on hold pending award.

Mr. FARR. We don't have Alaskan member here.

Ms. HAMMACK. No, you don't.

Mr. FARR. How about somebody in this—

Ms. HAMMACK. Texas is the next biggest, with 198 million.

Mr. FARR. So what does—when you—198 million in new start construction projects, and how does the CR disrupt those?

Ms. HAMMACK. The CR means we do not have new start authority. We cannot award contracts for construction under a CR. So unless we are specifically authorized new start authority, we will remain on hold, and the increase is almost at the pace of \$100 million worth of construction every week that we delay.

Mr. FARR. And that delay, then, is those jobs go to private contractors to bid on the projects, and those are private jobs.

Ms. HAMMACK. Those are private jobs, yes, sir.

Mr. FARR. So when we really talk about the CR hurting private sector, this is probably one of the best examples of it.

Ms. HAMMACK. Absolutely. And as I said, it is \$1.8 billion in construction right now that private contractors have bid on, that they are fully designed, they are fully ready to start construction.

Mr. FARR. So they are shovel ready.

Ms. HAMMACK. They are shovel ready, yes, sir.

Mr. FARR. Okay.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Farr.

Mr. FARR. If we had this authorization in the defense bill, which is the underlying package for the CR, we are going to pass a defense bill, then on top of that everything else is CR. If MILCON was part of the base defense bill, these construction projects, then you would have a statutory authority to go business as usual.

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. FARR. But if it is just CR, even if it goes to the end of the year, will you not have the authority?

Ms. HAMMACK. We do not. We do not have the ability to award new contracts.

Mr. FARR. Wow. Mr. Chairman, maybe—we got the ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Committee here—maybe we could get an amendment for that big, big defense build on the MILCON projects.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes.

Ms. HAMMACK. We would greatly appreciate that.

Mr. CULBERSON. If I could, be sure to clarify that as soon as we get a full-year CR, there is going to be new start authority in there. And that is, of course, what we are all working towards, is getting a full-year bill done, regular bill done for the rest of the year.

And then, finally, Mr. Farr, on Alaska, if you don't get those started pretty quickly, it is going to get cold pretty quick. When do you pretty much have to stop? You can't turn a shovel, what, after about October?

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, if we don't start by 1 May, then we will be unable to do those projects in Alaska.

Mr. FARR. I know I am getting a lot of pressure. What is the amount in my district?

Ms. HAMMACK. Currently, in California it is 126 million, and I believe approximately 90 million of that is in your district.

Mr. FARR. A lot of jobs.

Mr. DICKS. You are on mil time.

Mr. FARR. Yes. Mr. Dicks tried to talk me out of it my freshman year, so.

Mr. BISHOP. Excuse me. Will the gentleman yield?

Can you provide that for all of us?

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, we can.

Mr. BISHOP. All of us.

Ms. HAMMACK. We have it by state currently, and if you would like, we can break it down by installation and district.

Mr. CULBERSON. That would be helpful.

Mr. BISHOP. That would be very helpful.

Mr. CULBERSON. To everybody on the floor.

Mr. DICKS. We have got five states here. You have already mentioned two or three of them. Maybe you could just go through a list of—start with Georgia and—

Mr. BISHOP. Yes.

Ms. HAMMACK. Well, Virginia is 25 million. Georgia is 30 million. And then I think I covered Texas, California and Kansas.

Mr. DICKS. You didn't get Washington.

Ms. HAMMACK. Washington is 65 million, sir. My apologies.

Mr. DICKS. Sixty-five million?

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. DICKS. That is a lot of money.

Mr. FARR. First time I had more than you did for it.

Ms. HAMMACK. And that is as of today, which means next week there could be more projects that have gone to bid that we have received bids on, we have made a selection of the contractor, but we are unable to award. And the number goes up every day.

BID PROCESS DURING A CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. FARR. So we have made the selection of contractor. This delay is going to increase costs, isn't it?

Ms. HAMMACK. What we are doing currently is we are going back to the contractors whose bids have expired, asking for bid extensions. Some of them have given us bid extensions a couple of times already. We are finding out from some of them that they do not want to give us another bid extension. They want to re-bid, because prices have changed, and costs have increased.

Mr. FARR. So but you only have a fixed amount of money, so what are your options? You have to then put some on the chopping block? You have to reduce the scope of the project to fit the money? What do you do?

Ms. HAMMACK. An opportunity is to reduce scope is one opportunity. The other is we do have a contingency that could cover some of an increase in cost. Sometimes we have seen that the bids are coming in slightly lower than the programmed amount. So you have contingency funds there. Budgets are what were laid in place based upon a tri-service budgeting model.

Mr. FARR. If you have to re-bid, though, that starts the whole process all over again, or is the—

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, sir. It needs to go back out to be recomputed.

Mr. FARR. It is the same time length? How many months does that take?

Ms. HAMMACK. About 2 months.

Mr. FARR. So it is going to cost us more, and we are going to get less product.

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. DICKS. If you would yield, it is instability of the program, which is not good.

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. FARR. Let me ask you. It is interesting, because I found in looking at the FYDP for 2012 through 2016, there are \$3 million for classrooms and the Defense Language Institute in Monterey. Boy, we need those badly. We are in World War II barracks trying

to teach with the most modern equipment in the world in hot, humid buildings.

Then there was 69 million for barracks, but then when I looked at the FYDP for this year, those projects have slipped back. Why was that? They are back now to fiscal year 2013.

Ms. HAMMACK. I would have to take a look at that and get back to you. I do not have the details with me right now.

[The information follows:]

The \$69 million Enlisted Unaccompanied Personnel Housing barracks project for the Presidio of Monterey was moved to FY15 after review of the Permanent Party (PP) and Training Barracks buyout programs. The PP Barracks buyout program fully funds all PP barracks by FY13 with beneficial occupancy by FY15; whereas, the Training Barracks buyout program fully funds all training barracks projects by FY15 with beneficial occupancy by FY17. The Presidio of Monterey barracks project is part of the Training Barracks buyout program. The project was moved to the right to accommodate additional PP barracks requirements that were previously unprogrammed.

Mr. FARR. Yes, I would like to really find out why those barracks complex got pushed back by 2 years.

When you were in my office the other day, we talked about the conditions at Camp Roberts, and I would ask your predecessors in this room and, frankly, should have asked you, because you are the one that is on top of it, and I know you are going there. In fact, we are both going to be there on Friday.

I hope that you can take a look at prioritizing. This is National Guard work, doesn't get at all the priorities and everything else here in Washington gets. But how do we prioritize this huge training base under the command of the National Guard within all the other pressures by all the services who—I mean, how do we bring this up, move it up to the attention?

CAMP ROBERTS

I would like to get for the record just so we can keep everybody's focus on this, Mr. Chairman. It would be of your interest. It was in the Sacramento Bee, right here in front of me, if I can just find it in this pile of everything, reading that "California's Guard Largest Training Facility, Camp Roberts, Steadily Deteriorates."

And they have sewer coming up through the bathroom showers and things like that. Not a good way to have men and women in training.

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Would you like to put that in the record?

Mr. FARR. Yes, sir.

[The information follows:]

Camp Roberts is an enduring installation for the California Army National Guard (CAARNG). The utilities infrastructure on Camp Roberts is antiquated and in much need of repair.

Immediate / emergency maintenance issues should be reported through the soldier's chain of command and the soldier's chain of command will report any and all facility deficiencies to the Camp Roberts Directorate of Logistics (DOL) / Facility Maintenance Officer (FMO). The Camp Roberts DOL / FMO will evaluate reported deficiencies and will make a determination regarding the extent of work required to mitigate / fix deficiency.

Camp Roberts is scheduled to receive in the FY12 budget a 32 million dollar utilities infrastructure upgrade project. This project is comprehensive and will provide upgrades to the following systems: electrical distribution; natural gas pipelines; domestic water distribution; domestic well house and pumps; sanitary sewer; and storm water drainage.

THE SACRAMENTO BEE sacbee.com

California Guard's largest training facility, Camp Roberts, steadily deteriorates

cpiller@sacbee.com

Published Saturday, Mar. 26, 2011

CAMP ROBERTS – Most California Army National Guard members who deploy to the killing fields of Afghanistan first train here, a sprawling landscape of barracks, assault courses and firing ranges straddling San Luis Obispo and Monterey counties.

Before those soldiers encounter the depredations of war, they face the deprivations of Camp Roberts.

In Building 4001, service members routinely see raw sewage bubbling up from shower drains and toilets and spilling onto the floor, according to a February report by Sgt. Dustin Shepherd, noncommissioned officer in charge of camp operations.

Building 6038, where soldiers check in for training, recently lacked heat despite temperatures dropping to 30 degrees, and had no air conditioning for blazing summer days.

"I am literally sick over this," Shepherd wrote to superiors in a February e-mail obtained by The Bee, "and completely disgusted with the lack of soldier care."

Similar disrepair typifies much of California's largest Guard base.

Scores of buildings created as temporary structures during the urgency of World War II are still in use with jury-rigged plumbing, missing floor coverings and peeling paint. Some are falling apart.

Yet a Bee investigation found that millions of dollars in building materials, appliances and other supplies sit unused or ruined in Camp Roberts warehouses. Inventory controls are so poor, according to internal Guard reports obtained by The Bee, that officials don't know what they have or what is missing. Meanwhile, the camp routinely orders dozens of unneeded items.

The decrepitude of what Guard officials call a "State of the Art Readiness Center for Deploying Soldiers," say service members who know the camp well, stems from decades of deferred maintenance and neglect. Other state facilities – including nearby Camp San Luis Obispo, which boasts a well-appointed officers club and picturesque chapel with gazebo – have been updated and expanded.

"It's a travesty – their lack of care for soldiers," said retired Col. William Hatch, who commanded Camp Roberts from 2003 to 2004. "If we are sending them to war, we owe them the best training facilities. We owe that to the soldiers, their families and the citizens of the state of California."

Deterioration and waste

Camp Roberts' namesake is Cpl. Harold W. Roberts, a tank driver in World War I who won a Congressional Medal of Honor for valor. The camp opened in 1941. A now-shabby parade ground at its heart reflects early pride – at 1,400 yards long, it's the largest in the nation, according to the camp's official history.

Camp Roberts is by far the largest of the California Guard's three major training camps. On average more than 1,100 soldiers train here per day. Counting salaries for 560 full-time employees, modernization and federal stimulus funds, camp officials project its annual economic footprint at \$58 million.

The Guard licensed Camp Roberts in 1971 from the U.S. Army as a training site for marksmanship, tank maneuvers and other battle skills. In recent years, it has upgraded firing ranges and utilities; cleaned sewer lines; replaced roofs, siding and windows on some barracks; and enhanced a fitness room and a recreation center. Federal stimulus funds paid for \$14 million of the improvements.

Yet during a recent tour of the camp, signs of overall dilapidation were evident.

A storm had reduced terrain around some barracks to mud. Inside some buildings, linoleum floors were torn up, many walls battered and stained. Splintering handrails led upstairs, bare bulbs lighting the way. Some showers were rusted and filthy, some windows boarded up.

The camp swimming pool has been defunct for years. In a gymnasium "fight house" used to teach soldiers hand-to-hand combat, aged floor mats no longer align – a serious safety hazard.

Some employees line office doorways with sticky mousetraps in a vain effort to keep out mice.

In a recently prepared slide presentation, the camp's commander, Col. Barbara A. Nuismer, called the antiquated electrical distribution system unreliable and in some cases unsafe. She noted that some buildings lack interior wiring or fire alarms.

"Admittedly, Camp Roberts is in need of significant improvements, and our leadership will not rest until they are realized," Guard officials said in a written statement.

They called barrack upgrades a top priority, for which they were seeking \$75 million in federal funds. Even so, they said all barracks have smoke alarms and fire extinguishers, and troops housed in them patrol throughout the night, partly to watch for fires. They discounted suggestions that the camp is "overrun by mice" or "saturated by 'raw sewage.' "

Nearby, the camp ghost town features 658 long-condemned structures with collapsing walls and shattered windows that gaze blankly at passing jeeps. Signs warn of toxic contamination, such as lead, asbestos and hantavirus, an often deadly rodent-borne disease. A decaying building marked "NBC" – nuclear, biological chemical defense – and a sagging chapel serve as grim sentinels of a bygone training metropolis of the first rank.

Guard officials want to tear down the old buildings and fix two condemned bridges, they said, but lack the funds for those jobs and many others.

They said camp maintenance had been ignored by the federal government before the Guard took over. The problems are a legacy of early federal management, they said, and 40 years of Guard stewardship has not been sufficient to remedy them.

"Funding we receive has only allowed for a portion of what is needed to properly maintain the site," Guard officials wrote, "let alone bring it back from disrepair."

But a June 2010 inspection report obtained by The Bee suggests that some of the shabbiness stems from a breakdown in storing and tracking millions of dollars of supplies and tools in a row of 70-year-old, rundown warehouses where appliances and office furniture rust outside on loading docks.

The report says accounting for much of the property was impossible, in part because more than half of all contents, valued at millions of dollars, were not logged. Sorely needed building materials, worth an estimated half-million dollars, had aged past their usable life span. Sheetrock and wood doors rotted outside, according to the report, and vehicles damaged in accidents were left untouched for up to a year.

Another camp report says only one warehouse worker was employed to maintain the camp's entire inventory in buildings with jumbled shelves and leaky roofs. Even four full-time workers, the report indicated, would need more than 18 months to put the warehouses right.

Meanwhile, Camp Roberts purchased dozens of unused weed trimmers and 31 sets of 100 drill bits, the inspector indicated, "even though they have hundreds of spare bits on hand."

"If the people of the state of California knew how their tax money is being spent but then not used," the inspector wrote, "there would be an uproar."

Officials responded that the warehouse problems were overstated, and "limited manning and funding has forced us to be selective in which ills we would remedy first, but we have been neither inactive nor neglectful in that effort."

Follow the money

Camp Roberts' lowly status in the eyes of Guard leaders seemed clear in December 2003, Hatch said, when a powerful earthquake damaged camp structures, including a large warehouse and an ammunition bunker. The former commander now directs a training center for the state Emergency Management Agency.

His staff at Camp Roberts estimated \$17 million in repairs were needed. The Army Corps of Engineers conducted its own assessment and confirmed only \$4 million in damage, Hatch said.

He didn't fault those figures, he said, because "it was really hard, due to the state of degradation of Camp Roberts, to see what was really caused by the earthquake."

But the \$4 million never trickled down to Camp Roberts during Hatch's tenure. After he left in 2004, he said, he asked the new commander, Col. John Smith, whether the money had ever arrived. It hadn't.

Guard officials said \$4.7 million for quake repair was received in fiscal 2005, of which \$2 million went to Camp Roberts to fix a theater, a propane leak and sewer lines, among other problems. The rest went to Camp San Luis Obispo and other facilities.

A former director of operations at Camp Roberts, retired Lt. Col. Russell A. Smith (no relation to John Smith), attributed the camp's condition to larger, routine diversions of funds. Last week he told the California Senate Veterans Affairs Committee that, since 1989, \$550 million has been taken from funds designated for Camp Roberts to pay salaries to top Guard officers and for improvements at Camp San Luis Obispo and another base.

Guard officials called Smith's figures "egregiously inaccurate," because they exceeded the overall federal allocation for all facility improvements, and because such funds are not earmarked by facility.

This year, Camp Roberts will get nearly \$5 million from a \$12 million allotment.

The California Bureau of State Audits in recent years has issued three reports about possible diversions of funds, without directly addressing Camp Roberts. Some federal money – which comprises the vast majority of the Guard's roughly \$1 billion annual budget – might have been shifted improperly to pay employees who did not work on funded projects. Since at least 2007, auditors wrote, the Guard had not properly tracked spending for operations and maintenance, violating federal law.

Auditors repeatedly warned the Guard that it "lacked internal controls" to detect improper payments for work unrelated to the goals of the funding. The Guard promised to fix the problem by last August but has still not done so. Officials called the issue a "microaccounting" recommendation, rather than "an example of misappropriation of funds or unethical practice."

Somehow, other states have been able to improve their training sites despite similar challenges, Hatch said, adding that neglect and mismanagement have caused Camp Roberts to fall far behind. Hatch said he protested the conditions but was rebuffed without explanation.

" 'We don't have to tell you what we're doing,' " Hatch said headquarters told him when he was commander. " 'We don't have to be accountable to you.' "

© Copyright The Sacramento Bee. All rights reserved.

Contact The Bee's Charles Piller (916) 321-1113.

Mr. CULBERSON. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. FARR. And I know that the secretary is going to take care of this when she is out there on Friday.

Ms. HAMMACK. I won't say I will be able to take care of everything, but Camp Roberts is scheduled for a \$32 million utility infrastructure upgrade project. This is a training that is used regularly by the National Guard, primarily in May through August, with a group staying there from 2 to 4 weeks for training.

These are not permanent party barracks, and so we do not build them for permanent occupation. They are built as a camp. We did pull some data and take a look at the investment in sustainment, and there was about, historically, anywhere between \$5 million and \$8 million a year that is spent at the camp to work on those facilities.

In 2010 they received 8.6 million in sustainment account. They received 2.5 in MILCON and another 2.8 million. So there has been an investment just in the last 8 years of 43 million in sustainment, 10 million in MILCON, and 23 million in other—

Mr. FARR. And I am sure when you visit, as I have many times, you will ask where did that money go. I mean, one of the things they are—in the middle of the space, which is a former Army base given to the National Guard, next door to one of the Army's largest training bases, which is now under the command of the Army Reserve. Between these two bases you have got over 200,000 acres of, you know, remarkable training space.

In the middle of Camp Roberts is SATCOM, you know, the intell, everything else communications, a big, huge valley of satellites and everything. Camp Roberts does provide all the base ops for the SATCOM, and I don't think that they ever get any credit for that.

I mean, that is the problem, if you are going to eat a meal for all the workers at SATCOM or you are going to do anything, because SATCOM is just a circle out in the middle of nowhere. You drive there, and then you have to—everything else has to be done on Camp Roberts.

And I hope that you can start getting a kind of relationship between SATCOM and their ability to provide some of the support services for the base. And then we can talk more about that on Friday.

FORT ORD

Let me just—another question I have is when you were in my office—

You know, we have this crazy thing, Mr. Chairman. I think I brought it up. We have excess military property given when the BRAC closed Fort Ord, the largest training base in the United States ever to be closed. Twenty-five thousand people got up and left, just left a whole city.

And we are trying to build a veterans clinic on that land, and we have got this crazy OMB scoring that says you can't. And it is federal land. They have a federal building on it used jointly by DOD, active-duty DOD and veterans. And because of the way, its screwed up scoring, they won't allow us to go to bid on this thing.

And we talked about that. And you said you had a chance to go over and talk to OMB. What came out of that?

Ms. HAMMACK. I am going over to OMB at 4:15 today, sir.

Mr. FARR. Well, I hope I can tell you—say that you can say that the whole committee here was interested in resolving this question, because what applies to me applies to anybody. It is a circumstantial issue. It applies to everybody here. And it is just unfathomable that we can't use DOD land for DOD and veterans purposes. So you are aware of the issues, and I appreciate that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Mr. Farr.

The article which Sam provided may point out here that the internal Guard reports obtained by the newspaper officials don't know what they have or don't have or what is missing. Meanwhile, the camp routinely orders dozens of unneeded items.

It is astonishing. You said there is about \$48 million been invested in this camp, and it does sound appalling. Whether a man or woman in uniform is there for a week, a month or a couple of years, they ought to be provided with adequate, certainly, you know, the best possible living conditions. This sounds appalling. It is really worth your attention.

And before I go to Mr. Moran, I want to say that he has my full support in his problem that he has got in Northern Virginia.

If I may, if you would permit me, Mr. Moran, to intrude on your time a little bit—Madam Secretary, you have got the discretion, the authority to help solve this problem. I would like to ask if you would, please, on your own, just issue an order that there will be no more than 1,000 parking spaces provided for that facility that Mr. Moran is having a problem with, please, so we don't have to do it. Otherwise, we will do it. Please.

MARK CENTER BRAC 133

Ms. HAMMACK. The Army is constructing a DOD facility that meets the parking spaces for those who will be stationed there. And so currently we are building less and have built less than the allowed amount by code. But we are intending to utilize approximately 3,500 parking spots.

Mr. CULBERSON. Well, we don't want to—we would rather you all do it on your own initiative, but he has my full support and I know the support of this committee in helping to solve a bad problem created by BRAC. So I would like to ask you, please, would you issue an order limiting the number of parking spaces and then use buses to take people in and out of there, so we don't have to do it?

Ms. HAMMACK. I can say that I would discuss it with my OSD counterpart.

Mr. CULBERSON. I will recognize Mr. Moran and acknowledge that he has indeed the full support of the Chairman and this committee in helping you solve your problem, as would any member in their district with a local issue like this.

Mr. MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You think that is funny, Ms. Hammack? Big smile when the chairman asked you that.

The National Academy of Sciences just issued a report that concluded that the relocation of 6,400 Department of Defense personnel under BRAC to that Mark Center in Alexandria would likely subject the 200,000 commuters that have to drive by that inter-

section to substantial new delays of an hour or more, compromise the Washington headquarters military mission, and decrease the economic competitiveness of local businesses, not to mention the quality of life of everyone who lives in the area.

That is not funny. What is your response?

Ms. HAMMACK. Currently, the Department of Defense has come up with some proposals for improvements and is looking to fund it with some of the prior year savings from the BRAC 2005 account. This does require a reprogramming action, and it is something that I think you will see a request coming through soon to mitigate some of the challenges that might occur in that area.

Mr. MORAN. When are the people moving in?

Ms. HAMMACK. Right now the building will be ready for occupancy August 9th, and that is when the first people will start moving in.

Mr. MORAN. Of this year.

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORAN. And when will all 6,400 have been moved in?

Ms. HAMMACK. I do not have the schedule in front of me, but that is something we can get back to you on.

[The information follows:]

The OSD agencies occupying the facility are submitting that the data to the Washington Headquarters Services (WHS). WHS is managing the move into the Mark Center for the Department of Defense and has not finalized the schedule.

Mr. MORAN. No. You don't have any idea when they are going to be there?

Ms. HAMMACK. The OSD, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, is putting together that schedule, and I do not have it here with me.

Mr. MORAN. Will you have more than half of them moved in by the end of the year?

Ms. HAMMACK. The intent right now is to meet the BRAC deadline of September 15th, 2011. And there is work to meet that deadline. I do not know whether that means if all 6,000 will be moved in by September 15th or not.

ROAD IMPROVEMENTS STUDIES—BRAC PROJECT 133

Mr. MORAN. Bearing in mind that this is a decision that was made in 2005, 6 years ago, if you ask for this reprogramming, when will the money be made available? When will the road improvements be accomplished? And when as a result will the traffic congestion be mitigated?

Ms. HAMMACK. The schedule is entirely up to when we receive the funds and when the reprogramming effort goes forward. We are working with the Office of the Secretary of Defense on that. We hope that will come forward for authorization within the next 30 days.

Mr. MORAN. Let me get this right. So you have got 6,400 people moving into a building in September as a result of a decision that was made 6 years ago, and you haven't yet asked for reprogramming for the funds to start to address the delay that the National Academy of Sciences concluded is going to happen within a few months. That is what you are telling me.

Ms. HAMMACK. Previous transportation studies showed that the mitigation efforts that were part of the BRAC program, the 12 million I talked about earlier, would be sufficient to address any transportation challenges. It is in more recent studies that it has highlighted an additional need, and we are working to fund that.

Mr. MORAN. Do you agree with the Corps of Engineers' assessment that the intersections surrounding that Mark Center will experience failing levels of service as soon as you occupy that building?

Ms. HAMMACK. I am aware that several have been rated that, yes.

Mr. MORAN. That is not what I asked. Do you agree with that? You are saying you are aware of the study. Do you agree that that is the case that you are going to have failing levels of service?

Ms. HAMMACK. I do not know that we will have failing levels of service.

Mr. MORAN. Well, then what—

Ms. HAMMACK. I am aware of the study that if everyone came in at exactly the same time, those intersections could have failing levels of service.

Mr. MORAN. What are you doing about it? I mean, you know, you have been asked earlier about the defense access roads. Now, these are decisions that were made in 2005, 6 years ago. And you have used terms like, "well, we need better communication," "we are evaluating whether changes need to be made," "we need more discussion," "we will get back to you with more detail." I am writing down your response.

It is 6 years later. It is the 11th hour. Within months you have got more than 6,000 moving into a building. You transferred more than 20,000 people out of office space that was next to a metro station, and now you are telling us, "Well, we are getting around to asking for a reprogramming" to get money to start making the changes, which can't possibly happen until these people are moved in, can they?

TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

Ms. HAMMACK. We have a transportation management plan that will address the mass commuting expectations for that facility. Some of it will be transportation—

Mr. MORAN. Let me get this right. You have got a transportation management plan that will address—

Ms. HAMMACK. The expectation that a significant amount of people—

Mr. MORAN. That will address the expectations.

Ms. HAMMACK. Currently, a high percentage, approximately 40 percent of those people who work at the Pentagon, use mass transportation. It is much higher than national averages.

Mr. MORAN. And, Mr. Chairman, let me point out that is because they are in office space next to a Metro station. That is why they use public transit. They are all being taken away from those offices, away from those Metro stations, being put in a building that doesn't have access to Metro.

Have you factored that in?

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, we have. And it has a transportation center for buses. We will have shuttle services from Metro stations. We will have shuttle services from the Pentagon. We anticipate quite a few people will come into the Pentagon Metro station and take a shuttle bus, which goes against traffic, to get to the Mark Center.

Mr. MORAN. You could have quite a few people, but you are talking about thousands. You are still planning on occupying 3,800 parking spaces in an area that at maximum can't absorb 1,000 more vehicles, if they are spread out over a 3-hour period.

But you are here telling us this is what you are doing.

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORAN. As far as I am concerned, you are whistling on the sidelines, watching a crash about to happen. And then you are going to tell us, "Well, we are evaluating it. We need more discussion." That is not the way the military should be operating.

Ms. HAMMACK. We are currently responding to a VDOT study that was completed in December 2010, which identified an increased need, which did meet the DAR criteria, which generated the request for increased funding that is currently being programmed to address some of the transportation issues.

The previous studies did not show the same level of congestion as anticipated in the most recent study.

Mr. MORAN. And that is because you did a study in concert with the developer that you kept proprietary and didn't share with the state Department of Transportation or with the city. When it was shared, and they saw the assumptions that you were working on, they realized they were faulty. It was a deficient study.

For example, they assumed that even though 90 percent of the Washington headquarters service go to work on any given day, only 75 percent are going to show up. That was an assumption in the study.

You were shown that the sequence of lights is not the way it is now. They say 30 seconds here. You assumed a study with a different sequence of lights. You assumed turning lanes that in reality can't function in the way that you have suggested turning against solid green light of traffic going east.

The state determined and the city determined the assumptions that were used were false, because you had a conclusion that the—it wasn't you yourself—but that the Army wanted. And so they came up with what was a phony transportation plan.

And finally, when we got hold of it, we could see the deficiencies in it. And now you are relying upon that as the basis for your decision-making. And I know that you are upset now that I am upset, because this is not the way we generally treat people. But we have got a disaster about to happen.

And as far as I am concerned, you couldn't care less. You are not doing anything about it. We haven't even gotten the reprogramming letter. And in a few months we are going to have chaos there.

And when the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the Chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, who have to travel from the south of the Beltway to get into Washington, are stuck in an hour of delay, they are going to look around, and how could this possibly have happened?

And this is how it happens. Nothing was done until the 11th hour, and then you start thinking about it and suggest we need discussions. Maybe we need new legislation to figure out a way for Defense Access Roads money. But the reality is even if we get that money and you start construction, the construction is going to exacerbate the problem.

In my office you talked about that people—well, some people get up at 3 o'clock in the morning to get to work. What kind of impact does that have on their families when they have to go to bed at 8 o'clock? They can't spend any time with their kids, because they have got to get up at 3 o'clock to get into the Pentagon by 5 or 6 o'clock?

It is wrong.

All right. Do the short and midterm improvements that you are suggesting at some point are going to be made—does it satisfy the Defense Access Road criteria?

Ms. HAMMACK. Yes, they do.

Mr. MORAN. They do. So when will the short and midterm transportation improvements be completed?

Ms. HAMMACK. It depends upon when we get the authorization to proceed on the reprogramming issue.

Mr. MORAN. And when might you get that? What is that dependent upon? What is the first thing it is dependent upon?

Ms. HAMMACK. It is with OSD right now, and it is working its way through their system. I do not know what the timeline.

Mr. MORAN. So it is dependent upon the Department of Defense asking for it in the first place, which they haven't even asked for, have they?

Ms. HAMMACK. I believe that they are working their way through the system and the process that we are—

Mr. MORAN. Working their way through the system. This is 6 years—6 years in the making. It is about to happen. And now they are working their way through the system.

Ms. HAMMACK. Absolutely. Following the rules given to us by Congress to request a reprogramming issue.

Mr. MORAN. But it has been 6 years. Chaos is about to break loose. And DOD is still basically sitting on this reprogramming request.

Ms. HAMMACK. Considering the VDOT study was December 2010, the analysis came through, we put in the request. I will agree it is now April. I think that is something that will work its way through in the short term. I can't commit on dates, because it is not up to me. It is up to the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. MORAN. So you are implying it is VDOT's fault—

Ms. HAMMACK. Not at all.

Mr. MORAN [continuing]. That you just got the VDOT analysis. But the VDOT analysis is based upon the reality of what you are planning on doing. I don't know why it had to be up to VDOT to finally point out the fallacy of the plan you are working with.

Ms. HAMMACK. Our initial studies were based upon 2007 and 2008 data. And as time has progressed, as we have seen throughout the whole D.C. metro area, traffic has increased. The population has increased. The situation has changed, and we are responding in accordance to a changed situation.

Mr. MORAN. Well, I mean, that is what your staff may have told you, and I suppose they are content with that, because it is not going to affect them directly. But the reality is that it is not because of increased economic activity or developments that we have this problem. VDOT concluded that the transportation study you did several years ago was deficient. The analysis they did then was wrong.

What is the general suggesting?

General BOOZER. Congressman, what I was going to add to this is—and I know there are issues here that we are trying to work through.

Mr. MORAN. Oh, there are issues, General.

General BOOZER. Yes, Congressman. When the Mark Center was permitted, it was planned for an even greater density than the studies indicate. We are going to have a much lesser density than even what was permitted when we did the Mark Center.

These seven short-to-midterm fixes that we are trying to do, that the Secretary has mentioned with the reprogramming action, are going to get after the northbound I-395 on and off ramps, the Seminary Road issues that I know you are all familiar with, the Beauregard Street entries and exits. It is going to create a pedestrian bridge. Those are fairly easy fixes, once we get the funds and can move out as far as constructing.

Mr. MORAN. But, General, you haven't even asked us for the funds.

You know, Mr. Chairman, you may have detected a certain note of frustration. But I think that any of you would be experiencing a similar frustration. Two hundred thousand people is a lot of people that depend upon 395. Every one of them is going to be delayed for an interminable period of time.

Every street in that vicinity is going to go into lockdown because once people see the delay that will extend from the mixing bowl in Springfield down to Seminary Road, they are going to get off on other streets—Seminary, Beauregard, Duke Street, Van Dorn, you name it. So the place is going to become a parking lot, and it will extend for 2, maybe 3 hours.

Some of the assumptions that were made were clearly faulty. I mean, it was a rigged study—the changing the light sequence, assuming a much smaller number of people are actually going to show up to work on a given day, whatever. I can tell you about some of the other assumptions that were faulty.

One of them was the shuttles that will come from Metro stations. I went to one of the Metro stations. They assumed approximately a 20-minute shuttle. We just went on a regular morning, and it took more than 50 minutes. We sat there on the bus. We did exactly what every bus is going to do. And it was over 50 minutes.

Which means that your employees, that you have some responsibility for, are going to have to get up in the morning, drive to a parking lot, somehow get to that Metro station, then get on the bus, because Metro doesn't go to the site we are talking about. Sit on the bus. Same thing going home.

It just seems to me that the Defense Department should be a little more concerned about the number of people who are going to spend hours in their daily commute. And yet what we get, and

what I have been getting for years now, really, is this, "well, we will study it," "you know, VDOT didn't do the job," "well, we could have done more," "well, it is the city's fault," or it is somebody else's fault.

And now we are right here, 2011. They are all going to move. Nothing has changed. All 3,800 parking spaces are going to be filled. All 6,400 people are going to move there. It is being called Fort Belvoir, which it is not.

The one place you could have taken an exit ramp and emptied it out, you put a remote inspection facility for an office building. And these folks work in office buildings. They didn't have any remote inspection facility. You already got one at Fort Belvoir.

But all of these things have just been allowed to happen. That is very disappointing. And I know after this hearing you are all going to commiserate. "Oh, was he mean to me and rough and unjustified. It is not my fault. It is not your fault. It is not your fault. It is nobody's fault."

But it is going to be all our fault when this happens. We should be able to do something better than say, "I told you so." I am really disgusted at what has been allowed to happen. And now there is an inevitability to it. We can't even get language in the continuing resolution.

Mr. Chairman, I am at my wit's end on this. I guess it is fairly obvious. I am extremely disappointed with the people and decision-making capacities, because nobody stepped up. It is somebody else's fault.

Mr. BISHOP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP. I distinctly remember when we were going through this process, both on the Defense Subcommittee and the MILCON Subcommittee back in 2004, 2005, when we were anticipating the cost of the war, the FYDP and of the modernization of the forces.

We were anticipating all of that, and we were questioning the Secretary of Defense specifically about what those additional costs would be and asking for justification of force studies that would illustrate what those costs would be. And we were assured that the costs would be minimal and that we did not need to make plans for any additional resources for the kinds of things that you are describing.

And, of course, the studies that were done at that time apparently came back with the assumptions that were made by the leadership at that time. And, of course, we predicted then that it was insufficient, and we were trying to get more accurate accounting, which we never were really able to do.

Now we find ourselves at the appointed hour, faced with the situation that we expected, that we were afraid would occur. And so I share your frustration, Mr. Moran, and I would hope that this administration at this point in time would look forward to how we can fix the problem.

Get us the information that we need. Whatever it is that you need, if you have got to do a report, send us a letter, but let us get it done.

I yield, Mr. Chair.

Mr. MORAN. Well, thank you, Mr. Bishop.

The fact is that the savings estimates were hyperinflated. The costs were deflated. If you look at the numbers now, the savings from BRAC are almost immaterial, and the trend is that it may actually cost us more money in the final analysis.

But, you know, we were told also, you will recall, the Iraq war, Mr. Wolfowitz was up here saying it is not going to cost us a dime. We are going to make it all up in oil and, yes, yes, and a trillion dollars later, yes.

Well, the last thing I said was it is somebody else's fault. That is what is going to be said by everybody. The reality is it is my fault, it is your fault, it is all our fault for not doing something about that.

I don't have anything further to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. In this job, whenever you encounter a problem, I think it is incumbent on all of us to do the right thing for the right reasons. And the right thing in this case is to—you have the authority, you have got the discretion with the stroke of a pen to adopt the very reasonable solution that Mr. Moran has come up with.

You know, BRAC is what it is, and I want to sit down with all of you all. We are going to talk about a BRAC hearing, and let us design that very carefully and get the right folks down here as witnesses, because obviously there are some serious flaws with the BRAC process.

Any BRAC decision that would allow a catastrophe like this to go forward is obviously flawed, and we are going to have a whole hearing on this.

But, Madam Secretary, seriously, you are working on so many important things. Your responsibilities are so vital to the safety, the security, the happiness, the health of our men and women in uniform, and the scope of your responsibilities are immense. And this committee is committed to help ensure the health, safety and security of our men and women in uniform.

Do the right thing here. You are creating a huge problem. You have got a big problem with me, if you don't solve this for Mr. Moran. You have got a problem with the whole committee, because it is the right thing to do.

Transportation is another thing that is near and dear to my heart. I worked hard on it in the state legislature. My first promise to my district when I got elected was to rebuild the Katy Freeway, I-10, which you all are not familiar with, but it was an eight-lane freeway, an old interstate freeway in Houston that is the main street for West Houston that had not been rebuilt since 1969.

And when I got elected, it was eight lanes wide. We had traffic jams for hours. And I hated that freeway. Everybody hated it. And I promised to find a way to get it built in record time.

And the only way we can give people back their time is by improving transportation. And it is really one of our most precious assets. My daughter is now 14. Sam has taken great pictures of her that I will always treasure, and I, you know, bring her down here every chance I get. She is, as all our kids are our most important thing we do in life.

The only way we can give people more time with their kids is by improving transportation. And the right thing to do here is to help

Mr. Moran and adopt the very sensible solution he has proposed is to limit—with the stroke of a pen today, you can limit the number of parking spaces at that facility to a thousand. It is the right thing to do.

And in a tough situation that is going to require—all this other stuff you are talking about is going to take years to figure all that out. Building ramps, transportation improvements—that is going to take years. But you could with the stroke of a pen—you have got the authority to do so—would you please do so? Please avoid other problems in other areas.

I am brand-new to this job. You are brand-new to the job. You haven't even been here a year yet, and you walked into this hornet's nest. But you could solve it. Just do the right thing. Just listen to your heart. Would you please do the right thing for the right reasons and adopt Mr. Moran's solution to limit the parking spaces to a thousand?

I assure you I am going to find a way to do it. And you are going to cause all kinds of other problems in other areas that you don't need. Please?

Ms. HAMMACK. I think one of the things—one of the things that this committee needs to address and we all need to address is where does the military's responsibility end. And the guidance that we have been given is the DAR criteria, the defense access roads. That limits our responsibility to a certain boundary beyond the fence line.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, ma'am. I understand that. But here Mr. Moran has found a solution that you can do within your own authority to limit the number of parking spaces within the footprint of the facility. And that can be done right now.

You have got so much that you are responsible for. There is no need—and clearly, he has laid it out, and I understand his passion. There is nothing that will aggravate people more than being stuck in traffic. That is time lost with our sons and our daughters that you never get back. Every minute I miss with that child, I will—you never get it back.

And the right thing to do here is to adopt the solution. Don't make us impose it, because I will. We are going to find a way to do this to help him.

And they are coming in September, Jim. I didn't realize that. You got everybody showing up in September.

Mr. MORAN. Yes. Yes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Sam, did you have any other questions? I am happy to defer to you, my friend, if you want to do some follow up before you leave.

Mr. FARR. I have one question. It might be a happy question.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, let us have a happy question.

NET ZERO ENERGY

Mr. FARR. If you could define for the committee what the net zero base—what does that mean?

Ms. HAMMACK. Net zero means that we don't consume more energy on the base in a year than we are able to produce, so that we reduce our impact on the transmission and distribution infrastruc-

ture in the United States and we also improve our ability to respond to a national disaster, which could be grid failures.

Mr. FARR. And you are going to do that at Fort Hunter Liggett, and I would love to see the committee come out and see this. It is really a remarkable place. And if you do that at Fort Hunter Liggett, then we could do that at Camp Roberts right next door, and we could do it at other bases all over the country, couldn't?

Ms. HAMMACK. We are starting up the program, announcing those candidates April 19th, and we look forward to working with them and publicizing their efforts as they work toward net zero.

Mr. MORAN. And that net zero transportation would be really cool.

Mr. CULBERSON. A little net zero transportation, Mr. Moran, that would be good.

Please solve this.

Ms. HAMMACK. I want you to be aware that the Army is constructing the building. We are not occupying the building. It is the OSD that is occupying the building, the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CULBERSON. You have the authority within your—it is within your discretion and within your authority to sign an order and adopt the solution Mr. Moran has proposed.

Ms. HAMMACK. I do not know that it is, but it is something I would discuss with others in the Department of Defense.

Mr. CULBERSON. And you need to do it soon, quickly.

Mr. BISHOP. She says she doesn't know if she has the authority. She doesn't know if the department has the authority.

Is that what you are saying?

Ms. HAMMACK. We are constructing the building. We are not the tenants of the building. The Army is not tenanting at all in that building.

Mr. CULBERSON. So who would have the authority to issue an order limiting the number of parking spaces, as Mr. Moran suggests?

Ms. HAMMACK. We will discuss it, but I believe that the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Mr. CULBERSON. Would you make that request and make it urgent, because we really need this?

Mr. BISHOP. That is your boss?

Ms. HAMMACK. Well, Secretary Gates and company, yes, sir.

Mr. CULBERSON. Okay. Thank you.

Let me also—let me ask about—

We are going to stay after this, Jim. They are going to need to get this solved, because this is happening right away, and it is critical.

TEMPORARY END STRENGTH INCREASE

Let me ask about the temporary end strength increase that Secretary Gates announced in July of 2009—I want to say last year; it is already 2011—of a temporary 22,000 soldier increase in active-duty Army on top of the 65,000 soldier permanent increase.

Of these soldiers, 7,000 were integrated in 2010. If you could, talk to us a little bit about the status of the integration of the remaining soldiers. And since this is a temporary increase, when is

the Army planning to return to the congressionally approved active component end strength of 547,400?

General BOOZER. Yes, sir. You know, when Congressman Bishop was asking about the 27K, we did not speak to the 22,000 that was the temporary increase to our end strength. The Army will come down off of that 22,000 by 2013. So we will be back at 547,000 in 2013, sir.

Mr. CULBERSON. What are the current National Guard and Army Reserve end strength numbers?

General BOOZER. Sir, I don't have those available to me, but I can get those to you.

[The information follows:]

As of 6 April 2011, the National Guard end strength is 362,181 Soldiers and the Army Reserve end strength is 205,522 Soldiers.

Mr. CULBERSON. Sure, that is fine.

The increase was designed to meet a temporary challenge, which will peak in the coming year and abate over the course of the next 3 years. Are you confident this challenge will abate by the end? Is it possible that this temporary increase will become permanent?

General BOOZER. I am fairly confident, sir, that the 22K temporary is only temporary.

BOOTS ON THE GROUND AND DWELL TIME

Mr. CULBERSON. Very good, sir.

And finally, and I will yield to Mr. Bishop, your statement suggests the optimal state of the Army would be sustainable boots on the ground dwell ratio of 1:3 for the active and 1:5 reserve component. This would provide the strategic flexibility that you indicate is unavailable, given the current end strength and demands on the force.

Assuming your end strength remains the same, the Iraq draw down proceeds as planned, and troop demands for Afghanistan do not increase, when would you be able to reach the optimal state for the Army? And how would this equation change, if the 22,000 soldier temporary increase—sounds like that is going to be temporary—when would you be able to reach the optimal state for the Army?

General BOOZER. Well, sir, we believe we are going to be able to get to that 1:2 BOG:Dwell by 2012, by 2012. Now, that is a macro statement, because inside our Army we have got units like aviation units that are going to take a little while longer to get to that 1:2 dwell. Our aviation units right now are still on a 1:1, like our Combat Aviation Brigades.

I have a son serving in one of those brigades, and he has done 12 months in Afghanistan. He will be home at Fort Hunter in Savannah, Georgia, for 12 months, and we would suspect to see him back because of a low density, high requirement type of unit.

So some of those units will take a little bit longer to get to the 1:2 and then expand that to a 1:3.

Mr. CULBERSON. Very good, sir. Thank you. We will submit other questions for the record.

And let me ask Mr. Bishop if he has any other questions.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

General Boozer, in fiscal year 2011 there is \$18 million included for a Warrior Transition Unit at Fort Eustis. Will that project still be able to be executed when the fiscal year 2011 funding is resolved, when that issue is resolved?

I have been out to the Warrior Transition Unit at Walter Reed. I think it is an excellent unit, and we have got, of course, units all over. But I really would like to know what the status is. Do we have enough of the WTUs to meet the Army's needs?

And when you started standing these units up, I have to assume that you started at bases that had high operations tempo. But tell me how did you decide—what factors went into deciding where you would put the facilities? And how many of our members—well, explain to the subcommittee exactly what the value of these facilities are, the Warrior Transition Units.

General BOOZER. Yes, sir. Of course, the Fort Eustis—sorry—the Fort Eustis WTU, I don't see it on our list right now as one being in jeopardy. But Fort Eustis WTU, as I recall, is our last WTU.

Mr. BISHOP. Yes, it was deleted from the fiscal year 2010.

General BOOZER. It is in 2011. Yes, sir. I am sorry.

Mr. BISHOP. Yes.

General BOOZER. It is in 2011. And so I don't know where we are with the award process for that particular project. But it is right now the Army's final WTU facility with the exception of one, potentially, overseas—

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. That is—

General BOOZER [continuing]. When we build the new Landstuhl replacement hospital.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. What is the status of that one?

General BOOZER. That one is yet to be programmed.

Mr. BISHOP. Wouldn't you think that that one would be a priority, since that is the primary stopover from individuals coming back from theater in Iraq and Afghanistan?

General BOOZER. Yes, sir. It absolutely will be. But we will—

Mr. BISHOP. That should have been one of the earlier ones, wouldn't you think?

General BOOZER. Well, I guess in hindsight it should have maybe have been one of the early ones, but now we are going to build a new hospital. We have got to get the siting right for where the new hospital is. We want to make sure it is in close proximity to that new hospital, and so that is why we delayed the programming of that last WTU.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. That makes sense.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is all I have.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Bishop, thank you.

I want to thank you all so very much for your testimony. I truly am looking forward to working with you. We are both brand-new to this job, and I am looking forward to do anything we can to support you, but please, please solve Mr. Moran's problem.

Thank you very much. Thank you.

[Questions for the Record submitted by Congressman Young for the Honorable Katherine Hammack and MG James Boozer follows:]

Saint Petersburg Airport

Question 1. The 1st of the 159th Army Reserve Aviation Battalion recently moved an additional company to Saint Petersburg Airport and alerted them out of cycle that they will be deploying this October. I am thankful that the Army Reserve has leased two hangers in order to facilitate training at the Airport prior to their deployment, but that is a short term solution. Has the Army Reserve looked at prioritizing the expansion of the facilities to provide adequate training and maintenance space prior to the unit's return in 2012?

Answer. The Army Reserve did look at prioritizing the expansion of the facilities at Clearwater Airport prior to the unit's return in 2012; however site constraints at the Clearwater Airport did not permit the Army Reserve to program permanent facilities in the Fiscal Year 2012 budget request. The Army Reserve, working with the United States Army Corps of Engineers, will perform an Available Site Investigation with the intent of finding a suitable site for the additional MEDEVAC Company. The current plan has the Army Reserve requesting funds for a permanent facility in two phases starting in Fiscal Year 2014.

Virtual and Mechanical Training

Question 2. Our equipment has changed significantly since 2001. Much of the equipment we have today to combat our complex enemy is highly technical and limited to the warfighters in theater. In order to address this issue, virtual and mechanical training simulators have been provided to our men and women. Currently, there are 7 fixed site and 13 mobile common drivers' trainers that provide virtual training capabilities for MRAP variants. Do you believe there is a shortfall in virtual and mechanical training complexes in garrison, specifically to train soldiers on high tech equipment or machines (i.e. MRAPs)?

Answer. The Army has, and is, fielding a variety of Live, Virtual, Constructive, and Gaming Training Aids, Devices, Simulators and Simulations (TADSS) to support its units in the Continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska, Korea, Japan, Europe, and in the Southwest Asia Theater of Operations. These TADSS support the needs of Soldiers, commanders and units. The Army believes TADSS provide what is referred to in the question as virtual and mechanical training. With regard to common driver trainers for the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles, the 7 fixed and 13 mobile common driver trainers cited in the question are adequate to meet the needs of the Army. The Army's intent, when fielding TADSS, is to field a complete system of systems, to include the TADSS, themselves, an appropriate facility, staff to operate and maintain the device, and other necessary installation level support, such as maintenance. Together, these capabilities are known as the Army Training Support System (TSS). The Army's overall posture with regard to fielded TADSS and TSS capabilities is good. We do not believe there is a shortfall, but additional TADSS would further enhance current capabilities.

Virtual and Mechanical Training

Question 3. Because the high tech nature and constant software update requirements of virtual simulators, do you see potential cost savings in contracting private sector for goods and services with regard to training facilities?

Answer. The Army has pursued contracting with the private sector for goods and services with regard to Training Aids, Devices, Simulators and Simulations (TADSS) and associated facilities. First, the TADSS, themselves, are procured from the private sector. Additionally, the Army has an Army-wide support contract in place to maintain fielded TADSS. This contract, known as War fighter FOCUS, has provided a significant efficiency with regard to costs to maintain TADSS. The Army is initiating a similar Training Support Services (TSS) contract which will be awarded in FY11. This contract will complement Warfighter FOCUS by providing commands and installations with a means to augment their TSS government staffs with needed expertise from the private sector.

[Questions for the Record submitted by Congressman Flake for the Honorable Katherine Hammack and MG James Boozer follows:]

School Improvements

Question 1. Legislation has passed the House of Representatives which includes a provision that would appropriate \$250 million for the Department of Defense to make improvements at local, public schools owned by state and local governments but located on military bases.

Does the Department of Defense have the authority to carry out this provision, were it to become law?

Answer. Yes, the Department of Defense has the authority to carry out the provision as laid out in the statute.

School Improvements

Question 2. How would the Department determine which schools would receive the improvements? If there is a list of schools that would receive the finding, what criteria were used in determining the schools that were put on that list?

Answer. The Office of the Secretary of Defense is still reviewing this question and will provide an update.

School Improvements

Question 3. Would this broaden the responsibilities of the Defense Department beyond where they currently lie to include providing for the upkeep — physically and financially — of all such schools located on military bases?

Answer. No, the Department of Defense (DoD) will not construct any schools where we will be responsible for any maintenance. DoD will use all funds to construct or renovate schools in support of the local education authorities.

BRAC 2005

Question 4. The latest BRAC round in 2005 is scheduled to be completed no later than September 15⁶¹ of this year. The request for military construction funding for FY 2012 is \$9.9 billion below the amount enacted in FY 2010 and \$5.2 billion below what was requested in FY 2011, with the largest portion of those reductions coming from military base closure accounts.

How close is the Army to finishing the 2005 BRAC round?

Answer. 102 Army managed recommendations containing 1,147 actions require completion to comply with BRAC law. 26 recommendations and 427 actions are complete. Six recommendations are at high risk for meeting the statutory deadline. While the Department is facing scheduling challenges in a few cases, we are working diligently to ensure we satisfy our BRAC legal obligations. Army Senior Leaders continue to intensely manage implementation of each of our Army recommendations.

BRAC 2005

Question 5. How has the lack of an operating budget for FY 2011 impacted the Army's efforts to finish these projects on time?

Answer. Currently the Army has received \$358M (35%) of the \$1,012M requested in the FY 11 President's Budget. Operating under a continuing resolution has not affected BRAC implementation to date. To comply with BRAC law, the remaining balance of requested FY 11 finding is required to purchase furniture, equipment, information technology systems and other building requirements to achieve "troop ready" status prior to receiving moving units. All FY 11 finding is required by the third quarter to ensure we are able to fund all of these remaining requirements.

BRAC 2005

Question 6. You mention in your testimony that the Army is requesting nearly \$71 million for prior BRAC rounds, the bulk of which would be for "environmental restoration." Were these additional requirements on BRAC rounds that came after completion of projects? Will we have similar requirements down the road for the 2005 BRAC round?

Answer. BRAC environmental restoration requirements are to address contamination on surplus property that will transfer outside the Federal government after closure. Under the previous four rounds of BRAC the Army had surplus acres that were heavily contaminated and much of the \$71M is to be applied for resolving those problems. New environmental restoration requirements did surface after closure but all are related to existing contamination. Under BRAC 2005, there are also environmental restoration requirements at the closing installations; however the BRAC 2005 properties are generally less contaminated than prior BRAC properties. The Army will continue to conduct environmental restoration at the BRAC 2005 properties for several years, and we are programming funds to support those efforts.

Active Duty Component Reduction

Question 7. There has been talk that in the wake of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, the Army and the Marine Corps will reduce their active duty component. Are you incorporating this potential change into your long-term military construction plan?

Answer. Yes, the Army continues to review and analyze future force structure and operational adjustments to meet the directed 27,000 reduction in active component end-strength beginning in 2015. This reduction is conditional, based on projected demand for ground combat forces in Afghanistan, which is expected to reduce significantly by the end of 2014. Assuming the necessary conditions occur, an implementing plan will be developed and a set of options will be presented to Army Senior Leadership for decisions. No decisions have been made as to what type of units or what installations will be impacted.

Annual reconciliation of current requirements allows adjustments to be made to the military construction (MILCON) Future Year Defense Program (FYDP). Upon Army leadership approval of the end-strength reduction plan, the Army will adjust its MILCON programming as necessary.

[Questions for the Record submitted by Congressman Austria for the Honorable Katherine Hammack and MG James Boozer follows:]

Continuing Resolution (CR)

Question 1. I would like to ask you about the impacts for the current budget situation on the operations and contracting ability of the Army. With regard to the current MILCON impacts due to no new start authority, I understand that the Army currently has on hold 45 military construction projects valued at approximately \$1.063 billion and without new start authority those projects will not move forward in FY11.

In addition the Defense Agencies have not awarded 8 military construction projects in 6 states valued at approximately \$62 million, including a public safety replacement facility at the Defense Supply Center in Columbus, Ohio. I want to assure you, that giving you the new start authority and funding certainty you need to move forward on these projects is a high priority for me.

How do continuous operations under a CR affect your mission objectives? What are the short-term and long-term consequences of operating without enacted appropriations for the remainder of the fiscal year?

Answer. Continuous operation under a CR may compromise the attainment of mission objectives, as well as delaying the provision of supporting facilities for housing, training, and Quality of Life (QOL). The CR delay could result in reduced project scope or possible deferment or cancellation due to escalating costs. Postponing the award of FY11 projects has execution ripple effects through the next two years. The units intended to occupy the facilities will be delayed in moving into facilities, as opposed to originally scheduled moves. Units impacted by delayed moves will be compelled to use existing, inadequate or temporary facilities. In Alaska, if projects are not awarded in early May, they run the risk of being delayed a full year, until the next construction season.

81 projects valued at \$1,561M that are ready to award (as of 6 April 2011) will not be awarded. In the next few months, this backlog of un-awarded projects will grow. The costs of projects will increase because we have asked the contractors to hold their bids longer than normal (120 days vs. the normal 60 days). The bid risk model has changed, which prompts contractors to add factors for escalation of their direct, indirect and overhead costs. Some contractors may decide the risk is too high to bid; reduced competition often yields higher prices. Long term consequences involve interruption of the procurement process. Some contractors may not extend their bids causing the project to be re-solicited. This could also result in further delays, depending on the economic conditions in place at the time of the rebidding. The contracting processes when coupled with the program requirements, may cause projects to be down-scoped or even cancelled since they can no longer be afforded. Projects that experience cost growth could require supplemental funding to construct the planned scope.

Government Shutdown

Question 2. Yesterday, the Secretary of the Air Force said that the Air Force is in the midst of a series of strategy meeting to figure out how to function if the government shuts down. He said that it is not clear how the civilian or contractor workforce would be affected. Has the Army put together a plan to deal with a possible shutdown? If so, how will a shutdown affect our troops at home and in theatre? How will the Army civilian and contractor workforce be affected?

Answer. The Army follows guidance issued by the Office of Personnel Management and Army wide guidance received from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) (ASA (M&RA)). The details of the government shut-down plan and the overall impact across the Army can be provided by the ASA (M&RA) upon request.

Joint Systems Manufacturing Center

Question 3. In your view, what do you see as the future role - short-term and longterm - of the Joint Systems Manufacturing Center in Lima, Ohio? Specifically, the FY2012 President's Budget request indicates a shutdown of the U.S. tank industrial base for the first time since before World War II. Can you address the effect a shutdown of the U.S. tank industrial base will have on the future of the Joint Systems Manufacturing Center in Lima?

Answer. The Army has a very deep concern for the national industrial base and is exploring all options to ensure our capabilities are able to meet National Defense requirements both now and in the future. With regards to the plant in Lima, the Army has specific reviews ongoing that are in the pre-decisional phase and will get back to the Committee once our review has been finalized.

[Questions for the Record submitted by Congressman Farr for Katherine Hammack and MG James Boozer follows:]

Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site

Question 1. Some of the most ecologically sensitive native grasslands exist in Colorado in the Pinon Canyon. Army has been trying to acquire land there to turn it into a heavy duty training ground - first looking to buy 418,000 acres, and now about 128,000 acres.

Currently Congress has statutorily banned the Army from using funds that would go toward any activity that would expand the Pinon Canyon Maneuver Site. In addition, a federal court has rejected the EIS the Army submitted under which it claimed authority to expand the PCMS boundaries.

There is still great concern that DOD money continues to be funneled to land trust organizations to purchase development rights surrounding PCMS. Can you aver that this funding ban has not been violated, meaning no money has been spent on expansion construction or for the purpose of acquiring any interest in property that might be connected to expansion?

Answer. The Army has not spent money nor budgeted for expansion construction or for the purpose of acquiring interest in property that may be connected to expansion.