

**MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS
AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010**

TUESDAY, MAY 12, 2009

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met at 2:38 p.m., in room SD-124, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Tim Johnson (chairman) presiding.
Present: Senators Johnson, Pryor, Hutchison, and Murkowski.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

STATEMENT OF LOUIS JEROME HANSEN, DEPUTY ASSISTANT, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (STRATEGIC INFRASTRUCTURE) AND SENIOR OFFICIAL PERFORMING DUTIES OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (INSTALLATIONS AND ENVIRONMENT)

ACCOMPANIED BY:

JOSEPH F. CALCARA, DEPUTY ASSISTANT, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY (INSTALLATIONS AND HOUSING)

BRIGADIER GENERAL JAMES C. BOOZER, SR., DIRECTOR, OPERATIONS, OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT

MAJOR GENERAL RAYMOND W. CARPENTER, ACTING DEPUTY DIRECTOR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

BRIGADIER GENERAL JULIA A. KRAUS, DEPUTY CHIEF, U.S. ARMY RESERVE, DEPUTY COMMANDER FOR MANAGEMENT, RESOURCES, AND SUPPORT

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR TIM JOHNSON

Senator JOHNSON. Good afternoon. This hearing will come to order.

I welcome everyone to today's hearing. We are here to discuss the President's fiscal year 2010 budget request for military construction and family housing.

We will hear from two panels of witnesses representing the Army and the Air Force and the Reserve components. The first panel will be the Army.

Our procedure is to have opening statements by the chairman and ranking member, followed by an opening statement from our witnesses. In addition to the oral statements, all prepared statements from our witnesses will be entered into the record.

I request that our members limit their questions to 6-minute rounds.

Secretary Hansen, Secretary Calcara, General Boozer, General Carpenter, and General Kraus, thank you for coming today. We look forward to your testimony.

The Army's fiscal year 2010 budget request for active and Reserve military construction and family housing is \$5.25 billion, which is a 41 percent decrease from the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The active component is down 24 percent from the fiscal year 2009 enacted level, and the Army Guard is down 54 percent. Only the Army Reserve is showing an increase. I hope that you will address this trend and the reasons for it in your opening statement.

I am also interested in what impact the decision to reduce the Army's brigade combat team structure from 48 to 45 BCTs will have on the military construction, in particular on the stationing of Army forces in Europe and the global posture structure overall.

The Army continues to face a number of budget pressures due to wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the execution of the BRAC program, and the "grow the force" initiative. It is very important that adequate resources are available for the military construction projects needed to support these efforts, and I look forward to your assessment of the fiscal year 2010 budget request.

I now turn to my ranking member, Senator Hutchison, for her opening remarks.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON

Senator HUTCHISON. Well, thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate your holding the hearing, and I thank all of the witnesses for coming and sharing the priorities that you have with us.

The fiscal year 2010 budget request contains \$7.5 billion for implementing BRAC construction. That is a 15 percent decrease from the fiscal year 2009 level. I understand that there is a request for \$1.4 billion for overseas contingency operations that will be handled separately. So while we don't have all of your justifications yet for that, we will have to decide how that goes into this bill.

But I hope today's discussions with the Army and the Air Force address how the Department intends to complete all of the BRAC-recommended actions before the statutory deadline of September 30, 2011. Since the largest portion of the BRAC request goes to the Army, I hope Mr. Calcara will be prepared to speak to that.

Concerning the fiscal year 2010 budget request, I am concerned about the Army's investment in infrastructure in the United States. The active duty construction request is down 24 percent from last year's enacted level, and the Guard request is down 46 percent. I am pleased to see that the Reserve component has requested an increase of 33 percent, but overall, the Army's \$4 billion request is a 23 percent decrease. So I will look forward to Mr. Calcara discussing that.

When we were considering the stimulus bill several months ago, I thought that we should be increasing our military construction and moving it up because, of course, we know that there is a FYDP, and if we push that up, it is money that we were going to

spend anyway. We would just be creating jobs more quickly for Americans. That amendment did not see the light of day.

Our U.S. installations at places like Fort Hood, Fort Bliss, and Fort Bragg offer large maneuver areas, automated ranges, modern simulator training, and few restrictions on nighttime flying and training. As a result, soldiers trained in the United States and deployed overseas are better prepared to fight on day one of a conflict than those stationed overseas, where our forces must contend with onerous training restrictions.

Today, with our modern strategic deployment capabilities and the use of airlift and roll-on/roll-off ships, we can often project power from the United States faster than an overseas-based unit. The Overseas Basing Commission recommendations that our committee drafted and were enacted, in those, the BRAC recommendations and the global defense posture that focuses on expanded allied roles and partnerships dictate that it is in our national interest to relocate more of our soldiers back to the United States and fulfill overseas training and contingency missions by deploying U.S.-based troops where needed.

Stationing our troops in the United States provides more operational freedom of action, better training, and better family support than would be possible otherwise.

I must also point out that our current military has more citizen soldiers than we have seen in a great many years. I am very concerned about the overall trend in military construction for our Guard and Reserve components.

I would like to mention again this year the Army's new modular force plan, which will reorganize units into brigade combat teams. I understand this is about 80 percent complete now. The new plan calls for five new BCTs to be stationed at Fort Bliss, Fort Stewart, and Fort Carson.

Now we are told that a European commander wants to keep two BCTs in Europe for up to 2 years longer than the Army originally planned. I have discussed this with General Casey and Secretary Gates, and I hope that Assistant Secretary Calcara will tell us how the plans for moving the infantry divisions from Europe to the United States are going.

On the Air Force side, I look forward to the discussion with Assistant Secretary Ferguson concerning the construction program there as well. The Air Force's active duty construction request is 10 percent below last year's enacted level. The Guard component is requesting 56 percent less than last year, and the Reserve component 26 percent less.

I hope we don't lose sight of the fact that our airmen must have facilities and family support infrastructure from which to work and live that is commensurate with their dedication.

The Secretary of Defense outlined the four pillars of the Air Force's budget strategy—people, readiness, infrastructure, and modernization. I look forward to Secretary Ferguson discussing these priorities and how the Air Force can achieve them while taking such a risk in infrastructure.

I understand the Air Force intends to downsize its total infrastructure budget and physical plant by 20 percent, the 20/20 by

2020 plan, and I look forward to hearing more about this in an era of increased operational tempo.

Joint basing is another subject I am interested in. As everyone knows, the BRAC provides—the former BRAC provided 12 test joint bases. I hope the Air Force will speak today on how it proposes to operate a joint base and handle the real property issues on it since, in the present BRAC, the Air Force will be the lead in 6 of the 12 joint bases.

PREPARED STATEMENT

I am particularly interested in how the Air Force will operate Joint Base San Antonio as it assumes the responsibility for Lackland, Randolph, and the Army base Fort Sam Houston.

So thank you all for coming, and we look forward to your testimony.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate you holding this hearing today and am pleased to welcome representatives of the Army and the Air Force before the Subcommittee as we examine the President's fiscal year 2010 budget request for military construction, family housing, and Base Realignment and Closure actions for the Department of the Army and the Department of the Air Force.

The panel representing the Department of Defense will appear at our next hearing, and we'll discuss Department-Wide MILCON issues at that time. But for now I would just like to point out that the overall Department of Defense's military construction program, including military family housing and BRAC, is only \$22.9 billion, an 18 percent decrease from the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. The fiscal year 2010 budget request only contains \$7.5 billion for implementing BRAC construction actions, a 15 percent decrease from the fiscal year 2009 enacted level. Plus, I understand there is a request for \$1.4 billion for overseas contingency operations that will be handled separately. We have not received all of the justification material yet and so the Committee will decide exactly how we will include this in our bill. I hope today's discussions with the Army and Air Force addresses how the Department intends to complete all of the BRAC recommended actions before the statutory deadline of September 30, 2011. Since the largest portion of the BRAC request will go to the Army, I hope Mr. Calcara will speak to it today.

Concerning the fiscal year 2010 budget request before us today, for the base budget, I am concerned about the Army's investment in infrastructure in the United States. The active duty construction request is down 24 percent from last year's enacted level and the Guard request is down 46 percent. I am pleased to see that the Reserve component has requested an increase of 33 percent. But overall, the Army's \$4 billion request is a 23 percent decrease. I look forward to Mr. Calcara's comments.

As I said when we were considering the stimulus bill several months ago, we should be increasing our construction in the United States, not decreasing it. More military construction in the United States will enhance the quality of life for our soldiers, sailors and airmen, and it will provide much needed jobs for Americans. Our U.S. installations at places like Fort Hood, Fort Bliss and Fort Bragg offer large maneuver areas, automated ranges, modern simulator training and few restrictions on night time flying and training. As a result, soldiers trained in the United States and deployed overseas are better prepared to fight on Day One of a conflict than those stationed overseas where our forces must contend with onerous training restrictions. Today, with our modern strategic deployment capabilities and with the use of airlift and roll-on, roll-off ships, we can often project power from the United States faster than from overseas based units.

For these reasons, and in order to provide military families with greater stability, the Pentagon made the decision several years ago that it is better to bring our troops home and station them in the United States whenever possible. In order to do that we must be committed to providing them with the quality infrastructure these brave men and women deserve.

The Overseas Basing Commission recommendations, the BRAC recommendations and a Global Defense Posture that focuses on expanded Allied roles and partner-

ships dictate that it is in our national interest to relocate more of our soldiers back to the United States and fulfill overseas training and contingency missions by deploying U.S. based troops where needed. This is an admirable plan—one our service members, their families and our citizens are counting on. Stationing our troops in the United States will provide more operational freedom of action, better training, and better family support than would be possible otherwise. It will produce a stronger, more deployable, and more efficient Department of Defense.

I must also point out that our current military has more citizen-soldiers than we have seen in a great many years. I am very concerned about the overall trend in military construction for our Guard and Reserve components. These brave citizen-soldiers are making huge contributions to the Global War on Terror and I am keenly interested in seeing Guard and Reserve MILCON funding improve. Congress has always provided excellent support to the Guard and Reserve, but that should not provide an excuse for DOD to shortchange them in the budget process.

I would like to mention again this year the Army's new Modular Force Plan which will reorganize units into Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs). I understand this transformation is nearly 80 percent complete now. The new plan calls for 5 new BCTs to be stationed at Fort Bliss, Texas; Fort Stewart, Georgia; and Fort Carson, Colorado. Now I understand that the European Commander (EUCOM) wants to keep 2 BCTs in Europe for up to 2 years longer than the Army originally planned. I have discussed this issue with General Casey and Secretary Gates and I hope Assistant Secretary Calcara will tell us how the plans for moving the infantry divisions from Europe to the United States are going.

My State of Texas is the home for a large part of the Army. I am very pleased with the operational and infrastructure improvements to Fort Bliss, Fort Hood, and Fort Sam Houston, three very important installations in our national military preparedness. I am encouraged by the Army's emphasis on family support facilities at these and other bases around the country. I have said before, we have to take care of the soldiers and their families in order to retain these highly trained men and women.

I look forward to the discussion with Assistant Secretary Ferguson concerning the Department of the Air Force's construction program as well. The Air Force's active duty construction request is 10 percent below last year's enacted level. The Guard component is requesting 56 percent less than last year and the Reserve component is requesting 26 percent less. I know the Air Force has historically been willing to risk infrastructure in order to fund modernization, but I hope we don't lose sight of the fact that our airmen must have the facilities and family support infrastructure from which to work and live that is commensurate with their dedication to our country.

The Secretary of Defense outlined the four pillars of the Air Force's budget strategy as People, Readiness, Infrastructure and Modernization, in that order. I look forward to Assistant Secretary Ferguson discussing these priorities and how the Air Force can achieve them while taking such a risk in infrastructure. I understand the Air Force intends to downsize its total infrastructure budget and physical plant size by 20 percent, the "20/20 by 2020" plan, and I look forward to hearing more about how this will work in an era of increased operational tempo.

Again, I am proud to say my home state of Texas has always been home to more Air Force personnel than any other State, just as we have always been the largest Army state. Starting with Air Force basic training at Lackland AFB, technical and NATO pilot training at Sheppard AFB, NATO undergraduate pilot training at Laughlin AFB, and instructor pilot training at Randolph AFB; and continuing with operational bases at Dyess and Goodfellow AFBs; there is quite a lot of infrastructure needs in just those bases alone. In addition we are currently prepared in San Antonio with the initial secure infrastructure equipment should the Air Force announce the home of the new 24th Air Force cyber mission will be there.

Joint Basing is another subject I am very interested in. As everyone knows I have been a very strong advocate of fully funding the BRAC process, and I know that the 12 test joint bases are a result of BRAC recommendations. I hope the Air Force will speak today on how it proposes to operate a joint base and handle the real property issues on it, since the Air Force will be the lead at 6 of the 12 joint bases. I am particularly interested in how the Air Force will operate Joint Base San Antonio as it assumes the responsibility for Lackland, Randolph and Fort Sam Houston.

Mr. Chairman, again I want to express my appreciation to you for holding this hearing. We have a full slate of issues today and I look forward to discussing them as we begin this new appropriations cycle.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you, Senator Hutchison.
General Boozer, proceed.

General BOOZER. Sir, I am more than prepared to go ahead and start with my opening comments.

Senator JOHNSON. Secretary Hansen, please proceed.

General BOOZER. Okay. Thank you, sir.

STATEMENT OF LOUIS JEROME HANSEN

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Hutchison, distinguished members of the subcommittee, I am Jerry Hansen, the designated senior official currently performing the duties of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment. And it is my pleasure to appear before you today on behalf of the Secretary and the Army to discuss the Army's military construction, family housing, base realignment and closure budget request for fiscal year 2010.

QUALITY OF LIFE FOR SOLDIERS AND THEIR FAMILIES AND THE ARMY
BUDGET

First, we thank you all for your continued support to our soldiers and families serving our Nation around the world. As you know, the Army's strength is its soldiers and the families and Army civilians who support them.

We try, with your support, to ensure the quality of life we provide our soldiers and their families is on par with the quality of their service. Our budget requests represent minimum required levels which, if approved, will enable soldiers and their families to receive the facilities, care, and support they need to accomplish the monumental tasks we expect of them while preserving the all-volunteer force.

Our Army continues its largest organizational change since World War II as we transform to brigade-centric modular force, grow our end strength, and restation one-third of the force through base realignment and closure and global defense posture realignment.

The Army's fiscal year 2010 military construction and overseas contingency operations budget requests include \$10.4 billion for military construction, Army family housing, and BRAC, a combined amount.

As stewards of our Nation's resources, the Army requires each military construction project to attain a LEED silver rating—LEED being leadership in energy and environment design rating of at least silver to reduce total lifecycle cost and improve the environment. The Army plans to spend a significant sum over the next 5 years to invest in green buildings, to use less water, and to achieve 30 percent more energy efficiency in the process.

Fiscal year 2010 is our final year of BRAC construction. Full implementation of the BRAC 2005 recommendations will enable the Army to become a more capable expeditionary force as a member of the joint team, while enhancing the well being of our soldiers, civilians, and family members living and working and training in our installations.

The Army's remaining BRAC 2005 construction projects are scheduled for award by no later than the first quarter of fiscal year 2010. This will enable the major movement of units and personnel

planned for fiscal years 2010 and 2011, with expected completion by the mandated BRAC 2005 deadline.

The Army remains committed to achieving BRAC 2005 law and is on track to do so. With full and timely funding, we anticipate no impacts to movement schedules, training, or readiness.

However, we have moved into a period where our construction timeline flexibility is extremely limited. Cuts and delays in BRAC funding have caused significant difficulties as we have implemented BRAC projects in the past, and any significant delay in fiscal year 2010 MILCON funding would significantly challenge our ability to meet the September 2011 deadline.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, on April 6, 2009, the Secretary of Defense issued guidance to stop the growth of Army BCTs, brigade combat teams, at 45 versus 48, as you have mentioned. We understand this decision has caused significant concern, and we recognize the impact to communities that have made proactive investments to accept new units and families.

At this point, no decisions have been made as to which BCTs will be affected. But this decision and its associated impacts are being worked with urgency through an expedited Quadrennial Defense Review process, and we will work the details very closely with Congress as soon as the impacts to the military construction projects are known.

I am accompanied today by Mr. Joe Calcara, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Housing; Brigadier General Jim Boozer, Director of Operations, representing the Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management and the Installation Management Command; Major General Ray Carpenter, the Deputy Director of the Army National Guard; and Brigadier General Julia Kraus, Deputy Commander and Deputy Chief of the Army Reserve for Management, Resources, and Support.

PREPARED STATEMENT

We thank you again for the opportunity to appear before you today and for your continued support for America's Army, and we look forward to hearing your questions following brief remarks by the other panel members.

I will be followed by General Boozer, sir.
[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LOUIS JEROME HANSEN

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, it is a pleasure to appear before you to discuss the Army's Military Construction, Family Housing, and Base Realignment and Closure budget requests for fiscal year 2010. Our requests are crucial to the success of the Army's strategic imperatives to Sustain, Prepare, Reset, and Transform the force. We appreciate the opportunity to report on them and respond to your questions. We would like to start by thanking you for your support to our Soldiers and their Families serving our Nation around the world. They are and will continue to be the centerpiece of our Army, and their ability to perform their missions successfully depends upon the staunch support of the Congress.

The Army's strength is its Soldiers—and the Families and Army Civilians who support them. With your continuing support, we will assure that the quality of life we afford our Soldiers and Families is commensurate with the quality of their service. Our budget requests have been vetted to ensure they reflect the minimum re-

quirement to maintain the All-Volunteer Force and ensure Soldiers and their Families receive the facilities, care, and support they need to accomplish their missions.

OVERVIEW

REBALANCING THE FORCE IN AN ERA OF PERSISTENT CONFLICT

Installations are the home of combat power and a critical component of the Nation's force generating and force projecting capability. Your Army is working hard to deliver cost-effective, safe, and environmentally sound capabilities and capacities to support the national defense mission.

Our Nation has been at war for over 7 years. Our Army continues to lead the war efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq, as well as in defense of the homeland and in support of civil authorities in responding to domestic emergencies. Over time, these operations have expanded in scope and duration, stressing our All-Volunteer Force and straining our ability to maintain strategic depth. During this period, the Congress has responded to the Army's requests for resources, and that commitment to our Soldiers, their Families, and Civilians is deeply appreciated. Continued timely and predictable funding is critical as the Army continues to fight the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, meet other operational demands, sustain our All-Volunteer Force, and prepare for future threats to the Nation.

Our Army continues its largest organizational change since World War II, as it transforms to a Brigade centric modular force and grows the force to achieve an the Active Component of 547,400, a National Guard of 358,200, and an Army Reserve of 206,000 men and women. At the same time, we are restationing about one-third of the force through a combination of Base Closure and Realignment and Global Defense Posture Realignment actions. All of these initiatives have corresponding military construction requirements.

The details of the Army's fiscal year 2010 request follow:

Military Construction Appropriation	Authorization Request	Authorization of Appropriations Request	Appropriation Request
Military Construction Army (MCA)	\$3,116,350,000	\$3,660,779,000	\$3,660,779,000
Military Construction Army National Guard (MCNG)	(¹)	426,491,000	426,491,000
Military Construction Army Reserve (MCAR)	(¹)	374,862,000	374,862,000
Army Family Housing Construction (AFHC)	241,236,000	273,236,000	273,236,000
Army Family Housing Operations (AFHO)	523,418,000	523,418,000	523,418,000
BRAC 95 (BCA)	98,723,000	98,723,000	98,723,000
BRAC 2005 (BCA)	4,081,037,000	4,081,037,000	4,081,037,000
Overseas Contingency Operations	923,900,000	923,900,000	923,900,000
TOTAL	8,984,664,000	10,362,446,000	10,362,446,000

¹ Not available.

The Army's fiscal year 2010 Military Construction and Overseas Contingency Operations budget requests include \$10.4 billion for Military Construction, Army Family Housing, and BRAC appropriations and associated new authorizations.

ARMY MODULAR FORCE (AMF)

The Army continues to reorganize the Active and Reserve components into standardized modular organizations, increasing the number of Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) and support Brigades to meet operational requirements and create a more deployable, versatile and tailorable force. The Army strategy is to use existing facility assets where feasible and program projects when not. The fiscal year 2010 request of \$589 million will provide permanent facilities construction to support conversion of existing BCTs to new modern BCTs at Forts Wainwright, Carson, Lewis, and Bragg.

GROW THE ARMY (GTA)

On April 6, 2009, the Secretary of Defense issued guidance to stop growth of Army BCTs at 45 versus 48. We understand this decision has caused some understandable concern in places that expected to receive the three additional BCTs, and we recognize the impact this decision could have on communities that have made significant investments to accept new units. We are working the details with urgency, but at this point, no final decisions have been made as to which BCTs will be affected. The Army is conducting a thorough analysis with the goal of balancing our force mix for the current fight while setting conditions to meet the future strategic environment. We are leveraging the ongoing Quadrennial Defense Review process and our

force mix analysis to determine the proper balance. We will keep the Congress advised of our progress.

In the meantime, it is crucial that the Army maintain currently planned fiscal year 2009 construction projects and fiscal year 2010 construction, pending the analysis and decision by Army Senior Leaders, and recognizing that the vast majority of the facilities at Army installations are legacy systems still requiring modernization or replacement. Construction projects play an essential role in supporting our end strength growth to 547,400 as well as transforming our installations to support organizational changes. The fiscal year 2010 requirement for BCTs is \$404 million. Other Grow the Army facility support requirements, such as projects to support the combat support/combat service support units, training base, quality of life, and support to the Army National Guard and Army Reserve growth, in fiscal year 2010 total \$1.07 billion.

GLOBAL DEFENSE POSTURE REALIGNMENT (GDPR)

The Global Defense Posture Realignment initiative ensures Army forces are properly positioned worldwide to support our National Military Strategy and to support the mission in Afghanistan. GDPR will relocate over 41,000 Soldiers and their Families from Europe and Korea to the United States by 2013. Over time, it will build a BCT Complex and support facilities at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, and operational, training, and support facilities at Fort Benning, Fort Bliss, Fort Riley, Schofield Barracks, and Camp Humphreys. As part of the fiscal year 2010 program, the Army requires \$252 million to construct facilities in Bagram, Afghanistan and a warehouse in Kuwait. The total GDPR request is \$524 million.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE (BRAC)

The Army is requesting \$4,081,037,000 for BRAC 2005, which is critical to the success of the Army's BRAC 2005 initiatives, and \$98,723,000 for legacy BRAC to sustain vital, ongoing programs. BRAC 2005 is carefully integrated with the Defense and Army programs of Grow the Army, GDPR, and Army Modular Force. Collectively, these initiatives allow the Army to focus its resources on installations that provide the best military value, supporting improved responsiveness and readiness of units. The elimination of Cold War-era infrastructure and the implementation of modern technology to consolidate activities allow the Army to better focus on its core warfighting mission. These initiatives are a massive undertaking, requiring the synchronization of base closures, realignments, military construction and renovation, unit activations and deactivations, and the flow of forces to and from current global commitments. Results will yield substantial savings over time, while positioning forces, logistics activities, and power projection platforms to respond efficiently and effectively to the needs of the Nation.

Under BRAC 2005, the Army will close 12 Active Component installations, 1 Army Reserve installation, 387 National Guard Readiness and Army Reserve Centers, and 8 leased facilities. BRAC 2005 realigns 53 installations and/or functions and establishes Training Centers of Excellence, Joint Bases, a Human Resources Center of Excellence, and Joint Technical and Research facilities. To accommodate the units relocating from the closing National Guard Readiness and Army Reserve Centers, BRAC 2005 creates 125 multi-component Armed Forces Reserve Centers and realigns U.S. Army Reserve command and control structure.

The over 1,100 discrete actions required for the Army to successfully implement BRAC 2005 are far more extensive than all four previous BRAC rounds combined and are expected to create significant recurring annual savings. BRAC 2005 will enable the Army to become a more capable expeditionary force as a member of the Joint team while enhancing the well-being of our Soldiers, Civilians, and Family members living, working, and training on our installations.

BRAC 2005 IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

All of our BRAC 2005 construction projects are planned to be awarded by the first quarter of fiscal year 2010. This will enable the major movement of units and personnel in fiscal years 2010 and 2011, with expected completion by the mandated BRAC 2005 deadline. The Army remains committed to achieving BRAC 2005 Law and is on track to do so. With full and timely funding, there will be no impacts to movement schedules, training, or readiness. Fiscal year 2010 is our fifth and final year of BRAC construction. We have moved into a period where our construction timeline flexibility is exhausted. We cannot overstate the difficulties that cuts or delays in BRAC funding pose to the Army as we implement BRAC construction projects. If the Army program is not fully funded by October 2009, we will be significantly challenged to execute BRAC as intended.

BRAC 2005 FISCAL YEAR 2010 BUDGET

The Army's fiscal year 2010 budget request will continue to fund both BRAC and GDPR actions necessary to comply with BRAC 2005 Law. The Army plans to award and begin construction of 80 military construction projects, plus planning and design for fiscal year 2010 projects. This is estimated to cost \$2.5 billion and includes five additional GDPR projects, 37 Army National Guard and Army Reserve projects, and an additional 38 Active Component projects.

The BRAC budget request will also fund furnishings for BRAC projects awarded in fiscal year 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009 as the buildings reach completion and occupancy. The request also funds movement of personnel, ammunition, and equipment associated with BRAC Commission Recommendations.

In fiscal year 2010, the Army will continue environmental closure and cleanup actions at 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 \$147.7 million, which includes munitions and explosives of concern and hazardous and toxic waste restoration activities.

PRIOR BRAC

Since Congress established the first Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission in 1988 and then authorized the subsequent rounds in 1990, DOD has successfully executed four rounds of base closures to reduce and align the military's infrastructure to the current security environment and force structure. As a result, the Army estimates approximately \$12.6 billion in savings through 2008—nearly \$1 billion in recurring, annual savings from prior BRAC rounds.

The Army is requesting \$98.7 million in fiscal year 2010 for prior BRAC rounds (\$5.3 million to fund caretaking operations and program management of remaining properties and \$93.4 million for environmental restoration) to address environmental restoration efforts at 147 sites at 14 prior BRAC installations. To date, the Army has spent \$2.95 billion on the BRAC environmental program for installations impacted by the previous four BRAC rounds. We disposed of 181,345 acres (86 percent of the total acreage disposal requirement of 209,834 acres), with 28,489 acres remaining.

FISCAL YEAR 2010 OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS (OCO)

This request supports the National Strategy for OCO. The request funds projects critical to the support of deployed war fighters, operational requirements for airfields, operational facilities, supplies, troop housing and infrastructure to ensure safe and efficient military operations in Afghanistan. A total of 74 projects that will fulfill the Department's immediate mission needs and urgent infrastructure requirements in theater are planned for a total of \$828 million.

ARMY INITIATIVES

To improve the Army's facilities posture, we have undertaken specific initiatives or budget strategies to focus our resources on the most important areas—Range and Training Lands, Barracks, Family Housing, and Warrior in Transition Complexes.

Range and Training Lands.—Ranges and training lands enable our Army to train and develop its full capabilities to ensure our Soldiers are fully prepared for the challenges they will face. Our Army Range and Training Land Strategy supports Army transformation and the Army's Sustainable Range Program. The Strategy identifies priorities for installations requiring resources to modernize ranges, mitigate encroachment, and acquire training land. The fiscal year 2010 request supports 25 projects, \$178 million for Active Component training ranges.

Barracks.—Providing safe, quality housing is a crucial commitment the Army has made to all of our Soldiers. We owe single Soldiers the same quality of housing that we provide married Soldiers. Modern barracks are shown to significantly increase morale, which positively impacts readiness and quality of life. The importance of providing quality housing for single Soldiers is paramount to success on the battlefield. The Army is in the 17th year of modernizing barracks to provide about 148,000 single enlisted permanent party Soldiers with quality living environments. Because of increased authorized strength, the requirements for barracks have increased in several locations, and for fiscal year 2010, a total of \$711.5 million will be invested in 3,592 new permanent party barracks spaces that will meet DOD's "1+1" or equivalent standard. These units provide two-Soldier suites, increased personal privacy, larger rooms with walk-in closets, new furnishings, adequate parking, landscaping, and unit administrative offices separated from the barracks. We are on

track to fully fund this program by fiscal year 2013. The last inadequate permanent party spaces will be removed after the new barracks are occupied in fiscal year 2015. For trainee barracks, the Army is requesting \$535.9 million to build or upgrade 2,278 new spaces to standard. We are requesting funds to keep this program on schedule so we can eliminate all inadequate trainee barracks spaces, finishing funding with fiscal year 2015 and occupying the barracks in fiscal year 2017.

Family Housing.—This year's budget continues our significant investment in our Soldiers and their Families by supporting our goal to continue funding to eliminate remaining inadequate housing and sustain housing at enduring overseas installations. The U.S. inadequate inventory has been funded to be eliminated by the end of fiscal year 2007 through privatization, conventional military construction, demolition, divestiture of uneconomical or excess units, and reliance on off-post housing. For Families living off post, the budget for military personnel maintains the Basic Allowance for Housing that eliminates out-of-pocket expenses.

Warrior In Transition.—The Army \$1 billion budget for its Warrior in Transition (WT) Program funds military construction to facilitate command and control, primary care, and case management to establish a healing environment that promotes the timely return to the force or transition to civilian life. The fiscal year 2009 Overseas Contingency Operations requests \$425 million in funding. The fiscal year 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) provided \$100 million for two complexes and the fiscal year 2010 budget request will provide 13 complexes for \$503.5 million.

Overseas Construction.—Included in this budget request is \$437 million in support of high-priority overseas projects. In Germany, we are requesting funds for barracks at Ansbach and Kleber Kaserne. In Korea, we are requesting funds to further our relocation of forces on the peninsula. This action is consistent with the Land Partnership Plan agreements entered into by the United States and Republic of Korea Ministry of Defense. Two vehicle maintenance shops and a Fire Station are included. Our request for funds in Italy continues construction for a BCT. We are also including Training Aids Facilities in Japan at Camp Zama and Okinawa. Additionally, approximately \$678 million of our fiscal year 2009 Overseas Contingency Operations request will support military construction projects in Afghanistan for troop housing, airfield and operational facilities, infrastructure and utility systems, fuel handling and storage, and roads.

Other Support Programs.—The fiscal year 2010 budget includes \$153 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 2010 budget requests \$25 million for oversight of host nation funded construction for all Services in Japan, Korea, and Europe.

Incremental Funding.—We are requesting the third increment of funding, \$55.4 million, for the previously approved, incrementally funded, SOUTHCOM Headquarters at Miami-Doral, Florida. In addition, we are requesting the fourth and final increment of funding, \$102 million, for the Brigade Complex at Fort Lewis, Washington. The budget also includes \$23.5 million for a Brigade Complex-Operations support facility and \$22.5 million for a Brigade Complex-Barracks/Community, both projects at Dal Molin, Italy. Finally, we are requesting the second increments for the Brigade Complexes at Fort Carson \$60 million and Fort Stewart \$80 million.

The budget request also contains \$23 million for unspecified minor construction to address unforeseen critical needs or emergent mission requirements that cannot wait for the normal programming cycle.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The Army National Guard's fiscal year 2010 Military Construction request for \$426,491,000 (for appropriation and authorization of appropriations) is focused on Transformation/Army Modular Force, Mission and Training, Grow the Army, planning and design, and unspecified minor military construction

Transformation.—In fiscal year 2010, the Army National Guard is requesting \$158.2 million for six projects in support of our modern missions. There are three aviation projects to provide facilities for modernized aircraft and changed unit structure. Also in support of the Modular Force initiative, we are asking for two Readiness Centers and one maintenance facility.

Mission and Training.—Our budget request also includes \$154 million for 10 projects, which will support the preparation of our forces. These funds will provide the facilities our Soldiers require as they train, mobilize, and deploy. Included are two training facilities, six Range projects, and two Readiness/Armed Forces Reserve Centers.

Grow the Army.—Under the category of Grow the Army, we are requesting \$80 million for five Readiness Centers to improve the Army National Guard's ability to deal with the continued high levels of deployment.

Other Support Programs.—The fiscal year 2010 Army National Guard budget also contains \$24 million for planning and design of future projects and \$10.3 million for unspecified minor military construction to address unforeseen critical needs or emergent mission requirements that cannot wait for the normal programming cycle.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

The Army Reserve fiscal year 2010 Military Construction request for \$374,862,000 (for appropriation and authorization of appropriations) is for Preparation, Transformation, other support, and unspecified programs.

Mission and Training Projects. In fiscal year 2010, the Army Reserve will invest \$45 million to prepare our Soldiers for success in current operations. Included in the mission and training projects is an Armed Forces Reserve Center and a Combined Arms Collective Training facility, which will be available for joint use by all Army components and military services.

Grow The Army Projects.—The Army Reserve transformation from a strategic reserve to an operational force includes converting 16,000 authorizations from generating force structure to operational force structure from fiscal years 2009 through 2013. In fiscal year 2010, the Army Reserve will construct 19 Reserve Operations Complexes in eleven states and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, with an investment of \$304 million to support the transformation. These projects will provide operations, maintenance, and storage facilities for over 6,000 Soldiers in 56 newly activating combat support and combat service support units and detachments.

Other Unspecified Programs.—The fiscal year 2010 Army Reserve budget request includes \$22.3 million for planning and design for future year projects and \$3.6 million for unspecified minor military construction to address unforeseen critical needs or emergent mission requirements that cannot wait for the normal programming cycle.

ARMY FAMILY HOUSING CONSTRUCTION (AFHC)

The Army's fiscal year 2010 Family housing construction request is \$273,236,000 for authorization, authorization of appropriation, and appropriation.

The fiscal year 2010 new construction program uses traditional military construction to provide 38 new houses for Families with an \$18 million replacement project at Baumholder, Germany. The Army also requests \$32 million to fund the final increment for three projects at Wiesbaden, Germany, to finish replacement housing that was fully authorized in fiscal year 2009. These projects will result in completing 250 homes for Army Families.

The Construction Improvements Program is an integral part of our Family housing revitalization and privatization programs. In fiscal year 2010, we are requesting \$161.4 million to increase scope of these existing privatization projects: 334 homes at Fort Knox, Kentucky; 176 homes at Fort Wainwright, Alaska; 144 homes at Fort Polk, Louisiana; 90 homes at Fort Irwin, California; and, 78 homes at Fort Sill, Oklahoma. The Improvements program also provides \$11.9 million for equity contributions for 11 homes at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, and 8 homes at Fort Eustis, Virginia, that were required due to Base Realignment and Closure. Also, the fiscal year 2010 request supports \$46 million for direct equity investment in support of the privatization of 1,242 homes at Fort Richardson, Alaska, as part of the Joint Basing effort with Elmendorf Air Force Base.

In fiscal year 2010, we are also requesting \$3.9 million for planning and design for final design of fiscal year 2010 and 2011 Family housing construction projects, as well as for housing studies and updating standards and criteria.

Privatization.—Residential Communities Initiative (RCI), the Army's housing privatization program, continues to provide quality housing that Soldiers and their Families can proudly call home. The Army is leveraging 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 program will include 45 locations, with a projected end state of almost 88,000 homes—98 percent of the on-post Family housing inventory in the United States. At the end of fiscal year 2009, the Army will have privatized 44 locations, with an end state of over 85,000 homes. Initial construction and renovation at these 44 installations is estimated at \$12 billion over a three to ten year development period, of which the Army will contribute about \$2.0 billion. Although most projects

are in the early phases of their initial development, since 1999 through March 2009, our partners have constructed 18,769 new homes, and renovated 13,697 homes.

ARMY FAMILY HOUSING OPERATIONS (AFHO)

The Army's fiscal year 2010 Family Housing Operations request is \$523,418,000 (for appropriation and authorization of appropriations). This account provides for annual operations, municipal-type services, furnishings, maintenance and repair, utilities, leased Family housing, demolition of surplus or uneconomical housing, and funds supporting management of the Military Housing Privatization Initiative. This request will support almost 17,000 Army-owned homes, both at home and in foreign areas. More than 9,000 residences will be leased and more than 80,000 privatized homes will be managed.

Operations (\$88.4 million).—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 Family housing.

Utilities (\$81.6 million).—The utilities account includes the costs of delivering heat, air conditioning, electricity, water, and wastewater support for Family housing units. The overall size of the utilities account is decreasing with the reduction in supported inventory.

Maintenance and Repair (\$115.9 million). The maintenance and repair account supports annual recurring projects to maintain and revitalize Family housing 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 (\$205.7 million).—The leasing program provides another way of adequately housing our military Families. The fiscal year 2010 budget includes funding for 9,036 housing units, including project requirements for 1,080 existing Section 2835 (“build-to-lease”—formerly known as 801 leases), 1,828 temporary domestic leases in the U.S., and 6,128 leased Family housing units in foreign areas.

Privatization (\$31.8 million).—The privatization account provides operating funds for implementation and oversight of privatized military Family housing in the RCI program. RCI costs include selection of private sector partners, preparation of environmental studies and real estate surveys, and contracting of consultants. These funds support the preparation and execution of partnership agreements and development plans, and oversight to monitor compliance and performance of the privatized housing portfolio.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The Army is the DOD Executive Agent for the Homeowners Assistance Program (HAP); that is, the Army requests in its budget the funds needed by the DOD-wide program supporting all of the Services. In normal times, this program assists eligible military and civilian employee homeowners by providing some financial relief when they are not able to sell their homes under reasonable terms and conditions because of DOD announced closures, realignments, or reduction in operations when this action adversely affects the real estate market.

The 2009 ARRA expanded HAP to provide benefits to: (1) seriously wounded Warriors in Transition (to include Coast Guard and DOD civilian employees) who relocate for medical treatment or medical retirement, from September 11, 2001 (No expiration date); (2) surviving spouses of fallen warriors and DOD and Coast Guard civilians killed while deployed in support of the Armed Forces, from September 11, 2001 (No expiration date); (3) BRAC 2005 impacted personnel assigned to relocating or closing organizations or installations, without proof that the DOD announcement caused markets to decline (Expires 2012, or an earlier date designated by the Secretary); (4) Service members with permanent change of station orders required to relocate during the home mortgage crisis (Expires 2012, or an earlier date designated by the Secretary). The ARRA expanded HAP is funded at \$555 million.

Excluding the ARRA expanded HAP, the fiscal year 2010 budget requests authorization of appropriations in the amount of \$28.71 million. Total program estimate for fiscal year 2010, excluding ARRA expansion, is \$41.98M and will be funded with requested budget authority, revenue from sales of acquired properties, and prior year unobligated balances.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

The Army's fiscal year 2010 Operation and Maintenance budget includes \$2.85 billion in funding for Sustainment, Restoration, and Modernization (S/RM) and

\$8.61 billion in funding for Base Operations Support (BOS). The S/RM and BOS accounts are inextricably linked with our military construction programs to successfully support our installations. The Army has centralized the management of its installations assets under the Installation Management Command to best utilize this funding. Centralized barracks management, also known as the First Sergeant's Barracks Initiative (FSBI), will standardize barracks management Army-wide, enhance single Soldier quality of life, reduce overall un-programmed single Soldier Basic Allowance for Housing, maximize barracks utilization, and reallocate Soldier time away from non-war fighting tasks. The FSBI provides top-quality oversight and management of daily barracks operations. The FSBI review committee completed review and validation of funding requirements for 12 Installations. Implementing FSBI at these installations brings in about 55 percent of the Army barracks inventory.

SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, our fiscal year 2010 Military Construction and BRAC budget requests are balanced programs that support our Soldiers and their Families, Overseas Contingency Operations, Army transformation, readiness, and DOD installation strategy goals. We are proud to present this budget for your consideration because of what this budget will provide for our Army:

Military Construction:

- 26 new Training Ranges/Facilities
- \$11 billion invested in Soldier/Family Readiness
- \$1.8 billion to Grow the Army
- \$524 million support the mission in Afghanistan
- \$828 million funds projects for Overseas Contingency Operations mission in Afghanistan
- Over 3,300 Soldiers training in 16 new or improved Readiness Centers and Armed Forces Reserve Centers
- 20 New Army Reserve Operations Complexes
- 6,054 Soldiers get new Reserve Operations Complexes
- Over 7,800 Soldiers training in nine new or improved Readiness Centers and Armed Forces Reserve Centers
- Six Ranges serving 166,000 men and women in our Armed Forces

Base Realignment and Closure:

- Statutory compliance by 2011 for BRAC
- 80 Military Construction projects
- Planning & Design for fiscal year 2010—2010 Projects
- Remaining NEPA for BRAC 2005 actions
- Continued Environmental Restoration of 31,844 acres

Base Operations Support:

- Goal is to meet essential needs for all BOS programs: Base Operations, Family, Environmental Quality, Force Protection, Base Communications, and Audio/Visual.

Sustainment/Restoration and Modernization:

- Funds Sustainment at 90 percent of the OSD Facility Sustainment model requirement.

Our long-term strategies for installations will be accomplished through sustained and balanced funding, and with your support, we will continue to improve Soldier and Family quality of life, while remaining focused on Army and Defense transformation goals.

In closing, we would like to thank you again for the opportunity to appear before you today and for your continued support for America's Army.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL JAMES C. BOOZER

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you.

General Boozer.

General BOOZER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Hutchison, and distinguished members of the subcommittee.

On behalf of the Army's senior leaders and the more than 1 million soldiers that comprise our Army, I want to thank you for the opportunity to discuss the Army's fiscal year 2010 military construction budget request. It is truly an honor to be here with you today to do that.

I would like to extend our gratitude for this committee's support for our soldiers and programs over the years. Our brave men and women are performing their mission superbly, thanks to your continued support.

Our \$10.4 billion military construction request is crucial to the success of the Army's strategic imperatives to sustain, prepare, reset, and transform the force. Military construction plays a key role in each of these imperatives and is a key enabler in restoring balance and strategic flexibility in your Army.

We are on track to achieve balance but need your continued support so we can sustain soldiers and their families, prepare soldiers for success in the current conflict, reset them when they return from combat, and transform them for an uncertain future.

To do this, we must first sustain our soldiers and families by investing in quality housing and support programs, such as the Soldier-Family Action Plan. We have programs in place that will improve soldier and family programs and services, quality of healthcare, excellence in schools, youth services, and childcare, and expand education and employment opportunities for family members.

We are committed to continuing to improve soldier and family quality of life to a level commensurate with their level of service and sacrifice to the Nation.

We must also prepare our soldiers for success in the current contingency conflicts. To help achieve this goal, our fiscal year 2010 request includes \$178 million for 25 new range projects, as well as \$539 million for training barracks and \$1.5 billion for Grow the Army military construction projects.

The third imperative, reset, is about returning soldiers and equipment to conditions where they can unwind to prepare for future missions. The Army Medical Action Plan is one such program that incorporates care and services for wounded warriors and their families and provides world-class care to our warriors in transition for reintegration into the force or back to civilian life. We thank you for your support for this vital program as well.

As part of the fourth imperative, transform, the creation of the Installation Management Command in October 2006 continues our progress in centralized installation management and fosters more consistent, cost-effective, and accountable delivery of installation funding and services. We are well on our way to completing the largest transformation of the Army since World War II, and it is all being accomplished while in a conflict and with your committed support.

To improve efficiency and effectiveness, we are reshaping installations through BRAC and global defense posture realignment while simultaneously converting to a modular force, growing the Army, and converting the Army Reserve components to an operational force. Our military construction request supports this intricately woven, tightly synchronized stationing plan.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

I would like to reiterate Mr. Hansen's comments that we must receive full and timely BRAC funding in order to achieve the mandates of BRAC 2005 law. A delay in funding our \$4 billion BRAC

request beyond October 2009 could place making the BRAC mandated September 15, 2011 deadline in jeopardy. Our flexibility over the years executing this program are all but gone.

Finally, as Mr. Hansen has already stated, the Secretary of Defense's guidance to stop growth of Army BCTs at 45 versus 48 is being thoroughly, deliberately, and expeditiously analyzed by the senior Army leadership. We will work this closely with this committee and your staffs. In fact, we meet with your staffs next week.

The fiscal year 2009 and 2010 construction projects play an essential role in supporting our end strength of 547,000, as well as transforming our installations and facilities to support our modular design units. These ongoing investments will ensure soldiers and families have the modern facilities they deserve.

In closing, our request for military construction, BRAC, family housing, and overseas contingency operations plays a critical role in allowing us to put the Army back in balance to sustain the current fight and confront the future.

We thank Congress for its unwavering support of the Army's military construction programs over the years and ask for your continued support. Our goal is to have premier installations across the globe. Our soldiers and families deserve nothing less.

Thank you. It is an absolute honor to be here with you today, and I look forward to your questions.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL RAYMOND W. CARPENTER

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you.

Next is General Carpenter, a fellow South Dakotan. Please proceed.

General CARPENTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is great to see a fellow South Dakotan.

And again, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the Army National Guard military construction budget request for fiscal year 2010.

First, I must say thanks to this committee for its strong support of the National Guard in the past. Last year, the budget request for fiscal year 2009 asked for \$539 million in Army National Guard military construction, which appropriated for 29 projects. The Congress provided that and more, actually appropriating for us an additional \$197 million for 25 more projects. And we are profoundly grateful to this committee for that added support last year.

Today, you have before you a budget request for fiscal year 2010, which asks for \$426 million to fund 21 projects in 18 States. Those projects consist of readiness centers, ranges, Army aviation, fort facilities, training institutes, and maintenance shops. And we ask you to provide full funding for that request.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

The average age of Army National Guard Readiness Centers across our Nation is 41 years old, and 24 percent of those are over 70 years old. So the need for your continuing strong support is vital to the continued success of our Army National Guard.

Moreover, in this time of economic trouble for our Nation, I would point out that the National Guard military construction funding is a uniquely effective means of stimulating local econo-

mies. Army National Guard facilities are not concentrated on large installations but are widely dispersed across America in more than 3,000 locations and communities.

Finally, I would note that the Army National Guard Readiness Centers are very important parts of the community in which they are located and provide a day-to-day connection between the United States military and hometown America.

Mr. Chairman, the Army National Guard is proud of its history, accomplishments, and service to our Nation. For the past 2 years, we have averaged in excess of 50,000 soldiers mobilized at any given time. And today, we are at 60,000 soldiers mobilized, and those great citizen soldiers are a part of our Army National Guard and are on point for our Nation as we speak.

The 21 projects that we have submitted are about people and readiness—training our soldiers, providing for their well being, and maintaining and sustaining our facilities and equipment to be ready for our Nation's call for State and local emergencies.

I am grateful to be here today to represent those 366,000 citizen soldiers, and I welcome your questions.

I will be followed by General Kraus.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL JULIA A. KRAUS

Senator JOHNSON. General Kraus.

Chairman Johnson, Senator Hutchinson, distinguished members of the subcommittee, thank you for the invitation to appear before you today to discuss Army Reserve military construction. It is an honor to testify before you on behalf of Army Reserve soldiers, family members and civilians.

In the midst of two ongoing wars and transformation efforts to grow, restation and modernize the Army, the Army Reserve is building new capability. In fiscal year 2010, we are requesting twenty one MCAR projects and will be involved in thirty five base realignment and closure (BRAC) projects.

The Army Reserve fiscal year 2010 military construction request of \$374,862,000 (for appropriation and authorization of appropriations) is for mission and training, grow the Army, other support, and unspecified programs.

MISSION AND TRAINING PROJECTS

In fiscal year 2010, the Army Reserve will invest \$45 million to prepare our soldiers for success in current operations. Included in the mission and training projects is an Armed Forces Reserve Center and a Combined Arms Collective Training facility, which will be available for joint use by all Army components and military services.

GROW THE ARMY PROJECTS

The fiscal year 2010 Army Reserve military construction request represents the second year of a 3 year plan to implement the transformation from a strategic reserve to an operational force. Nineteen Reserve operations complexes in 11 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico will be constructed, with an investment of \$304 million, to support the transformation. This \$304 million is 81 percent

of the MILCON budget request. These projects will provide operations, maintenance, and storage facilities for over 6,000 Soldiers in 56 newly activating combat service and combat service Support units and detachments.

While the pace of construction is hectic and the resources committed are remarkable the Army Reserve has significant facility and infrastructure needs. We are working aggressively to address all our facilities and infrastructure requirements to ensure soldiers receive the best training and support possible and that we adequately support and maintain on-hand and inbound modular force equipment to ensure unit readiness.

Thank you for your continued support for the men and women who serve in your Army Reserve and for the opportunity to brief the subcommittee on the state of Army Reserve military construction projects.

This concludes my statement and I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

HOMEOWNERS' ASSISTANCE PROGRAM (HAP) FOR MILITARY FAMILIES

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you.

Mr. Hansen, I am very interested in the Homeowners Assistance Program, or HAP. As you know, I added \$555 million to the stimulus bill to extend homeowners' assistance to military families caught up in the mortgage crisis.

Can you tell me about the status of implementing the expanded program, and what does the Army estimate that the total requirement will be to ensure that this assistance will be available to all qualified Army families?

Mr. CALCARA. Mr. Chairman, I will take that question. And I would like to thank you first for your leadership on that important program. I know you worked very hard, your staff, along with Ms. Evans, to help us get that in the ARRA program, and it is going to make a big difference for a lot of all members of the armed forces—not just the Army, but the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Air Force, and members of the Coast Guard as well.

The Army is the executive agent for it, as you know. When we came in with plans to expand that authority, which goes back 40 years, we had to scale the program to work within available resources. Over the last several weeks, we have had a cross-functional team comprised of representatives of all the services shaping the program's entitlement structure. And we have finished that process and have drafted the final policy.

Where we are now is because some of the benefits will be paid to nonmilitary members, such as surviving spouses and people who have retired, we need to get into the OMB rulemaking process. We are implementing that as we speak. We have had a meeting on it, I think, this week. We expect to get through rulemaking and start paying benefits in the latter part of June.

We anticipate a tremendous response to this program and a lot of success, with at least 10,000 to 12,000 claims forecasted in the immediate future.

Again, I thank you for your leadership on helping us get that program in place.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD MILITARY CONSTRUCTION BUDGET

Senator JOHNSON. General Carpenter, the South Dakota Guard is in the process of constructing a joint forces headquarters in Rapid City. The Guard leadership in South Dakota has indicated a need for an additional \$7.9 million to complete the project in this fiscal year.

Could you give me an update on this project and the required funding? And did you need additional funding for fiscal year 2010?

General CARPENTER. Mr. Chairman, as you are well aware, the project was validated and initially funded in the military construction budget for the Army National Guard. We do have an additional request for \$7 million based upon some additional requirements to that joint force headquarters project, which includes some additional units and some additional requirements that were not in the original 1390/91.

We have reviewed that requirement and that request, and we found them to be valid and a requirement in terms of making that a complete project. So we expect that there would be some sort of funding to accommodate that.

Senator JOHNSON. Mr. Hansen, over the past several years, Congress has provided funding to support the Army's Grow the Force initiative, including 48 brigade combat teams, or BCTs. Last month, the Secretary of Defense announced that the number of BCTs were to be stopped at 45.

What impact will this have on the Army's military construction program, and will it have any impact in fiscal year 2010? What is the status of the Army's stationing plan in Europe, and when do you expect the Secretary to make a final decision on how many brigades will remain in Europe?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, sir. With your permission, sir, General Boozer is geared to answer that one.

General BOOZER. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So, as you indicated, we all are aware of the Secretary of Defense's guidance on April 6 to stop growth of Army BCTs at 45 versus 48, and we will reach the 45th brigade combat team in fiscal year 2010 when we stand up, activate 2d Brigade 1st Armored Division at Fort Bliss, Texas. That will get us to the 45th brigade combat team.

The Army's position concerning the Secretary's guidance is we currently want to maintain our construction projects for 2009 and 2010 because it is both projects in 2009 and 2010 that construct facilities for those six Grow the Army brigades at Fort Carson, Fort Stewart, and Fort Bliss.

As Mr. Hansen indicated in his opening comments, we are currently going through a very, very detailed analysis, a very deliberate analysis of the impacts and courses of action to how we would stop at 45 versus 48.

We also know that in fiscal years 2012 and fiscal years 2013, Mr. Chairman, as you mentioned, we are to bring those two brigades back from Germany—one in fiscal year 2012 to Fort Bliss, Texas, and one in fiscal year 2013 to White Sands Missile Range. Those two brigades, we are going to get informed by this accelerated Quadrennial Defense Review that is currently ongoing.

The construction projects that we have planned in 2009 and fiscal year 2010 are critical, essential in supporting us in getting to our—and we have reached our end strength of 547,400 soldiers that we are slightly above and have to bring that down to get back to our TAA.

So these construction projects are critical in, one, providing facilities for our end strength. And so, our intent is to continue with those programs, maintain those programs, get informed by the QDR, get informed by the courses of action that we are working through now, and work this through.

So we would ask for your patience and hope to be able to do this as quickly as possible. I wish I could give you a time. I know the Chief of Staff of the Army was engaged with Mr. Edwards in the HAC hearings, MILCON hearings last week. Certainly, we would have to have something done before the budget goes to the September conferences at the latest.

ARMY BCI GROWTH

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you, General.

Senator HUTCHISON.

Senator HUTCHISON. I am not sure that I totally understood your answer, and I wanted to follow up on Senator Johnson's question. What effect will the stopping at 45 have on the statement of the commander at EUCOM—he is recommending that two of the brigades stay in Germany for 2 years longer.

Are you saying that will not impact, that decision hasn't been made or that the stopping at 45 does not necessarily mean that the decision has been made that some would stay, that two would stay in Europe? If you could clarify for me?

General BOOZER. Yes, ma'am. And I am sorry for the confusion.

The Army's position, one, is those two brigades will return, as I indicated, fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013.

Senator HUTCHISON. So the two—

General BOOZER. They are almost two separate issues.

Senator HUTCHISON. Okay.

General BOOZER. The decision for the 45 is completely independent of the two brigades coming back from Germany. That issue, it will be reviewed during the QDR.

Senator HUTCHISON. I understand. That is exactly the clarification I was looking for.

So you are moving on schedule, as long as the MILCON stays on schedule, to move those troops as originally determined earlier in BRAC?

General BOOZER. Yes, ma'am.

Senator HUTCHISON. Okay. And let me ask you also in the general BRAC arena if the budget that you have this year, plus last year, if you feel that you are on schedule for having all of the BRAC construction done within the September 2011 timeframe?

General BOOZER. Yes, ma'am. I believe we are on schedule. We are on track. We are essentially halfway through the program. Over 180 projects of 326 are either complete or being constructed. That leaves us 146 projects remaining to execute.

And our intent, with timely funding, is to advertise for projects during the fourth quarter of this year so that we can award them

right at the start of first quarter 2010. But BRAC timeline we are on track now.

Senator HUTCHISON. And do you feel like more money would help move anything further toward that deadline, or are you comfortable that we are on time and on budget?

General BOOZER. No, ma'am. I don't think additional funds would help at this point. It all has to do with capacity, and so I think we have maxed out capacity and maxed out funding for BRAC.

Senator HUTCHISON. Thank you.

EXPANSION OF RANGERS IN PINON CANYON, COLORADO

Pinon Canyon, Mr. Hansen, as you know the Army has been trying to expand the ranges at Pinon Canyon, Colorado, for at least 2, maybe 3 years now but has been held up by environmental issues. And last year, this committee prohibited the Army from even advancing the environmental impact study to expand the ranges there. Actually, it was the full Senate that enacted that.

So what is the option that the Army is looking at? Are you still going to push Pinon Canyon, or are you looking to expand ranges at other installations, seeing that the likelihood of expanding at Pinon Canyon is probably pretty slim?

Mr. HANSEN. Thank you, ma'am.

The Army does not have the luxury of excess or surplus maneuver training land capacity at any of its installations, as you know. And we have legitimate needs for expanded training land to support the concentration of units in the United States, modular conversion to BCTs, training for operating environment, and continued environmental challenges to the Army's ability to fully access the land that it does currently own.

And we do hope to continue to work in a cooperative fashion with the State of Colorado and local landowners, and it is hopeful we can arrive on a way ahead that meets the Army's need and also works for the landowners. We are seeking a win-win there, and we are certainly looking at other installations, too, and the decision on which three BCTs would be eliminated certainly is a big factor in all of these decisions.

Senator HUTCHISON. When will you pull the plug on Pinon Canyon if you don't see a possibility? I mean, it seems pretty clear from the outside that is very remote right now. And I have tried to help on this, but it is not going anywhere. So when do you say, "Here is plan B?"

Mr. HANSEN. We do not have a date on that yet, ma'am. But we certainly are—

Senator HUTCHISON. Are you pursuing other options? Are you beginning to look for other places where you can expand other than Pinon Canyon?

Mr. HANSEN. Within Colorado, there are insufficient Federal lands within about a 200-mile radius of Fort Carson that are capable of supporting the required maneuver training, and Federal lands outside this area would entail additional transportation costs, increase convoy travel time, and increase the possibility of safety issues and unnecessary hazard to the force.

So, and it would also have significant environmental restrictions. So we certainly are looking at expansion at all our facilities since we have—

Senator HUTCHISON. Other places besides Colorado?

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, ma'am, as part of the decision on the three BCTs that we previously discussed, as well as the needs at Fort Carson.

Senator HUTCHISON. Thank you.

Mr. HANSEN. Yes, ma'am.

Senator HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator JOHNSON. Senator Pryor.

Senator PRYOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your time on this.

Let me start with you, if I can, Mr. Calcara, and that is we have some legislation here that we are working. It is S. 590, Defense Communities Assistance Act of 2009. And let me start with a success story in a post BRAC environment. It is actually not in my State. It is in the ranking member's State of Texas.

The Red River Commerce Park is 765 acres that was once part of the Red River Army Depot, and it was transferred via a no-cost EDC 10 years ago. We have that same legislation this time to do no-cost EDCs. It now boasts nearly a million square feet of industrial commercial space, including a biodiesel production facility, 25 private housing units, a golf course, and over a dozen tenant companies employing nearly 1,000 people.

And from my standpoint, it is probably a lot cheaper in the long run on everybody to do a no-cost EDC than it is to try to convey the property some other way. I would like to hear your thoughts on the Army's position on trying to do some of the property that has been BRAC'd, so to speak, through no-cost EDCs.

Mr. CALCARA. Yes, sir. Our BRAC disposal strategy is contingent upon a number of factors, not to mention the reuse plan and the environmental issues on the site. We would prefer to keep all the tools available in the BRAC toolbox, including no-cost EDCs, cost EDCs, public benefit conveyances, and look at the entire suite of options before we unilaterally decide that all EDCs would be no cost.

The Army believes the imperative here is to get the property back in productive reuse as quickly as possible. And in many cases, that requires investment of dollars for environmental cleanup that are otherwise not programmed.

ENVIRONMENTAL CLEANUP OF LONE STAR ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT

One of the strategies that we believe works best for that is to go to public market, bring private dollars to the table, and have clean-up done incidental to redevelopment. This reduces the cost of the cleanup in terms of funding it up front, gets the property redeveloped quicker, and also brings in private capital to supplement precious dollars that we would have to program for cleanup.

So, in the end, the speed is one aspect of it. But it really becomes speed and productive reuse as quickly as possible—not just speed and transfer, but speed in getting the cleanup done.

Senator PRYOR. Let me ask this as a follow-up to that. The Lone Star Army ammunition plant, which is basically more or less adja-

cent property, as Senator Hutchison knows, was, again, BRAC'd in 2005. Do you know—do you have a sense of how much it has cost the Army to maintain that property since 2005?

Mr. CALCARA. I don't have the numbers available. The issue, of course, with Lone Star for us would not necessarily be a cost avoidance for caretaker. It is more where are we going to get the environmental dollars to clean it up and program it?

What we would like to do with Lone Star is leverage the timber to reinvest back in the property for cleanup, to help not only expedite transfer, but clean up at a cost-effective basis.

Senator PRYOR. Do you remember, I thought we appropriated some money to do the cleanup?

Mr. CALCARA. We do have some dollars appropriated, but we do not believe those will be sufficient to get the property cleaned and back into reuse as quickly as if we did go to a public sale process to tap private markets.

Senator PRYOR. Do you know what your current timeline is on making the decisions around Lone Star?

Mr. CALCARA. We just received the reuse plan in here about 30 days ago. We are studying it. We are looking to make some broad-based decisions later this summer.

Senator PRYOR. Mr. Hansen, do you have any comments on Lone Star and the approach that Army is taking with regard to the no-cost economic development conveyance?

Mr. HANSEN. Not beyond what Mr. Calcara said, sir.

Senator PRYOR. Let me ask, if I may, General Carpenter, about some training facilities available to National Guards around the country. I know that one of the things that we see that has obviously become more and more important in the last few years is the so-called "live fire experience," where it may be urban warfare, and they need to simulate that as part of their training. For example, the Arkansas National Guard has to travel to Camp Shelby, Alabama, to do that.

Have you looked at whether it is more cost effective to do the travel and to keep all the folks moving and take them offsite and out of State, in many cases hundreds and hundreds of miles away, and do that training versus just building training facilities in the home State? Have you all looked at that?

General CARPENTER. Sir, as an overall project in that arena, what we have seen in the last several years because of the increased number of brigade combat teams in the active Army, we have seen places where the Army National Guard has traditionally gone to train not being available because of the mobilization process and also because of the other tenants on the installation. For instance, the 256 Brigade out of Louisiana—

Senator PRYOR. Right.

General CARPENTER [continuing]. Struggles to get on Fort Polk now because of the training in the OPTEMPO in that particular arena. We have worked with 1st Army and are currently doing a study on those kinds of things that you have just outlined, sir. And the issue is where do we train the Army National Guard, and what is the proximity to that unit's home station?

And so, between simulation and the live fire piece, we have that under study right now, and we would expect to have that study completed some time in the next year.

Senator PRYOR. Great.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

FISCAL YEAR 2010 BUDGET REQUEST FOR ARMY GUARD

Senator JOHNSON. I will use my discretion to ask one more question. Mr. Calcara, the committee is concerned about the level of funding requested for the Army Guard and Reserve forces. The Guard and Reserves have been a critical component in our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Recently, Secretary Gates indicated that more Reserve components may be tapped for service in Afghanistan, and yet we see a 54 percent reduction in the fiscal year 2010 budget request for the Army Guard. Can you explain this reduction in funding, and what impact is it having on the backlog of needed Guard and Reserve construction projects?

Mr. CALCARA. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I think you need to look at the two sets of numbers in the request for each year, as opposed to the difference between what was enacted last year and this year's request. I don't believe the difference is that great. And as it tiers into the greater Army program of Grow the Army and global positioning, along with the increases in the Reserves, I think we are meeting all the current requirements that the Guard has for fiscal year 2010.

We do have additional requirements that we are looking to rack and stack from 2011 through the FYDP, and we are working on that now. But I think if you compare the fiscal year 2009 request to the 2010 request, there is about a 10 or 15 percent difference between the two numbers.

Senator JOHNSON. Senator Hutchison.

Senator HUTCHISON. I am through. Thank you.

Senator JOHNSON. You may be excused.

Senator HUTCHISON. Thank you all very much.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

STATEMENT OF KATHLEEN I. FERGUSON, DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR INSTALLATIONS

ACCOMPANIED BY:

GENERAL JOSEPH LENGYEL, COMMANDER, AIR NATIONAL GUARD READINESS CENTER

GENERAL HOWARD THOMPSON, DEPUTY TO THE CHIEF OF STAFF, AIR FORCE RESERVE

Senator JOHNSON. I am pleased now to welcome our second panel of witnesses, Ms. Kathleen Ferguson, Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Installations; General Joseph Lengyel, Commander, Air National Guard Readiness Center; and General Howard Thompson, Deputy to the Chief of Staff for the Air Force Reserve.

Thank you all for coming. We look forward to your testimony. And again, your full statements will be entered into the record.

Ms. Ferguson, please proceed.

Ms. FERGUSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On behalf of America's airmen—

Senator HUTCHISON. Is your microphone on?

Ms. FERGUSON. That would be better, I guess.

It is my pleasure to be here today, along with Generals Lengyel and Thompson from the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve.

We would like to begin today by thanking the committee for its continued support of your Air Force and the many dedicated and brave airmen and their families serving around the globe.

Today, more than 27,000 airmen are currently deployed in support of ongoing operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, the Horn of Africa, and many others, daily demonstrating their importance in support of joint combat operations. Within the Secretariat for Installations, Environment, and Logistics, we fully appreciate the impacts our efforts have in support of these airmen and how it affects their ability to positively influence our Air Force's warfighting capabilities and capacity to counter hostile threats.

But before we begin, I want to tell you that we heard your concerns last year that the Air Force did not have enough funds in the future years defense plan (FYDP) and the Air Reserve components were not receiving enough of a share. The Air Force has increased funding across the FYDP by nearly \$2 billion, and we have changed the way we allocate between the active Air Force, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve to give the Reserve components a larger share.

MILCON, family housing, and BRAC programs form the foundation of our installation structure. Our installations serve as key platforms for the delivery of global vigilance, reach and power for

our Nation, and our fiscal year 2010 investments reflect a direct connection to this vital work.

As we continue to focus on modernizing our aging weapon systems, we recognize we cannot lose focus on Air Force infrastructure programs. Our fiscal year 2010 President's budget request of \$4.9 billion for MILCON, military family housing, BRAC, and facility maintenance is a reduction from our 2009 request of \$5.2 billion.

This reflects an increase in MILCON and fact-of-life reductions due to the anticipated completion of the privatization of military family housing and BRAC 2005 round implementation.

Using an enterprise portfolio perspective, we intend to focus our limited resources on the most critical physical plant components by applying demolition and space utilization strategies to reduce our footprint, aggressively pursue energy initiatives, continue to prioritize family housing, and modernizing dormitories to improve quality of life for our airmen.

In regards to military family housing, our master plan details our housing MILCON operations, maintenance, and privatization efforts. Since last spring, we have completed new construction or major improvements on more than 2,000 units in the United States and overseas, with another 2,286 units under construction in the United States and 2,783 units under construction overseas.

Our 2010 budget request for military family housing is just over \$567 million. The request for housing investment is \$67 million to ensure the continual improvement of our overseas homes. Our request also includes an additional \$500 million to pay for operations, maintenance, utilities, and leases for the family housing program.

Now I would like to address our efforts in support of base realignment and closure. BRAC 2005 impacts more than 120 Air Force installations. Unlike the last round of BRAC, where 82 percent of the implementation actions affected the active Air Force, in BRAC 2005, 78 percent of implementation actions affect the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve.

In fact, the Air Force will spend more than \$478 million on Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve BRAC MILCON projects. The Air Force's total BRAC budget is approximately \$3.8 billion, which the Air Force has fully funded. Our fiscal year 2010 BRAC 2005 budget request is approximately \$418 million, of which less than 20 percent is for BRAC MILCON projects. I would like to emphasize the BRAC program is on track to meet the September 2011 deadline.

Air Force MILCON, military family housing, and BRAC initiatives will continue to directly support Air Force priorities. It is imperative we continue to manage our installations by leveraging industry best practices and state-of-the-art technology.

Our civil engineering transformation efforts, now entering the third year, continue to produce efficiencies and cost savings that enhance support for the warfighter, reduce the cost of installation ownership, and free resources for the recapitalization of our aging Air Force weapon systems.

More importantly, these investments reflect effective stewardship of funding designed to serve our airmen in the field, their families, and the taxpayer at home.

PREPARED STATEMENT

Mr. Chairman and Senator Hutchison, this concludes my remarks. Thank you and the committee again for your continued support of our airmen and their families, and we look forward to your questions.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF KATHLEEN I. FERGUSON

INTRODUCTION

More than 27,000 Airmen are currently deployed in support of ongoing operations, daily demonstrating their importance in support of Joint combat operations. Within the Secretariat for Installations, Environment and Logistics (SAF/IE), we fully appreciate the impact our efforts have in support of these Airman and how it affects their ability to positively influence our Air Force's warfighting abilities and capacity to counter hostile threats.

To that end, the men and women of SAF/IE are committed to ensuring our Air Force installations are right sized to support our forces, our combat systems have a robust logistics infrastructure for sustainment, and our forces have the necessary accessibility to the full spectrum of our environment to ensure combat readiness. In addition to our Airmen's combat readiness, we also appreciate how these same efforts support our Airmen and their families and ensure a Quality of Service commensurate with the contribution they provide to the defense of our Nation.

Air Force Military Construction (MILCON), Military Family Housing (MFH), and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) programs form the foundation of our installation structure. Our Air Force installations serve as key platforms for the delivery of Global Vigilance, Reach and Power for our Nation, and our fiscal year 2010 investments reflect a direct connection to this vital work.

As the Air Force continues to focus on modernizing our aging weapon systems, we recognize that we cannot lose focus on critical Air Force infrastructure programs. In order to maintain effective stewardship of the resources given to us, our fiscal year 2010 President's Budget of \$4.9 billion for MILCON, BRAC, MFH, and facility maintenance is a reduction from our fiscal year 2009 request of \$5.2 billion. We intend to mitigate potential shortfalls in MILCON and facility maintenance funding by bolstering our restoration and modernization programs as much as possible. Using an enterprise portfolio perspective, we intend to focus our limited resources only on the most critical physical plant components, by applying demolition and space utilization strategies to reduce our footprint, aggressively pursuing energy initiatives, continuing to privatize family housing and modernizing dormitories to improve quality of life for our Airmen.

Our efforts are in direct support of and consistent with the Air Forces' five priorities, (1) Reinvigorate the Air Force Nuclear Enterprise, (2) Partner with the Joint and Coalition Team to Win Today's Fight, (3) Develop and Care for Airmen and Their Families, (4) Modernize our Air and Space Inventories, Organizations and Training, and (5) Recapture Acquisition Excellence. It is with these priorities in mind that I will outline our MILCON, Military Family Housing and BRAC efforts and the individual priorities they support.

REINVIGORATE THE AIR FORCE NUCLEAR ENTERPRISE

The Air Force has a solemn responsibility and obligation to operate and maintain its portion of America's nuclear deterrent posture, which consists of land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, nuclear-capable bombers and dual capable fighters. Over the past several months the Air Force senior leadership team, along with the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and Interagency partners, have closely examined the Air Force nuclear enterprise and identified several areas for improvement.

The results of these internal assessments reinforced the need to continually focus on nuclear sustainment and operations as well as the management of the weapons and their delivery platforms. A critical aspect of this effort includes the infrastructure and facilities providing the necessary life-cycle installation support of this vital mission. Air Force Civil Engineers and field experts are currently conducting Facility Condition Assessments of all nuclear-related facilities, which will provide detailed information on our infrastructure deficiencies directly supporting the nuclear mission. Projects will be developed, programmed, and prioritized appropriately to obtain the necessary funding required to correct any deficiencies.

Additionally, the fiscal year 2010 President's Budget request includes an investment of \$45 million in four infrastructure projects at Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota, FE Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming and Clear Air Station, Alaska. These projects include missile procedures, training operations and missile service complex facilities.

DEVELOP AND CARE FOR AIRMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES

Airmen are the Air Force's most valuable resource and we remain committed to recruiting and retaining the world's highest quality force. As part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, monies allotted to the Air Force support that effort. Over \$260 million in MILCON will improve the lives of our Airmen and their families through MFH improvements, dormitory construction, and providing Child Development Center facilities and services.

Developing Airmen

The Air Force must continue to ensure we are preparing Airmen for the challenges of today and tomorrow by providing quality facilities in which to train and operate. Our fiscal year 2010 budget request includes \$39 million for three projects. We will construct a new recruit dormitory and basic military training facility giving incoming Airmen quality training facilities to start a career of service. Another highlight includes a C-5 Ground Training Schoolhouse addition for the Air Force Reserve Command.

Military Family Housing Program

The MFH Master Plan details our Housing MILCON, operations and maintenance, and privatization efforts. Since last spring, the Air Force completed new construction or major improvements on over 2,000 units in the United States and overseas, with another 2,286 units under construction in the United States and 2,783 units under construction overseas.

Our fiscal year 2010 budget request for MFH is just over \$567 million. The Air Force request for housing investment is \$67 million to ensure the continual improvement of our overseas homes. Investments will provide whole-house renovations for 365 units at two overseas bases and extend their useful life. Our request also includes an additional \$500 million to pay for operations, maintenance, utilities and leases for the family housing program.

Housing Privatization

Housing privatization continues to improve quality of life for our Airmen and their families. To date we have privatized approximately 38,900 housing units at 44 bases. We have seen the delivery of over 10,000 new or renovated homes and are currently bringing more than 200 homes a month online. We will have leveraged more than \$402 million in government investment to garner almost \$6.3 billion in private sector total housing development, or \$16 of private investment for each public tax dollar. With the support of Congress, we will continue to work toward our goal to privatize 100 percent of Military Family Housing in the Continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska and Guam by the end of fiscal year 2010.

Unaccompanied Housing (Dormitories)

The Air Force Dormitory Master Plan is the cornerstone for developing requirements for unaccompanied housing. The budget request includes five dormitories worth \$138 million. We will continue to replace existing dormitories at the end of their useful life with a standard Air Force-designed private room configuration under the "Dorms-4-Airmen" concept. Simultaneously, our implementation of a "bridging strategy" ensures we are investing Facility Sustainment and Restoration and Modernization funds into aging facilities to extend their useful life until MILCON replacements can be executed and to ensure we keep "good dormitories good."

Fitness and Child Development Centers

Elevated operations tempo and increased home-station demands makes physical fitness an imperative for Airmen. Our fiscal year 2010 request includes two Fitness Centers worth \$41 million. We also remain focused on providing our families with appropriate and nurturing child care facilities. We will continue to invest in these facilities which we believe are key to caring for Airmen and their families. This year's budget request includes two child development centers worth \$20 million.

Environmental Quality and Management Systems

Our environmental management programs continue to ensure the most basic quality of life needs are met for our Airmen and surrounding communities: clean

air, clean drinking water and healthy working and living conditions for our workforce and base residents. We have implemented a new environmental management approach at Air Force installations. Installations are now utilizing the Environmental Management System to identify environmental aspects of base operations, assess their impacts, and help commanders make informed decisions and investments to reduce environmental risks and compliance costs. Our installation commanders significantly reduced new environmental enforcement actions by 44 percent from fiscal year 2005 to fiscal year 2008.

We are also continuing our existing environmental quality and restoration programs. The fiscal year 2010 request includes just under \$1 billion for direct-funded non-BRAC environmental programs such as: traditional environmental restoration activities, environmental compliance activities and projects, pollution prevention initiatives, environmental conservation activities, munitions response activities, and investment in promising environmental technologies. Our environmental restoration program is proceeding aggressively to clean-up sites contaminated by past practices. The Air Force closed or has remedies in place at 89 percent of the contaminated sites and expects to have remedies in place at all sites by fiscal year 2012, 2 years ahead of the Department of Defense fiscal year 2014 environmental restoration goal.

MODERNIZE OUR AIR AND SPACE INVENTORIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND TRAINING

Modernizing our aging air and space inventories, organizations and training to prepare for tomorrow's challenges requires significant investment of \$353 million for 34 projects. We will complete the planned F-22 beddown, including the two Air National Guard projects at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii. The beddown of the F-35 also continues to be a priority, with eight projects supporting actions at Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada and Eglin Air Force Base, Florida.

We also continue to modernize our facilities in support of our larger aircraft by constructing seven new facilities supporting C-130 operations and training. Other projects in this program include a consolidated communication facility at Cannon Air Force Base, New Mexico, two research facilities at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio and upgrading electrical infrastructure at Hurlburt Field, Florida. As part of our work to achieve balance across our portfolios, we continue to transform the enterprise by developing new concepts of operations, implementing organizational change, and integrating advanced technologies in installation support.

Energy Stewardship

The Air Force has launched an aggressive program to invest in facility energy conservation and renewable energy alternatives. Recently, the Secretary of the Air Force signed a Mission Directive institutionalizing energy policy within the Air Force and driving more efficient energy management practices. Together, these policies will direct specific actions in the areas of operational processes, training, and installation management geared toward reducing our "energy footprint," and increasing our use of cleaner energy alternatives.

Over the past year, we've stood up the Air Force Facility Energy Center (FEC) at the Air Force Civil Engineer Support Agency at Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida. The new FEC consolidates energy technical expertise and project management capabilities in order to leverage best practices across the force. The goal of this office is to develop and implement innovative energy solutions reducing our energy "footprint" at Air Force installations. In 2008, the Air Force Infrastructure Energy Strategic Plan was issued to guide the strategic and tactical direction of our energy program, a plan designed to balance supply-side energy assurance and demand-side energy efficiency. It incorporates the energy strategy of the 21st Century designed to meet the energy mandates outlined in the Energy Policy Act 2005 (EPAct 05), Executive Order (EO) 13423 and Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (EISA 2007). The strategy maps the way ahead for meeting energy mandates through fiscal year 2015 and covers facilities infrastructure as well as fuel efficiency in our ground transportation fleet.

The new infrastructure energy strategy is founded on Four Pillars that are designed to (1) Improve Current Infrastructure, (2) Improve future infrastructure, (3) Expand renewables, and (4) manage cost. We intend to achieve the Four Pillars by incorporating best business practices into our education and training programs, pursuing cultural change in our organizations, and improving our asset management. We see potential indicators that our efficiency strategy is providing return-on-investment. In 2008, the Air Force energy intensity decreased by 17.8 percent from the fiscal year 2003 baseline. The Air Force also developed a life-cycle cost-effective metering strategy to meet EPAct 05, which mandates the installation of electric meters on required facilities by 2012. We recognize the value of metering and are already 74 percent complete toward the goal. The Air Force is also making great strides in

our water conservation program. In fiscal year 2008, we consumed 1.3 billion gallons less water than our fiscal year 2007 water usage.

In the area of renewable energy, our strategy expands public and private partnerships by leveraging private sector capital to bring renewable power production to our bases at competitive prices. For example, in a partnership with state and local government and private industry, the photovoltaic (PV) solar array at Nellis Air Force Base, Nevada, the largest PV array in North America, generated 57,139 megawatt-hours in fiscal year 2008. Through a Congressional appropriation, F.E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyoming, installed a 2,000 kilowatt wind turbine in January 2009, adding to the two turbines already operational. Together the three wind turbines are capable of generating 6.7 million kilowatt-hours per year, enough to power 836 homes. These and other renewable energy and conservation initiatives provide examples of how the Air Force is committed to not only meeting, but exceeding the goals of the new Executive Order with initiatives that provide long-term return-on-investment.

Sustainability

With an eye toward improving future infrastructure, our traditional project goals of delivering high quality facility projects on schedule and within budget is expanding to include creation of functional, maintainable, and high performance facilities. Under EO 13423 and EISA 2007, the Air Force employs the Federal Leadership in High Performance and Sustainable Building Guiding Principles to reduce total cost of ownership and improve energy efficiency and water conservation to provide safe, healthy, and productivity-enhancing facility environments. We also employ the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) criteria in our designs. The LEED Green Building Rating System is the nationally accepted benchmark for the design, construction, and operation of high performance green buildings. In 2008, the Air Force certified its first LEED gold building at Offutt Air Force Base, Nebraska. This year, 100 percent of Air Force-eligible MILCON projects will be capable of certification in LEED.

The Air Force understands that it is not just new construction that needs this focus and attention. We have already begun the task of greening our existing building inventory and installation support platforms. Sustainability cannot just be about facilities, it has to be a holistic approach to include how we develop and sustain our installations. The vision is to build and shape sustainable communities using innovative solutions to lower the cost of installation support and provide more eco-friendly installations.

BRAC 2005 Execution Report Card

BRAC 2005 impacts more than 120 Air Force installations. Whether establishing the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter Initial Training Site at Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, closing Kulis Air Guard Station in Alaska, or transferring Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina to the Army, the Air Force community as a whole—active, Guard, Reserve—will benefit from changes BRAC achieves.

Unlike the last round of BRAC where 82 percent of the implementation actions affected the active Air Force, in BRAC 2005, 78 percent of implementation actions affect the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve. In fact, the Air Force will spend more than \$486 million on Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve BRAC MILCON projects. In addition, many of the BRAC MILCON projects on active Air Force installations, like the C-130 facilities built or renovated at Elmendorf Air Force Base, or KC-135 facilities built or renovated at Seymour-Johnson and MacDill Air Force Bases, will benefit Air Reserve Component forces stationed there.

The Air Force's total BRAC budget is approximately \$3.8 billion, which the Air Force has fully funded.

The Air Force's largest BRAC costs are for military construction projects; approximately \$2.6 billion. Operations and Maintenance expenditures closely follow at \$926 million. This includes expenditures for civilian pay and moving expenses, supplies, equipment, travel, etc. There are other BRAC expenses, as well. Other requirements include expenses for information technology, equipment procurement, and Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard training, to name a few, at \$142 million.

Other BRAC programmed amounts include \$132 million for military personnel expenses and environmental planning and cleanup.

The Air Force's fiscal year 2010 BRAC 2005 Budget Request is approximately \$418 million, of which less than 20 percent is for BRAC MILCON projects.

The Air Force's primary focus in the fiscal year 2010 program is in budget areas other than BRAC MILCON because we are now more focused on personnel-related issues, relocating assets and functions, outfitting new and renovated facilities, pro-

curing end-state necessities, and continuing environmental actions to realign and integrate the total force.

Joint Basing

The Air Force has a long and successful history of working toward common goals in the Joint environment. The Air Force remains committed to ensuring all bases, Joint or otherwise, maintain their capability as weapon system platforms and meet our quality of life standards. To accomplish this we worked with our sister Services and OSD to establish common quality of life standards that ensure our personnel receive efficient installation support services.

The Services are addressing many complex issues such as information technology integration, human resources planning, manpower and fiscal resources, and new organizational structures. A Senior Joint Base Working Group, led by the Deputy Undersecretary of Defense (Installations and the Environment) developed implementation policy to guide the transition of installation management functions and meet the BRAC timeline. The group is in the process of reviewing and coordinating the numerous details in the formal support agreements and implementation plans to establish each Joint Base. The five Joint Bases aligned in the first phase of implementation have developed comprehensive Memoranda of Agreement (MOA) establishing the relationships between the Services, and are now shifting their focus to the orderly transition of installation management functions by October 2009. The seven Phase II installations are developing their MOAs now and will begin the transition of functions next year, and will complete the process by October 2010.

Legacy BRAC—Real Property Transformation

The Air Force remains a Federal leader in the implementation of the management principles outlined in Presidential Executive Order 13327, Federal Real Property Asset Management. We continue to aggressively manage our real property assets to deliver maximum value for the taxpayer, improve the quality of life for our Airmen and their families, and ensure the protection and sustainment of the environment to provide the highest level of support to Air Force missions. The Air Force is achieving these goals through an enterprise-wide Asset Management transformation that seeks to optimize asset value and to balance performance, risk, and cost over the full asset life cycle. Our approach is fundamentally about enhancing our built and natural asset inventories and linking these inventories to our decision-making processes and the appropriate property acquisition, management and disposal tools.

Even though the BRAC 2005 round did not reduce the Air Force's real property footprint, our current transformation efforts seek to "shrink from within" and to leverage the value of real property assets in order to meet our "20/20 by 2020" goal of offsetting a 20 percent reduction in funds available for installation support activities by achieving efficiencies and reducing by 20 percent the Air Force physical plant that requires funds by the year 2020.

Base Realignment and Closure Property Management

To date, the Air Force has successfully conveyed by deed nearly 90 percent of the 87,000 acres of Air Force BRAC 88, 91, 93 and 95, which we refer to as legacy BRAC, with the remainder under lease for redevelopment and reuse. The highly successful reuse of Air Force Base closure property led to the creation of tens-of-thousands of jobs in the affected communities. To complete the clean up and transfer by deed of remaining property, the Air Force is partnering with industry leaders on innovative business practices for its "way ahead" strategy. These include an emphasis on performance-based environmental remediation contracts, using such performance-based contracts on regional clusters of BRAC bases, and innovative tools such as early property transfer and privatization of environmental cleanup so that the cleanup efforts complement, rather than impede, the property redevelopment plans and schedules. Our objectives remain constant and clear: (1) provide reuse opportunities that best meet the needs of the Air Force and local communities, (2) move the process along smartly in each situation to get property back into commerce as soon as practical, and (3) provide transparency throughout the process. Of the 32 legacy BRAC bases slated for closure, the Air Force completed 20 whole-base transfers. Ten of the remaining 12 bases are targeted for transfer by the end of fiscal year 2010, while the last two (former George and McClellan Air Force Bases) will be transferred no later than the end of fiscal year 2012.

As the Air Force transfers BRAC property for civic and private reuse, it is paramount we ensure any past environmental contamination on the property does not endanger public health or the environment. The Air Force will continue to fulfill this most solemn responsibility, as reflected in our fiscal year 2010 request of \$116 million for legacy BRAC cleanup activities and another \$20 million for BRAC 2005 cleanup activities. Recent progress at the former McClellan Air Force Base in Sac-

ramento, once the most environmentally contaminated closure base within DOD, is a sterling example of the effective approach taken by the Air Force and the local community in fostering redevelopment of closure base property. As a result of previously unprecedented collaboration between the local community, the Environmental Protection Agency, State environmental regulators, the primary developer, and the Air Force on the privatization of cleanup of the base, the former base is quickly becoming the “greenest” business park in California. It is home to what will be the most energy-efficient computer data center in the Nation. The former base is also now home to North America’s largest photo-voltaic solar panel manufacturing plant, a 1-million square foot joint venture facility called Opti-Solar. The plant will create 1,000 green jobs producing 2,000 solar panels per day beginning in 2009.

In summary, the Air Force’s real property asset management framework involves an understanding and balancing of our mission needs and risks with market dynamics, the Federal budget, the condition and performance of our assets and the need to protect the environment.

PARTNER WITH THE JOINT AND COALITION TEAM TO WIN TODAY’S FIGHT

America’s Airmen are “All In” supporting the Joint and Coalition team to win today’s fight with precision and reliability. Our fiscal year 2010 program includes \$544 million for 28 projects directly connected to today’s fight. Four projects valued at \$198 million directly support U.S. Central Command by providing much needed in-theater airlift ramp and fuel facilities, a war-reserve material compound, and a passenger terminal. Other projects include an aerospace ground equipment maintenance complex at Ramstein Air Base in Germany, a Global Hawk maintenance and operations complex at Naval Air Station Sigonella in Italy, and beddown facilities for Air Force air support and operations personnel with Army units. These investments provide direct returns by reducing backlog and waste in our logistics trail, and increase the capacity and efficiency of our fighting forces at downrange locations.

Approximately 30,000 Airmen are currently deployed as part of Operations ENDURING FREEDOM and IRAQI FREEDOM. More than 3,000 of these Airmen are civil engineers, with over 40 percent of our deployed engineers filling Joint Expeditionary Tasking billets, serving side-by-side with our sister Services. Our heavy construction Rapid Engineer Deployable Heavy Operational and Repair Squadron Engineers (RED HORSE) and our Prime Base Engineer Emergency Force (BEEF) engineers are well-known in-theater for their ability to build and maintain expeditionary installations. Airmen continue to assist both Iraq and Afghanistan in building the capacity to provide self-governance. Since 2004, the Air Force has completed over \$5.6 billion in major renovation or construction projects, giving the governments of Iraq and Afghanistan the capacity to provide basic services for its people. Whether it is serving on Provincial Reconstruction Teams, mitigating the threat of improvised explosive devices, standing up host nation Field Engineering Teams, or teaching aspiring engineers at the Afghan Service Academies, Airmen continue to demonstrate courage, commitment, and dedication in contingency operations. We are honored to serve with our Joint and Coalition team partners and will continue to support the Nation’s call-to-arms by providing unique engineering capabilities and the most talented installation support personnel available.

RECAPTURE ACQUISITION EXCELLENCE

The Air Force remains committed to recapturing acquisition excellence and developing innovative solutions that enable smart business decisions. Through the Air Force Civil Engineer Strategic Sourcing Program Management Office at the Air Force Civil Engineer Support Agency at Tyndall Air Force Base, Florida, we are working to select and prioritize sourcing opportunities and oversee the efforts of other Major Command-initiated CE strategic sourcing efforts. The Program Management Office will capitalize on industry-best practices to reduce the cost of building systems and commodities while improving the delivery of support to our customers. Five strategic sourcing opportunities and a commodity cost review are currently in progress to identify sourcing strategies leading to regional or enterprise-level acquisitions. We organized a staff comprised of civil engineers, contracting officers and financial specialists to ensure we implement a well-integrated, cross functional approach aimed at determining the right investments for our enterprise.

CONCLUSION

Air Force MILCON, MFH and BRAC initiatives will continue to connect directly to Air Force priorities. It is imperative we continue to manage our installations by leveraging industry-best practices and state-of-the-art technology. Our CE trans-

formation effort, now entering its third year, continues to produce efficiencies and cost savings that enhance support for the warfighter, reduce the cost of installation ownership, and free resources for the recapitalization of our aging Air Force weapon systems. More importantly, these investments reflect effective stewardship of funding designed to serve our Airmen in the field, their families, and the taxpayer at home.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you, Ms. Ferguson.

The fiscal 2010 Air Force budget request for military construction is about 10 percent lower than the 2009 request. Last year, the Air Force acknowledged that it was assuming a greater risk in construction funding to steer more funds into air and space assets.

Is this year's budget request a continuation of that policy? Could you outline that risk that the Air Force is leveraging with the drop-off in funding for military construction?

AIR FORCE RESERVE AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD MILCON FUNDING

Ms. FERGUSON. Yes, thank you.

Overall, the Air Force has reduced our fiscal year 2010 President's budget request from our fiscal year 2009 President budget request. In fiscal year 2009, our request for infrastructure programs was \$5.2 billion. And this year, when you add MILCON, family housing, BRAC, and facility maintenance, we are right about \$4.9 billion.

We have increased in some areas and have decreased in others. In military construction, from one President's budget to the other President's budget, we have increased about \$300 million. We have increased our family housing maintenance count by about \$200 million, predominantly in the energy area and to improve dormitories.

And we have reduced funding in both family housing and BRAC, directly related to reduced requirements in both of those accounts. And that is good news because that reflects success in the program, and we do not need any additional funding beyond what we have asked for in this budget for either BRAC or family housing.

Overall, if you look to see how we allocated the funds between the active and Air National Guard—and each the active, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve have seen increases from last year—our active request went up about 22 percent, the Air Force Reserve about 45 percent, and the Air National Guard went up about 273 percent. But as you do point out, it is lower than the appropriated amount, but the Air Force did increase—continues to take risk in infrastructure, but did increase our President's budget request above what we did have last year.

Senator JOHNSON. Could you give me an update on the housing privatization efforts at Ellsworth Air Force Base?

Ms. FERGUSON. The Ellsworth Air Force Base project is part of a grouped project. It is in the concept development stage right now, and we anticipate coming over to the Hill to give a briefing within the next few months. But I will be happy to come over and give you more details on that.

[The information follows:]

ELLSWORTH AFB HOUSING PRIVATIZATION

The Air Force will provide the Military Construction-Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, Senate Appropriations Committee a briefing on the housing privatization efforts at Ellsworth Air Force Base, South Dakota in July 2009.

Senator JOHNSON. As a result of an OSD decision, the Air Force budget request does not include an updated FYDP. Last year, the Air Force Guard and Reserve FYDPs were very thin. What impact will the new FYDP policy have on the ability of Congress to provide additional funds for key Air Guard and Reserve priorities?

FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM AND AIR RESERVE COMPONENT FUNDING

Ms. FERGUSON. At this time, OMB has asked the Department not to present any funding beyond fiscal year 2010 in our budget. Pending the additional guidance from the President and OMB beyond what is in our justification books, we are continuing to work with OSD on the development and release of anything beyond what we have provided in fiscal year 2010.

Senator JOHNSON. General Lengyel and General Thompson, would you please give the subcommittee your assessment of this situation?

General LENGYEL. Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the question and the opportunity to comment.

It is a concern to the National Guard bureau that potentially there are projects in the FYDP to accelerate. As you are well aware, the Air National Guard has been able to gain an average of \$150 million or more in accelerations yearly. So the inability to do that could, in fact, hinder our ability to recapitalize our \$14 billion plant.

We hope perhaps that there is some way that we find a way to fund those projects into the FYDP so that they can be accelerated. But currently, we are playing as partners with the Air Force with the funds available in the program.

Senator JOHNSON. General Thompson.

General THOMPSON. Sir, we are just a microcosm of the overall Air Force, the same as the Air National Guard. Much smaller program, but we have the same concerns.

We have a backlog that we would like to be able to accelerate. As with the Army that spoke earlier, our request last year of \$19 million ended up an appropriation of \$37 million. Our request this year is \$27 million. So we are—like the regular Air Force, our appropriation did exceed our request. So we thank you very much for that.

So just as Joe mentioned, we will be in the same boat, all three components of the Air Force, if we cannot work some accelerations with you.

Senator JOHNSON. General Lengyel and General Thompson, I am deeply concerned over the level of funding in the fiscal year 2010 request for the Air Guard and Reserve. The Air Guard request is 60 percent below the fiscal year 2009 enacted level, and the Air Force Reserve request is nearly 26 percent below fiscal year 2009 enacted.

This is not the first decrease we have seen in funding requests from the Air Guard and Reserve. What impact is this trend having on the Air Guard and Reserve MILCON program?

General LENGYEL. Well, sir, Mr. Chairman, once again I would comment that I see this budget as actually an improvement over the previous 2 year budgets for sure. Last year, I believe we had somewhere just over \$34 million in current mission projects in the budget. This year, we are in excess of \$120 million.

We are pleased and working again in concert with the other components in the Air Force to play by the same rules. I can tell you that like every other part in the Air Force, the Air National Guard received its top three priorities in MILCON projects, no different than anyone else.

Competition for funding in the budget process is a challenge, but we are happy to say that with the Air Force, we are playing pretty much as one team. And we are treated no different, I would say, than any other part of the Air Force.

Senator JOHNSON. General Thompson.

General THOMPSON. Sir, I concur with General Lengyel. And the thing that I think is the difference this year than perhaps last year is we, as the Air Force, changed the business rules whereby the Reserve components received their percentages of the overall MILCON budget, which resulted in a more fair application of those percentages across our portfolio. So it is better than last year.

Now, frankly, it is the difference between last year and this year was the wisdom of the Congress in accelerating some additions to the budget. But our requests are in line. We feel fairly treated. We are equal partners with the Air Force, and especially with the change in business rules, we are very satisfied with the way that we are treated as part of the Air Force team.

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you.

Senator HUTCHISON.

Senator HUTCHISON. Well, I want to thank the chairman for asking about the Reserve issue because that has been a concern of mine as well.

24TH AIR FORCE HEADQUARTERS MILCON REQUIREMENTS

We are all waiting for the decision on the Cyber Command, as you can imagine, and I wondered what the MILCON requirements might be for the new 24th Air Force headquarters that will come with that Cyber Command?

Ms. FERGUSON. Ma'am, it would be premature for me to speculate at this time because the Air Force has not yet made an announcement on the basing location. But certainly, as soon as that is made, we can provide you and your staff an update on that.

Senator HUTCHISON. Regardless of where it goes, have you done planning or is there nothing contingent in your budget request for any added building for that?

Ms. FERGUSON. There is nothing in our building request for Cyber Command right now. What I can describe is the process that we have gone through so far. As you know, the Air Force announced in January six locations that were going to be visited for possible beddown locations for Air Force Cyber Command.

Space Command took the lead. They performed the site surveys at each of those six locations. And as they performed those six site surveys, they looked at what it would take to reach initial operating capability at that installation, and they looked at what it would take to get to final operating capability at that location.

They also evaluated the installation based on six criteria that had been provided by the Secretary of the Air Force, and they included things like mission synergy, communications, bandwidth, availability of facilities, transportation, security, and off the top of my head, I can't remember the last one.

But that has been ongoing, and right now, we are just waiting to make the announcement for the preferred location and the other reasonable alternatives. And at that time, the Air Force will begin to accomplish the environmental assessment for the beddown of Cyber Command.

Senator HUTCHISON. So what then would be the timetable? If there is nothing in this year's budget request for generic military construction for that headquarters, what would then be the timetable for putting it into the FYDP or into a future budget?

It just seems like you would want to stand it up as early as possible. And I would have thought you might have something set aside for that for whenever the announcement was made so it could be started immediately.

Ms. FERGUSON. Our anticipation is that it will be in the fiscal year 2011 budget request. If any MILCON is required to stand up Cyber Command or Cyber Numbered Air Force (NAF), that will be done in the fiscal year 2011 budget. And we will work an interim operations and maintenance (O&M) fix, O&M solution if required for the interim stand-up.

JOINT BASING AND BRAC 2005 ROUND IMPLEMENTATION

Senator HUTCHISON. Okay. Let me ask you the other issue that I had mentioned earlier, and that is the Air Force will be the lead on 6 of the 12 joint bases in BRAC. What are your preparations for that, and what is your thought of the way you will be putting those operations headquarters together for all the different services?

Ms. FERGUSON. Sure. And as you point out, they are through BRAC 2005, joint basing was directed at 12 installations, 12 joint basing installations. The Air Force has lead at six of those installations, and we are follow at four. And we have been working very closely with OSD and our partners in the Army and the Navy to execute joint basing as directed by BRAC 2005.

And OSD and the other services have basically broken down joint basing implementation into two phases, and Phase ones are underway right now. The memorandums of agreement have all been signed for the first five joint bases. In the first five, it is Naval Air Base Little Creek/Fort Story, Fort Myer/Henderson Hall, Andrews/Naval Air Station Washington, McGuire/Fort Dix/Lakehurst, and then installations at Guam, both Andersen Air Force Base and Navy Region Guam.

All the rest of the joint bases are in Phase II, and that does include Lackland Air Force Base, Fort Sam Houston, and Randolph Air Force Base. And I can tell you briefly, all of the Phase I bases

have reached their initial operational capability today, and they will reach full operational capability, will be fully stood up on 1 October of this year.

The Phase II MOAs—and I can talk to you specifically about Lackland/Fort Sam in just a second. All the Phase II MOAs are under development right now with an initial operational capability (IOC) for the follow-on for the Phase II bases in January 2010 with full operating capability in October 2010.

Lackland Air Force Base, Fort Sam Houston, and Randolph Air Force Base are one of the last seven bases to go through this process I will describe for you. But there is a combination of folks here in Washington, DC helping to make this work, along with each of the major commands helping to make this work.

And the next major milestone for Lackland Air Force Base/Fort Sam Houston on May 22, the command structure at the major commands for both the Army and the Air Force will submit a draft memorandum of agreement to the Department of Defense for us to start looking at. And there will be a workshop that is held in San Antonio from the 9th to 12th of June.

The anticipation for an MOA signature for Fort Sam Houston, Lackland Air Force Base, and Randolph Air Force Base will be the 22nd of September.

Senator HUTCHISON. Could I just follow up with a quick question, and that is who will make the MILCON requests where there are joint bases? Will it be the lead, or will it be the service?

Ms. FERGUSON. It will be the lead for installation support functions. If there is a mission change, then it will be the requiring. So if there is an Army mission change on Fort Sam Houston, the Army would make that request. If it was for a regular mission support facility, like a gym or an administrative facility to replace something existing, the Air Force would do that as the lead for that joint base.

Senator HUTCHISON. Thank you.

Senator JOHNSON. Senator Pryor.

Senator PRYOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

AMERICAN EAGLE HOUSING PRIVATIZATION

Ms. Ferguson, let me ask, as you are very well aware because you have dealt with this for a long time, the Little Rock Air Force Base, along with bases in Georgia, Massachusetts, and Florida, was able recently to resolve a very complicated housing privatization issue. And the first question is could you give us just—give the subcommittee here a status report on all the bases, if you could, just kind of where that stands now and particularly where we started in terms of what our original goals were versus how many houses and how many refurbished houses we end up with now?

Ms. FERGUSON. Sure. And first, I want to thank you and your staff for all the work you helped us with as we did the work out of the American Eagle project. As you know, the American Eagle projects, the four projects were very difficult for us, and we appreciate the support of yourself and the other members as we worked through that.

Specifically for Little Rock Air Force Base, the scope was reduced from 1,200 to 1,000 as we worked the restructured deal. And there

was less new construction than what was in the original American Eagle project.

The feedback we have got so far is the Hunt-Pinnacle team, the new project owner that is in there, has done a great job of bringing in new branding to the installation. They have done a tremendous job of taking care of some of the backlogs of maintenance, roof repair, storm damage repairs that were both at Little Rock and Moody Air Force Bases.

And we have got great feedback from the installations on the work that they have done since they have gone in there in November. The Air Force has issued notice to proceed for demolition and construction, and Hunt-Pinnacle has begun work on the 10 partially completed houses that American Eagle started. And those houses should be complete in June. We should be able to start moving families into those 10 houses in June.

The other things they are doing is they are demolishing some of that partial work that American Eagle had done that wasn't recoverable, and that should be done also. And starting in June, they should begin working on 131 new houses at Little Rock Air Force Base with work to be done in March 2011.

Senator PRYOR. If I recall, Little Rock has their set of issues, and Georgia, Massachusetts, and Florida, they are all a little different. But are they generally following on that same track that, in effect, the taxpayer is getting a little less than what we had originally bargained for? But the work is back on track and things are moving to, under the circumstances, a conclusion that is relatively satisfactory?

Ms. FERGUSON. Absolutely. Each one of them is similar. Each project is different in some respects. Some—at Patrick Air Force Base, we added some additional homes to the deal. Originally, it was all the houses were off base. We did roll in some houses that were on base to the deal.

Part of the difficulty with the work out of American Eagle is there was some collapsed bonds. There wasn't enough money available to do what was done originally. And because of the financial crisis and the economy, we were unable to go out and get additional financing. So we had to live within the dollars that were available at the time.

Work is progressing at all four bases. At Patrick Air Force Base, they are demolishing 111 houses right now, and those should be complete shortly. They have begun renovation of 435 homes that were brought into the deal in the north and central housing.

At Moody Air Force Base, they are completing 50 of the homes that American Eagle had started. And at Hanscom Air Force Base, I actually just came back from a trip to Hanscom Air Force Base and visited up there, and they are completing 26 houses that American Eagle started. And they have done a great job.

On the 1st and 2nd of June, I am traveling to Little Rock, Patrick, and Moody Air Force Bases to do another touch with the other three bases—

Senator PRYOR. Great.

Ms. FERGUSON [continuing]. To get hands on in how they are doing.

Senator PRYOR. Great. Thank you for doing that.

Now let me ask, from this point moving forward, have you prepared a set of lessons learned, things that if you could go back, you would do them differently and a better game plan as we move forward? Do you have that?

AMERICAN EAGLE—LESSONS LEARNED

Ms. FERGUSON. Absolutely. We have learned a lot of lessons from American Eagle and not just the Air Force, but the Navy and the Army also did as well. And I will go through just a couple of things the Air Force has done and how we have changed our processes as we have taken lessons learned from American Eagle.

The first thing we did is we centralized source selection authority, and actually, that authority resides with me and my office. Before, when we awarded the four American Eagle projects, there were different source selection authorities for each one of the four. They were all awarded within a 1-year time period. And so, we weren't able to see those things that were occurring across the Air Force.

We have centralized construction management reporting to the Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment down in San Antonio, and they have got standard construction reporting, and they have got financial and construction reviews. We monitor almost on a daily basis some key performance indicators. We monitor the construction schedules, the budgets, the financial indicators, the debt covenants, and the operating expenses.

We do, along with our partners, do customer service and satisfaction surveys. We do a monthly in-depth review at my level of the execution of these projects. We have initiated also pretty robust development review visits where we send a team out from Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment to go out and actually touch on the ground on a pretty frequent basis the issues that are happening there.

Senator PRYOR. I think all of that is good because I think actually privatization for housing does make a lot of sense, but we just have to make sure that we manage it properly.

One last question on that specific deal, again, I think there were four bases involved in four different States. Is there anything right now that the Air Force is doing with regard to American Eagle? Any recourse, any lawsuit, trying to recover some of the lost money, or have we blacklisted them for future projects? What, if any, actions has the Air Force taken with regard to American Eagle?

Ms. FERGUSON. I will have to get you an update on that. They were working through—our general counsel is working through their review of the potential debarment, and we will get you an update on that. I just don't have a current status.

[The information follows:]

AMERICAN EAGLE

An ongoing investigation into American Eagle's conduct continues. As information is developed and made available through the investigation, the Air Force Suspension and Debarment Official will continue to monitor whether there exists a sufficient basis to require a suspension or debarment action to protect the Government's interests in accordance with 48 C.F.R. Subpart 9.4. In the meantime, as it relates to American Eagle's responsibility to be a contractor to the U.S. Government, before

awarding a contract to American Eagle or any of the major corporate entities making up American Eagle, in accordance with 48 C.P.R. Subpart 9.1, contracting officers throughout the Federal Government will be required to make an affirmative determination of responsibility. The affirmative responsibility determination requires contracting officers to verify that prospective awardees (a) have adequate financial resources to perform a given contract; (b) be able to comply with the contract requirements; (c) have a satisfactory performance record; (d) have a satisfactory record of integrity and business ethics; (e) have the necessary capabilities to perform the contract; (f) have the necessary facilities to perform the contract; and (g) otherwise be qualified and eligible to receive an award. Apart from removing American Eagle from the housing privatization projects, at this time the Air Force has not initiated any other action against American Eagle.

Senator PRYOR. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, just so you will know, my thought is, if you have a company like American Eagle that just doesn't honor its obligations, its contracts it has made, my sense is they ought to be—there ought to be some sort of so-called “death penalty” for them or some sort of blacklist where for a period of years they just can't bid on these contracts.

But anyway, we can talk about that in another context.

Thank you.

Senator JOHNSON. I will take that under advisement.

Senator Murkowski.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

COAL TO LIQUID FACILITY NEAR EIELSON AIR FORCE BASE, ALASKA

Ms. Ferguson, I want to ask about a situation up north as it relates to Eielson and Fairbanks, the community that is the largest community in relation to that base there.

Recognizing that the Air Force has embarked on this strategy to promote the development of synthetic fuels, one that I heartily endorse, last year in the fiscal year 2009 Defense Appropriations Act, there were \$5 million in O&M funds that was set aside, another \$5 million in research and development funds that was set aside to study the feasibility of a coal-to-liquids facility near Eielson.

And the Fairbanks North Star Borough, which is the local government there, has been working on this project for quite some time. They have defined several issues that they believe are very important to resolve in order to decide how to move this forward and whether to go forward with the project.

The Air Force is now in the process of commissioning two studies now, and it is my understanding that the Fairbanks North Star Borough believes that these studies will not answer the questions about this project, which really do need to be answered now. And apparently, it wasn't up until just about a week ago that the Air Force actually met with the community leaders about the problem.

The community leaders don't feel that the Air Force has been listening to their concerns, and the concern is that they will go forward, spend \$10 million on studies that may have very little value.

So the question that I have of you this afternoon is whether the Air Force is prepared to work with the leadership of the Fairbanks North Star Borough to address the concerns about how this \$10 million is going to be spent?

Ms. FERGUSON. That is a great question. Absolutely, the Air Force is committed to work with the community of Fairbanks and the Fairbanks Economic Development Council (FEDC) up there as

we work through how we spend this \$10 million and how do we best support the community as we move forward.

As you point out, there was a meeting just recently with the community that was on the 3rd of May, and the feedback I got out of the meeting is there was a lot of issues that were raised. And I think it helped to alleviate some of the concerns of the community at that time.

And the purpose of the meeting was really to provide them an update as to where the Air Force was, and to be quite honest, it was hard for the Air Force to get started on this. It was an unusual earmark. We weren't quite sure how to work it, how to work it with the community. So I think that is why there was some delay in beginning to talk to the community.

The folks at the local level were concerned, as you point out, on how the Air Force was going to go forward, what were the studies that we are going to do, how we were going to integrate the community in that. And I can tell you just a couple of things.

The Air Force is really doing three studies. One is the research on the feasibility of a coal-to-liquid plant. Can it work up there? How will it work? What are the things that need to be done to make that work?

And then the second thing is an environmental baseline study, which you have to do for any project. And then the third thing, and this may be one of the things the community is concerned about, is the mission compatibility study. How would a coal-to-liquid plant work alongside the existing missions or potential future missions at Eielson Air Force Base?

So there are kind of three parallel studies all going on. Those will all come together mid to late summer, July-August timeframe. There is actually another meeting up there today with General Chandler, the Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) commander. And he is meeting with Mayor Whitaker and the FEDC folks today.

And then there will be another follow-on meeting in late July, early August that talks about, the results of the preliminary studies and helps to map out a way forward.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Well, I am pleased to see that there is a greater level of communication. I think the community's concerns about how these dollars are going to be spent are good and fair and legitimate. And in order for this to work, there has got to be a full understanding as to how the project truly does play forward.

And I appreciate—I have had an opportunity myself to sit in on the initial meeting, and you had all the stakeholders in the same room. And there was a great deal of energy and a great attitude about the feasibility of how we can really make this work. Since then, everything has kind of fallen by the wayside, and the level of communication has not been what it needs to be.

So I would just encourage that there be that level of coordination and collaboration between the leadership within the Fairbanks community and the Air Force. So I appreciate that.

BRAC 2005 CLOSURE OF KULIS AIR NATIONAL GUARD BASE, ALASKA

And then one final question, and this relates to the 2005 BRAC and Kulis Air National Guard Base there in Anchorage. We think, within the community, that this has been a win in terms of clo-

asures—a win for the Air Force and a win for the community. Because once Kulis moves then over to Elmendorf, the land that Kulis currently occupies can be put to economic development.

So the question quickly to you is whether or not Kulis is on track and whether or not there is adequate funding to complete that BRAC process there at Kulis?

Ms. FERGUSON. Absolutely. Kulis Air National Guard Base is on track for September 15, 2011. And we do not need any additional funding. The Air Force has fully funded BRAC not just at Kulis, but across the Air Force.

And we monitor the execution of that very closely. We do quarterly program management reviews. The last one was just under a month ago, and so far everything is on track and on budget.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Good. I always like good news like that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Senator JOHNSON. Thank you, Senator.

I would like to thank all of our witnesses for appearing before the subcommittee today. We look forward to working with you this year on what is likely to be a very compressed schedule.

For the information of members, questions for the record should be submitted by the close of business on May 15.

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing, but were submitted to the Department for response subsequent to the hearing:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE

F-22 FOR HAWAII ANG

Question. Hawaii's Air National Guard will receive its allocation of twenty F-22 fighters in February 2011.

Do you believe that the two projects requested in fiscal year 2010 will be completed, or near completion, when the planes arrive?

Answer. Given the above information that F-22 fighters will begin arriving at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii in February 2011, it is likely that the two projects requested in fiscal year 2010 will be underway, assuming the current President's Budget request is passed to provide funding at/near the start of the fiscal year in October 2010. However, it is unlikely that the two projects will be nearing completion when the fighters arrive.

Question. Hawaii's Air National Guard will receive its allocation of twenty F-22 fighters in February 2011.

Could you please explain the process by which priority was given to the F-22 military construction projects required at Hickam AFB?

Answer. The Air Force prioritized basing locations through an integrated process that considered mission requirements, available space/facilities, timing of aircraft arrivals, and available military construction funding. Within this prioritization methodology, the Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii projects were aligned against fiscal years 2010–2013. The Air National Guard conducted site surveys and Site Activation Task Forces at Hickam Air Force Base which were attended by representatives from the Headquarters Pacific Air Forces staff and the F-22 Systems Program Office as well as the host unit scheduled to operate the aircraft. Based on operational requirements, sequencing of construction, constructability of the available sites, and funds available through the military construction program, the first two projects were aligned against fiscal year 2010. These projects provide critical aircraft parking apron/taxiway pavements (\$7 million) and the dedicated Low Observable/Composite Repair Facility (\$26 million) needed to begin operating the aircraft from Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii.

Question. The Department of Defense recently announced its intention to halt production of the F-22 in fiscal year 2010. Plans to construct additional infrastructure

at Hickam AFB for the F-22s, bed down and other support facilities, is scheduled to occur in the next 4 years.

What, if any, impact does the plan to discontinue production of the F-22, and changes to the F-22 allocations or scheduled delivery, factor into the prioritization of future F-22 projects at Hickam?

Answer. The fiscal year 2010 President's Budget request shows aircraft arriving at the 154th Wing, Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii beginning in the first quarter of fiscal year 2011. The total delivery is programmed to be completed with 18 primary aircraft authorized by the end of the first quarter of fiscal year 2012. Currently, there is no programmed impact to the prioritization of future F-22 projects at Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii based on the Department of Defense's intent to halt production of further F-22 aircraft.

SHORT AUXILIARY FIELDS (SAAF) IN HAWAII

Question. Hawaii's location in the Asia-Pacific region provides many opportunities and challenges to our military. Strategically located in the Pacific, Hawaii presents many unique challenges that include the ability to respond to threats in a vast geographic area, and when called upon, provide humanitarian assistance during times of disasters. Our military is engaged in Overseas Contingency Operations in Afghanistan and Iraq, which increased the pace of deployments for our men and women in uniform. These deployments require our service members to maintain a high level of training and readiness. One of the training requirements is proficiency to land on Short Auxiliary Airfields (SAAF). Hawaii does not have a SAAF runway for C-17 crews to complete their qualifications requirements, and must fly to the continental United States. This increases costs for the Air Force, results in a loss of valuable man-hours are lost, and increases the strain on the C-17s.

Does the Air Force plan to budget for the construction of an SAAF in the State of Hawaii in the near future, and what annual costs are incurred by the Air Force in its current arrangement to maintain C-17 crews' qualification requirements versus the cost of construction an SAAF?

Answer. The Air Force is addressing the C-17 Short Auxiliary Airfield (SAAF) training requirements through our standard military construction program. The project proposed in support of this requirement competes against other existing requirements on an annual basis.

The Air Force is minimizing costs associated with annual SAAF training requirements for Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii C-17 aircrews by using simulated SAAFs on Kaneohe Bay Marine Corps Air Station or Kalealoea (John Rogers/Barbers Point Airfield). The use of these simulated SAAFs, such as a painted SAAF on the runway at Kaneohe Bay Marine Corps Air Station, requires a temporary 15th Operations Group Commander waiver to the Air Force C-17 SAAF training standard. Any initial or requalification C-17 aircrew training must be completed on an actual SAAF runway.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR MARY L. LANDRIEU

WEAPONS LOAD TRAINING FACILITY AT BARKSDALE AFB, LA

Question. With the delivery of the full President's Budget on Friday, my staff has completed an initial review of the military construction projects for the State of Louisiana. Our quick review has indicated just one Department of Defense project: A new "Warrior in Transition Complex", at Fort Polk, for our Wounded Warriors. My first question is for the Air Force. "Reinvigorate the Nuclear Enterprise" is currently, your number one service priority. The stand-up of Global Strike Command is a clear message of that stated priority. However, adequate training facilities are critical to sustaining this mission area. The 2nd Bomb Wing, located at Barksdale Air Force Base, has an urgent need for a new Weapons Load Training Facility. This facility will directly support training of our crews in the proper processes and procedures for nuclear and conventional munitions loading of the B-52. This facility, which directly supports the Air Force's number one priority, is currently not funded for fiscal year 2010.

Can you explain why?

Answer. Projects identified by the New Discovery review were prioritized and the most critical projects were funded first (two Minot Air Force Base, North Dakota facility projects in fiscal year 2010). The Weapons Load Training Facility is a solid Air Force military construction requirement. Currently, there are existing workarounds that temporarily allow mission accomplishment. This requirement will

continue to be evaluated during the upcoming budget cycle and the Quadrennial Defense Review.

MILCON IN THE AMERICAN RECOVERY AND REINVESTMENT ACT OF 2009

Question. Just a few short months ago, The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 provided the Department of Defense nearly \$2.2 billion in military construction funding. I'm disappointed that the State of Louisiana received none of this funding.

For the Air Force can you explain the process you followed to prioritize and submit military construction projects for this funding, to include your Guard and Reserve components?

Answer. The Air Force received \$310.1 million in military construction funds through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. The Military Construction funds were provided in the following categories: Air National Guard (\$50 million), Child Development Centers (\$80 million), Troop Housing (\$100 million), and Military Family Housing (\$80.1 million). There were no funds provided for Air Force Reserve military construction activities.

Air National Guard projects were selected from projects previously validated by the States and Air National Guard leadership. Several considerations were taken into account in project selection including: ability to award quickly, design complete projects ready for solicitation, State workload (including Wing Deployment status), and maximizing available funding at multiple locations.

The Child Development Center (CDC) projects represent the top seven priorities in the Air Force's CDC construction program. Projects were previously prioritized by the major commands and Air Force Services during the fiscal year 2009 budget process.

In selection of the troop housing, or dormitory projects, the Air Force followed the Air Force Dormitory Master Plan in selecting military construction projects. Additional consideration was applied with regard to the ability to execute projects quickly and maximizing the available ARRA funds.

Lastly, two Military Family Housing military construction projects were selected based on the ability to execute the projects quickly. In the case of Malmstrom AFB, MT the project corrected structural safety deficiencies posing a threat to our Airmen and their families.

GLOBAL STRIKE COMMAND

Question. Ms Ferguson, you played a lead role in the site selection process for Global Strike Command. In April 2009, the Air Force announced that Barksdale Air Force Base was the chosen location to bed down this new command. I understand that the Environmental Impact Study is still in progress. We're anxiously awaiting the final results. As we've previously discussed with both Secretary Donley and General Schwartz, the cyber innovation center, located just outside Barksdale Air Force Base, is a world-class facility, designed to house and support cyber technology development. Yet, it was constructed to support the Air Force. I'd encourage the Air Force and this committee, to consider this facility in both the short and long-term plans, as a realistic, cost-effective method of standing up Global Strike Command at Barksdale Air Force Base.

What fiscal year 2010 funding has been requested to prepare for this transition, and to achieve the initial operating capability of Global Strike Command at Barksdale AFB, pending the EIS results? What is the Air Force's latest estimate for completing and announcing the Environmental Impact Study results?

Answer. \$20 million has been requested in the fiscal year 2010 President's Budget to fund the provisional command's operations and transition of Global Strike Command to its final location. Currently, we estimate that the environmental assessment will be complete the final week of June with an announcement shortly thereafter.

MILITARY COMMAND LOCATIONS OFF MILITARY RESERVATIONS

Question. Military commands are traditionally located on a military base or post, with force protection being one of the driving requirements and benefits of doing so. However, one exception that comes to mind is the United States Southern Command, located in Doral, Florida. In fact, the new consolidated headquarters, authorized by the 2008 National Defense Authorization Act, has paved the way for construction of their new headquarters on 55 acres of Florida-owned land immediately adjacent to the command's current facility. Both the current and the future headquarter buildings are located outside the confines of a military facility.

What would prohibit a major command from being located off-base, even in an interim fashion?

Answer. There are no regulatory requirements which would prohibit a military command (e.g., headquarters) from being located off-base; however, the exacting force protection requirements mandated by the Department of Defense would make an off-base location very costly. Department of Defense guidance, contained in various DOD instructions and Unified Facility Criteria, requiring stand-off distances from roads and other buildings, controlled perimeters, positive identification of persons accessing the facility and other stringent anti-terrorism and security measures are expensive to attain. When the U.S. Southern Command Headquarters relocated to Miami, Florida in 1997, the extensive array of anti-terrorism protective requirements were not yet established. We note that, due to the current anti-terrorism guidance and BRAC decisions, efforts are currently underway to re-locate significant Washington, DC-area headquarters staff elements from off-base facilities to various military installations within the National Capitol Region for similar reasons.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator JOHNSON. This hearing is recessed.

[Whereupon, at 4 p.m., Tuesday, May 12, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]