

2005 BRAC COMMISSION REGIONAL HEARING

THURSDAY, JULY 7, 2005

1:30 PM

SHERATON NATIONAL HOTEL

ARLINGTON, VA.

STATE TESTIFYING:

VIRGINIA

COMMISSIONERS PRESIDING:

The Honorable Anthony J. Principi, Chairman

The Honorable James H. Bilbray

The Honorable Philip E. Coyle, III

General Lloyd W. Newton, USAF (Ret)

Brigadier General Sue Ellen Turner, USAF (Ret)

Charles Battaglia, Executive Director

Rumu Sarkar, Associate General Counsel

CHAIRMAN:

The Honorable Anthony J. Principi

WITNESSES:

The Honorable Mark R. Warner, Governor of Virginia

The Honorable John W. Warner, U.S. Senator, VA

The Honorable George F. Allen, U.S. Senator, VA

Congressman Jim Moran, VA-8

Congressman Tom Davis, VA-11

Jay Fiset, Arlington County.

General Paul Kern, USA (Ret.)

Ed Sheehan, Night Vision Laboratory

Congresswoman Thelma Drake, VA-2

Congressman Robert C. Scott, VA-3

Mayor Ross A. Kearney, Hampton, VA

Mayor Joe S. Frank, Newport News, VA

Reported by:

Megan McKenzie, RPR

OPENING STATEMENT OF ANTHONY J. PRINCIPI, CHAIRMAN,
DEFENSE BASE CLOSURE AND REALIGNMENT COMMISSION

CHAIRMAN PRINCIPI: Good afternoon.

I'm Anthony Principi, and I will be the chairperson for this regional hearing of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission.

I'm also pleased to be joined by my fellow commissioners, Congressman Jim Bilbray, who represented Nevada in the House; the Honorable Phillip Coyle; General Lloyd Newton, United States Air Force, retired; General Sue Turner, United States Air Force, retired. I'm certainly pleased to welcome the distinguished governor, Senator Warner, Senator Allen, members of the Congressional Delegation of Virginia.

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

The Congress entrusts our Armed Forces with vast but not unlimited resources. We have a

responsibility to our nation and to the men and women who bring our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps to life, to demand the best possible use of limited resources.

Congress recognized that fact when it authorized the Department of Defense to prepare a proposal to realign or close domestic bases. However, that authorization was not a blank check. The members of this commission accepted the challenge and necessity of providing an independent, fair and equitable assessment and evaluation of Secretary Rumsfeld's proposals and the data and the methodology used to develop that proposal.

We committed to the Congress, to the President, to the American people that our deliberations and decisions would be open and transparent and that our decisions would be based on the criteria set forth in the statute.

We continue to examine the proposed recommendations set forth by the Secretary of Defense on May 13 and measure them against the criteria for military value set forth in the law, especially the need for surge manning and for homeland security.

But be assured we are not conducting this review as an exercise in sterile cost accounting. This commission is committed to conducting a clear-eyed reality check that we know will not only shape our military capabilities for decades to come but will also have profound effects on the communities and on the people who bring our communities to life and certainly our military installations to life.

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

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the thousands of involved citizens who have already contacted the commission and shared with us your thoughts, concerns and suggestions about the base closures and realignment proposals. Unfortunately, the sheer volume of correspondence that we have received makes it impossible for us to respond to each and every one of you in the

short time within which this commission must complete its work and submit a report to the President on September 8.

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

Today we will hear testimony from the State of Virginia. The state's elected delegation has been allotted a block of time, determined by the overall impact of the Department of Defense closures and realignment recommendations on the State of Virginia.

The delegation members have worked closely with their communities to develop agendas that I am certain will provide information and insight that will make a very valuable part of our review, and we would greatly appreciate your adhering to your timelines, every voice today is important.

I now request our witnesses for the State of

Virginia who will be testifying today to stand for the administration of the oath required by the Base Closure and Realignment statute. The oath will be administered by the commission's designated federal officer, Rumu Sarkar.

(Whereupon, the witnesses were sworn.)

CHAIRMAN PRINCIPI: Governor Warner?

TESTIMONY OF THE HON. MARK R. WARNER,
GOVERNOR FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

GOVERNOR WARNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the commission. My name is Mark Warner. I'm governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia.

And before I start, let me just express on behalf of all of the speakers today and all of us here our grief, concern and our thoughts and prayers for the victims of the terrorist bombings in London earlier today.

We condemn the murderers who commit such acts. We are firmly united with our president in our national efforts to defeat terrorists both at home and abroad. I know the resilience with which the President speaks, we will ultimately win this struggle.

I want to also personally thank the members

of the commission. We had a chance to meet with Chairman Principi a little bit earlier in this session, and I want to personally thank all of you for taking on this enormous responsibility. We know you do not have an easy job; but the President has entrusted you with something that is terribly important; and we view you as a body that we look forward to working with.

Let me briefly describe to you the agenda for our oral presentations today. In my remarks, I will provide an overview of the BRAC issues that affect all portions of the Commonwealth. Senator Warner will then address the BRAC process and specific issues associated with legislation created to implement at BRAC. Senator Allen will follow him and will speak to the unique benefits and synergies in Virginia to the military and its very, very critical missions. Following Senator Allen, we will have a panel of speakers on issues that coincide with Northern Virginia, followed by a panel that will address issues in Hampton Roads and, if time permits, the Fredericksburg region as well.

In addition, we have submitted for the record and in great detail the important written material

which we believe will be crucial to your deliberations.

In our remarks today, we want to emphasize to you four key points:

First, Virginia remains committed to its centuries-long tradition of supporting the needs of America's military. Because of our unique concentration of military bases in Virginia from all branches of the service, we are uniquely positioned to provide common security, to support the transformation efforts initiated by the Secretary, and to be accessible to both the Pentagon and other National Capital Region agencies. We truly have the Virginia military advantage.

Second, Virginia and its communities, and there are many from the communities affected, are well equipped to handle the proposed expansions at Fort Belvoir, Quantico, Fort Lee, Norfolk Naval Base and Shipyard.

Third, let me acknowledge that we're not saying that every recommendation of closing and moving was wrong in Virginia; but we do believe there were certain recommendations that we'd like to point out some additional facts, specifically

the decision to close Fort Monroe, to shift missions and personnel from Fort Eustis and Dahlgren. We believe we can make the case that these were not supported by sound strategic analysis.

And fourth, and we'll spend some time -- and I will come back and revisit this subject after Senator Allen has finished. The recommendations to vacate over eight million square feet of leased space in Northern Virginia is unnecessary for the security of our military forces, inordinately expensive, and inconsistent with the BRAC legislation and inconsistent with the treatment of leased space in other areas of the country. In particular, we will spend a great deal of time on this subject.

DoD's recommendations to move five extramural research commands from Northern Virginia to Maryland is flawed because it's failed to consider lower-cost alternatives available in close proximity to the current locations of those agencies, close-by alternatives that would not provide the disruption that the proposed move would ensure, and close-by alternatives that will actually save DoD more money than their proposals.

These points will obviously be elaborated.

Let me start with first, the Virginia advantage. The Commonwealth of Virginia and the host of community leaders all across this room consider the needs of the military in Virginia to be one of our highest priorities. This has been a historic fact.

As a matter of fact, that commitment of Virginia to our nation's military goes a long way back. One of the bases you have scheduled for closure, Fort Monroe, back in 1821, Virginia actually gave the land to the U.S. Military to create Fort Monroe. Virginia continues today to provide unique location, strategic and quality-of-life advantages for America's military forces. Senator Allen will spend some time addressing these issues.

Let me now turn to my second point, our ability to support the recommendations for base expansions in Virginia. Virginia's communities are ready, willing and able to support the proposed expansion at installations throughout Hampton Roads, Central Virginia and Northern Virginia. We have already more than 250,000 defense-related workers already that live and work

in Virginia. As a result, we know well what our military needs and wants are in terms of community support, public infrastructure, and quality of life.

Simply put, Virginia's a state where BRAC-recommended growth and future non-BRAC growth can be solidly planned for and accommodated. In fact, we've already engaged in the process of planning for the transportation improvements that will be needed if and when the BRAC recommendations are implemented.

For instance, I have recently directed the commissioner of transportation to update our six-year transportation plan to address the new military needs as the BRAC recommendations are finalized.

Let me give you a couple of examples of what we're looking at. Transportation movements around Route 1, around Fort Belvoir and also around the gated Quantico. I-564 inter-modal connector and Chambers Field interchange at Norfolk Naval Station and similar installations around the state.

I've also asked our state's Department of Education to work closely with local school issues

that may be effected by the impact of the additional personnel moving into the communities. The school systems will be ready.

Military families that transfer to Virginia will be greeted with the highest quality of life. They'll quickly discover why over 700,000, the highest per capita in the nation, military retirees and their families have chosen to stay in Virginia and call it home.

Let me now turn to some specific observations about the expected significant growth at Norfolk Naval Station and the Shipyard. Norfolk Naval Station has phenomenal access and quality of life. The infrastructure inside and outside the fence allows us to absorb more than 6,000-plus new workers. In addition, we have adequate berthing to accommodate all of the submarines, if they were to so choose, moving down from New London. As this example, specifically on Norfolk, indicates, we are well equipped to handle this expansion.

On base closures, let me turn to that issue. We have chosen to focus on a couple of specific instances. Fort Monroe, for example. We believe that the environmental cleanup costs of Fort Monroe will be as much as four times the amount

estimated by the DoD BRAC calculations. For that reason, among others, we ask you to re-examine the case.

In terms of Fort Eustis, the City of Newport News offered to construct at the city's expense a new facility to house the Surface Deployment and Systems Command. DoD's cost-savings analysis is inaccurate because it's not taking into account the substantial savings of the city-backed proposal.

In a similar fashion, we don't think the proposed move of the Navy's large gun weapon and ammo testing from Dahlgren to New Jersey takes into account the significant differences between the Army and Navy in terms of how they test and evaluate large guns and ammunition.

Let me touch briefly on Oceana. I understand the commission is potentially looking at that, and I hope that the commission will deal not with some of the misinformation and myths about Oceana but about the facts.

Oceana and its surrounding area continued to co-exist well. We have more than 3,600 acres of restricted easements outside the fence and 8,700 acres of restricted easements in the Fentress.

In addition, the City of Virginia Beach has committed more than \$200 million during the past decades to improve transportation around the base. And while we hear from some folks who complain, in a recent scientific poll, 86% of the residents of Virginia Beach firmly support Oceana staying in that community. Obviously DoD has already made that determination of the value of having those air wings based close to the carriers. In addition, we stand ready if the outlying field in North Carolina does not proceed to provide Virginia alternatives.

Finally, in turn and most troublesome, is the question of the leased space issue in Northern Virginia. Eight million square feet proposed for change. DoD's recommendations on leased space clearly deviate from the criteria established by law. Senator Warner spent some time on this.

We believe that the National Capital Region is one of the best-protected places on earth. We can never guarantee, as we saw in London earlier today, 100% risk-free; but achieving appropriate levels of security, DoD and every American requires a reasonable approach and one that reassures our citizens.

My colleagues, we'll touch on both of these issues; and I will come back again after Senator Allen's comments to follow up on some of the particular concerns related to the research facilities in Northern Virginia as somebody who spent 20 years in the RND field and high-tech field before transformation to government. I think there are serious disruption issues that we need to bring to the table.

So with that, I will turn over the balance of my time to my colleague, Senator Warner, to address some of these issues. Senator Warner.

TESTIMONY OF THE HON. JOHN W. WARNER,
U.S. SENATOR FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

SENATOR WARNER: Thank you very much, Governor; and I want to commend you and the commission you established with my good friend, the former congressman over here and Secretary Reeder joining him.

We put together exactly what was needed to have a coordination of all the assets in our state, the governments, city council, all the other elected officials to bring together facts that we will present today in what I believe is a very, very strong case.

I join you, Governor, in expressing deep regrets to those who lost their lives in this most recent terrorist attack and those suffering from injuries and the families. But I am mindful of the fact that today this great nation is holding this open assembly, attended by hundreds of people; and I thank every person who's taking the opportunity to depart from their daily routine to join in this room today. We can only do that by maintaining a free nation.

And on the first news of this tragedy as I awakened this morning, my thoughts went to our own men and women in the Armed Forces, wherever they are in the world, and their families because it's only because of their willingness to serve and their sacrifices are we able to enjoy that measure of freedom we have here in our great nation.

I thought that my most valuable contribution -- given that the Governor's covered a good deal of the state, my good friend George Allen will cover other parts, members of Congress, Congressman Davis and Moran and Drake and Scott will cover their individual districts -- is to talk about the fact that I have been on every one of the teams that drew up the law on BRAC since

1988.

I first had familiarity with BRAC with the Secretary of the Navy. In those days a service secretary could close a military facility, and I exercised that authority. But then it was soon recognized by the Congress that that system couldn't work and that we had to enact a law, a law which said Congress has a role; the President has a role with the Department of Defense; and the local communities have a role. And we tried our very best to strike a balance and set forth clearly and succinct those criteria to be followed by this distinguished commission.

I, again, join my governor and others for thanking you for your service. I have personally known a number of the individuals on this commission for many years, and I have absolute confidence in them to make fair and objective decisions in the best interest of the country.

But I'm going to absolutely be very clear. I know the law, particularly this last one because I was privileged to be chairman of this committee. And I regret to say that I find in this situation in our state that with the best of intentions, the Department of Defense, through the secretary, made

its recommendations; but those recommendations are not predicated on the criteria as set forth in the law. And I believe as you go through, you will find substantial deviation from the decision-making process and the decisions made and the actual words of the law.

Now, I have prepared -- as a former lawyer, I rather enjoyed it. In 27 years -- 27 years I've served in the Senate, and I've had no opportunity to draw up a legal brief. But there's a 36-page legal brief up here, and I drew up every word of it. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to read that brief.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN PRINCIPI: I will.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. Chairman, in the Armed Services Committee, I wield that gavel and say, "We'll admit that to the record, and it will be part of the record."

I do hope -- and I say this most respectfully because I've tried hard; and I think I am as well qualified as anyone, having drafted the law that's before us today and enacted by the Congress and signed by the President. I know that law, and I know what Congress intended.

Now, there may well be situations that were

before the Department of Defense in which they feel in the transformation and modernization of our forces, which is absolutely essential, that certain actions have to be taken; and I'll address some of those specifically here in this Northern Virginia area.

And had the Department of Defense come to the Congress and say, we need not only the authority to do such and such but the authority to handle the uniqueness of the situations here in Northern Virginia, it is my judgment we would have incorporated that in the law. But I've gone back; and I've looked at all of the communications between the Administration and the Congress, committees of the Armed Services, of the House and the Senate; and there's none to be found. And therefore, I feel that in fairness as you would go through these deliberations, you'll find where you'll have to reject certain requests by the Secretary of Defense.

This -- I'm going to read this because it is very complicated. And it's all out there on the website. Copies of it are available, but this is the highlight.

When my colleagues and I wrote the

legislation that authorized the Defense Base Realignment and Closure round for 2005, we specifically addressed issues of openness, transparency and an independent review of critical decisions in order to preserve the integrity of and the public trust in the BRAC process.

The BRAC process is absolutely essential, ladies and gentlemen; and that's why I put so much of my career behind it. In these many years -- 17 years I've dealt with this process because we've got to keep the American Armed Forces on the cutting edge of technology. We cannot be utilizing funds to be expended on keeping old infrastructure in place when we need new infrastructure.

So BRAC is essential, but we've got to do it in a way that maintains the trust and the confidence of the men and women of the Armed Forces and the public. We did our best to do that. We directed the Secretary of Defense to make recommendations based on those criteria and those criteria alone.

For example, Section 2913(f) of Title 10 of the United States Code states:

"The final selection criteria specified in

this section shall be the only criteria to be used, along with the force-structure plan and infrastructure inventory referred to in Section 2912, in making recommendations for the closure or realignment of military installations inside the United States under this part in 2005."

The BRAC law simply does not provide the legal basis for the department to take actions or implement decisions as part of the BRAC process that are not in accordance with the BRAC criteria.

However, based on an extensive review of supporting documentation, along with the experience that I have had over these 17 years in drafting legislation and participating in these rounds of BRAC, I most respectfully call to the attention of the commission a number of the department's recommendations which, in my view, quote, as the law says, deviates substantially, end quote, from the BRAC legislative requirements in three important areas.

First area, certain recommendations were justified by factors and priorities other than the selection of criteria in violation of Section 2914(f).

Two, certain recommendations were based on

data that was not certified as required by Section 2903.

Three, certain recommendations did not contain accurate assessments of the costs and savings to be incurred by the Department of Defense and other federal agencies as required by Section 2913(e).

I will support my position with three legal briefs; and I have them right here in addition to a 37-page legal brief which covers it more thoroughly; and there they are.

I ask that they be entered in as part of the record, together with my principles.

CHAIRMAN PRINCIPI: Without objection.

SENATOR WARNER: Thank you.

The first brief pertains to the criteria related to military value. The law states the Department of Defense must use the criteria as the framework for the department's BRAC analysis.

Now, I will say in fairness to the process that the emphasis on military criteria was not one requested by the department and the President as he sent draft legislation to the Congress; but the Congress has the right to put that down as the top criteria; and we did that ever so clearly in this

statute.

Yet on September 8, 2004, acting under Secretary of Defense Wynne, announced that a series of 77 transformation options would, and I quote, "constitute a minimal analytical framework upon which the military departments and Joint Cross Service Groups will conduct their respective BRAC analysis," end quote.

There is no record that these options were ever formally approved. However, these options were extensively used by the military department and the Joint Cross Service Groups in their BRAC deliberations.

The department BRAC red team -- now that's the team that was looking at it to see that it was done properly -- raised concerns about the use of their transformation options during a meeting on March 22, 2005.

And I quote from their actual minutes, quote, since transformation is not one of the final selection criteria, transformational justifications have no legal basis and should be removed, end quote.

However, as slated July 1, 2005, the director of the Technical Group informed my office that --

and I quote him, transformation options guided recommendations, end quote.

Clearly, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, a substantial deviation from the law. The Headquarters Group used two OSD imperatives to guide their recommendations. One, significant reduction in leased space in the NCR. Two, reduce DoD presence in the NCR in terms of activities and employees.

Yet acting under Secretary of Defense Michael Wynne's guidance on military value principles dated October 14, 2004, does not have any discernible correlation between military value as determined by the Congress and transformation options, including the goal of reducing leased office space in the NCR or reducing DoD's presence in the NCR.

An OSD official involved in the BRAC process went so far as to dictate respective BRAC recommendations on a meeting January 5, 2005.

I quote, "the OSD member met with Mr. DuBois and gave him an NCR update. Mr. DuBois stated the leadership expectations include four items: One, significant reduction of leased space in the NCR. Two, reduce DoD presence in the NCR in terms of

activities and employees. Three, MDA, DISA, and the NGA are especially strong candidates to move out of the NCR," end quote.

I cannot recall in my 17 years of association with the BRAC process when installations within a specific region were targeted by the Department of Defense for specific scrutiny and recommendations for realignment or closure. Congress intended the legislative criteria and force structure requirements to be evenly applied to all military installations. OSD imperatives targeting a certain region should not have been used to guide BRAC recommendations. In fact, these imperatives violate Section 2903(c) of the BRAC laws, which require that all installations within the United States be treated equally.

My time has expired, and I'll submit the balance for the record. It gets stronger as I go on.

(Laughter.)

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN PRINCIPI: Senator Allen.

TESTIMONY OF THE HON. GEORGE F. ALLEN,
U.S. SENATOR FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA

SENATOR ALLEN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,

members of the commission. Let me state, as my colleagues have, to our friends in Britain that their friends across the Atlantic here stand with them. They stand with -- we stand with them. We feel like we were attacked just as much as we did in Madrid, whether it's London, whether it's New York City or the Pentagon.

And this just should reinforce all our resolve that free and just societies, where we do have freedom of expression, freedom of religion, a free-enterprise system and the rule of law, will prevail over such vile hate-filled terrorists.

And I thank our men and women in the armed services for protecting us as well as those in homeland security, intelligence and a variety of other agencies.

Now, Mr. Chairman and BRAC commissioners, I thank you for your tireless efforts on these issues that have such great importance to the future of our national security. I sense, following some of this BRAC commission this round, that there will probably be more changes than any other previous commission's changes in DoD recommendations.

This BRAC commission here, I would say to the

chairman and commission members, has to recognize that Virginia's been on the forefront of our national defense for many years. Virginia's the home to the men and women of our military in all the armed forces, Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force and their families.

Virginia actually operates as a commonwealth, as an integrated military installation that focuses its sovereign efforts on attending to the very diverse and interconnected needs of the military, including the essential partnership between government and the civilian contract personnel.

The Virginia Delegation is united. The governor, Senator Warner, myself, and our members of Congress, Congressmen Scott, Davis, Moran and Drake as well as local leaders and other experts, we're here today to show beyond a reasonable doubt that a number of the recommendations provided by the Secretary of Defense as they relate to leased office space in Northern Virginia and Fort Monroe in Hampton deviates substantially from the legislative mandates of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission statutes.

My colleague had part of his brief explained

to you here in great detail. I don't believe that a full or accurate consideration was given to many of these recommendations to determine if they were honestly viable options. It appears that in many cases, military value was ignored and unsubstantiated arguments were conducted to justify an agenda that has little to do with the proper BRAC criteria.

First, one, to speak on the Secretary's recommendations in the Hampton Roads area very briefly, particularly Fort Monroe and Fort Eustis, Fort Monroe is clearly one of our nation's oldest military bases. It is safe to say that this fort, which actually has a moat surrounding it, is one of the most unique and secure in the nation. Its military values not just are subjective comments here. It's been proven throughout history, and it is a premiere location for TRADOC.

Now, because the Secretary's recommendation does not contain a cost estimate for the environmental remediation and cleanup, it surely appears that these criteria was quickly glanced over or completely ignored.

Initial estimates for the cleanup were around \$300 million; but I'd like to note for the record

that when I was governor going through the 1995 BRAC process, the BRAC commission considered an analysis that was conducted by the 1993 BRAC commission which reported, according to a study conducted by the Naval Explosive Ordnance Facility in 1980, that the cost of cleaning up the base would be approximately \$635 million.

The Navy's survey covered only one fourth of the base. It was the unoccupied quarter of the base at that. So you factor in inflation, and it is clear that the comprehensive remediation for the entire facility would easily exceed \$1 billion.

Now, considering these costs, one can confidently assert that any potential savings from closing Fort Monroe will be so far into the future that you cannot quantify them; and there won't be savings. And, in fact, the bottom line is that the closure of Fort Monroe would lead to arguably the most convoluted, complicated, costly and controversial closings in our nation's history.

Now, with respect to Fort Eustis, please, I would urge the members of the commission to look specifically at the weak economic basis for the proposed move of the Aviation Logistics School.

The move to close that component would cost nearly \$500 million for a savings of about \$77 million over a 20-year period, which doesn't make a great deal of sense for the taxpayers or the defense mission.

Please, I would urge you. We all endorse the comments that we'll hear from the mayors of Hampton and Newport News as they lay out very cogent, logical statements on the unique values of these two forts.

Now, also stated by Governor Warner, late last week we received notice that there's an inquiry as to closing of the Master Jet Base at Oceana. The justification or reasoning behind this inquiry stems from, allegedly, encroachment associated with Oceana.

That's not a unique or an unusual situation. There are air bases all across the country where encroachment is an issue. But I'll tell you this, members of the commission, if we were having a conversation outdoors in Virginia Beach, and it was interrupted by the sound of a jet flying overhead, the remark you'd always hear is, "That's the sound of freedom."

The point is is that Virginia Beach strongly

supports Oceana; and Oceana, those naval families have a wonderful place for their families to live in the Virginia Beach area.

Now, with respect to Northern Virginia, adding to Senator Warner's expert legal brief that I know you'll carefully examine because this is like one of the original authors of all of this, so he knows this better than anyone else; but I would like to make three key points here.

You're aware that the military is very different today than it was ten years ago. That's why there are a few vital issues that need to be considered.

Number one is the changing nature of the military. Two, the essential teamwork between civilian and military personnel. And three, the fundamental importance of preserving the synergy of our nation's foremost scientists and researchers.

Now, to achieve these goals we must avoid substantial disruption in the essential efforts or lose essential personnel. These highly skilled well-educated men and women are, indeed, our most valuable assets for these very high-tech military functions.

As governor and now on the Committee on Science and Innovation Competitiveness in the Senate, I've always advocated how important technology and leadership and innovation was to our civilian economic competitiveness as well as our military superiority. I believe what you would find with these proposals is a very detrimental effect.

In fact, what we ought to be doing instead of separating and putting up barriers between the private sector, and whether those are enterprise solutions or civilian contractors and the military or homeland security or intelligence, we ought to be tearing down barriers; and we would have, I think, then more innovative communications, technology, enterprise solutions and software systems that are necessary for us to prevail against our economic as well as military competition.

It's for that reason I'm very concerned about the adverse consequences that will flow from the current recommendations for the military science and technology command agencies DARPA, ONR, AFOSR, and AOR.

I join my colleagues in stating that very

Careful analysis in reviewing these recommendations for these commands show rather than strengthening our national security if adopted, they will actually lead to mission degradation and increased cost.

You have to understand that Northern Virginia has an extraordinary synergy of universities, contractors, civilian and military research agencies that represent a creative collaboration for perfective ideas and knowledge that enables new capabilities, also in close proximity to the Pentagon. Your commission should not render asunder this convergence of national defense foresight that enhances military effectiveness.

However, I'm going to submit my statement for the record since I'm the same as Senator Warner's. But on ready access, research agencies are dependent on ready access; and they have to have that access to a large pool of highly educated contractors who surround them in Northern Virginia and, in particular, Arlington.

In the case of DARPA, nearly three-quarters, three-quarters of the agency's internal 828-person staff are civilian contractors. Another 900 contractors are within walking distance of the

DARPA offices.

Now, as you heard -- I know you did, Mr. Chairman -- at our earlier meeting in Arlington a few months ago, DARPA has very serious concerns about the willingness and ability of these contractors to move either to Bethesda or the Anacostia annex sites, particularly given the requirement that most of them would then have to then add a crossing over the Potomac River, over the very few but very highly congested bridges.

Please recall Ron Kurjanowicz's statement. He is the program manager with DARPA. He clearly stated it was a very harmful proposal which would result in the loss of creative scientists, engineers and technologists. Also at that meeting, members from the Missile Defense Agency, Office of Naval Research, and DISA also stated that the proposed recommendations would have them lose people and risk mission.

These are among the most highly trained and sought-after technical experts in the nation. They are manpower resources who can and will find alternative employment that will not require them to move from home or to substantially increase their commutes.

Remember that the director of DISA said the proposed move had implications of a 50% loss of personnel plus the difficulty of constituting or reconstituting a security-cleared personnel force which are so valuable in the private sector.

Talking to Bobbie Kilberg with the Northern Virginia Technology Council, the more security clearance someone has, the more they'll get paid in the private sector. Also, the National Science Foundation is within walking distance of the defense research agencies. Since the NSF operations are so closely intertwined with research agencies, the proposed recommendations will rupture their close working relationship as well.

I would like to put in the record also, Mr. Chairman, members of the commission, a letter dated June 29, 2005, from Dr. Hans Benedict, who is the director for the Center for Technology and National Security regarding the BRAC recommendations on the defense labs. And I'll put that as part of my statement and into the record.

Let me just state pertinent parts of this. Dr. Benedict writes, "The future will be characterized increasingly by the globalization of

